

Architecture
Structural
Geotechnical



Materials Testing
Forensic
Civil/Planning

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP
EMPLOYEE OWNED

SOILS AND GEOLOGY STUDY

**Meadowbrook Park
70 Single Family Residential Development
Colorado Springs, Colorado**

PREPARED FOR:

**Meadowbrook Development, LLC
c/o CMC, Inc.
PO Box 7207
Colorado Springs, CO 80903**

JOB NO. 177164


August 26, 2020

Respectfully Submitted,
RMG – Rocky Mountain Group

Reviewed by,
RMG – Rocky Mountain Group

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Kelli Zigler".

**Kelli Zigler
Project Geologist**



**Geoff Webster, P.E.
Sr. Geotechnical Project Engineer**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 GENERAL SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	4
1.1 Project Location	4
1.2 Existing and Proposed Land Use.....	4
1.3 Project Description	4
2.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF PREPARERS	4
3.0 STUDY OVERVIEW	5
3.1 Scope and Objective.....	5
3.2 Site Evaluation Techniques	6
3.3 Additional Documents.....	6
4.0 SITE CONDITIONS	6
4.1 Existing Site Conditions	6
4.2 Topography	6
4.3 Vegetation	7
4.4 Aerial photographs and remote-sensing imagery	7
5.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION AND LABORATORY TESTING	7
5.1 Laboratory Testing	7
5.2 Groundwater.....	7
6.0 SOIL, GEOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING GEOLOGY	7
6.1 Subsurface Soil Conditions	8
6.2 Bedrock Conditions.....	8
6.3 Soil Conservation Service	8
6.4 General Geologic Conditions	8
6.5 Engineering Geology.....	9
6.6 Structural Features.....	9
6.7 Surficial (Unconsolidated) Deposits.....	9
6.8 Features of Special Significance	9
6.9 Drainage of Water and Groundwater	9
7.0 ECONOMIC MINERAL RESOURCES.....	9
8.0 IDENTIFICATION AND MITIGATION OF POTENTIAL GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS	10
8.1 Hydrocompactive Soils	10
8.2 Steep Slopes	11
8.3 Erosion.....	11
8.4 Faults and Seismicity.....	11
8.5 Radon.....	12
8.6 Proposed Grading, Erosion Control, Cuts and Masses of Fill.....	12
9.0 BEARING OF GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS UPON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT.....	13
10.0 BURIED UTILITIES	13
11.0 PAVEMENTS	14
12.0 ANTICIPATED FOUNDATION SYSTEMS.....	14
12.1 Structural Fill - General.....	15
12.2 Surface Grading and Drainage	15
12.3 Foundation Drains	16
13.0 ADDITIONAL STUDIES.....	16
14.0 CONCLUSIONS	16
15.0 CLOSING.....	17
FIGURES	
Site Vicinity Map	1
Proposed Concept Plan	2
Test Boring Location Plan.....	3

Explanation of Test Boring Logs	4
Test Boring Logs	5-8
Summary of Laboratory Test Results (Unified)	9
Summary of Laboratory Test Results (AASHTO)	9.1
Soil Classification Data	10-11
USDA Soils Survey Map	12
Engineering and Geology Map	13

APPENDIX A

Additional Reference Documents

APPENDIX B

Guideline Site Grading Specifications

1.0 GENERAL SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 Project Location

The project lies in the N¼ of the SE¼ of Section 8, Township 14 South, Range 65 West, of the 6th Principal Meridian in El Paso County, Colorado. The approximate location of the site is shown on the Site Vicinity Map, Figure 1.

1.2 Existing Land Use

The site currently consists of three parcels. The total area of the proposed site is 7.81 acres as recorded on the El Paso County Assessors website. The parcels included are:

- Schedule No. 540808000053 – 4.47 acres, currently zoned as “RR5 CAD-O” – *Residential Rural, Commercial Airport District*
- Schedule No. 5408403001 – 0.62 acres, currently zoned as “I-2 CAD-O” – *Limited Industrial, Commercial Airport District*
- Schedule No. 5408008002 – 2.72 acres, currently zoned as “CR-I-2 CAD-O” – *Commercial Regional Limited Industrial, Commercial Airport District*

The parcels are currently not developed.

1.3 Project Description

Based on a concept plan prepared by Kimley Horn, which was provided to us by our client, it is our understanding the Meadowbrook Park development is to consist of 70 single-family residential units. At this time, it is uncertain if the units will be constructed atop a crawlspace or basement foundation. The concept plan is presented in Figure 2.

Access into the development will be from Meadowbrook Parkway to the west. Additional proposed land usage includes a detention area in the southeast portion of the site, district tracts, landscaped public easements, utility easements and private roadways and driveways. A retaining wall is proposed along the southern boundary of the property. Interior driveways and parking areas will most likely be privately owned and maintained by an HOA or the developer. If public streets are developed, they will require a site-specific pavement design investigation and report.

The development is to utilize public sewer and water services. Neither individual wells nor on-site wastewater treatment systems are proposed.

The purpose of this report is to provide a Soils and Geology Study for approval of the entire three parcels for the Planned Unit Development (PUD) within El Paso County, Colorado.

2.0 QUALIFICATIONS OF PREPARERS

This Geology and Soils Study was prepared by a professional geologist as defined by Colorado Revised Statutes section 34-1-201(3) and by a qualified geotechnical engineer as defined by policy statement 15, "Engineering in Designated Natural Hazards Areas" of the Colorado State Board of Registration for Professional Engineers and Professional Land Surveyors. (Ord. 96-74; Ord. 01-42).

The principle investigators for this study are Kelli Zigler P.G., and Geoff Webster, P.E. Ms. Zigler is a Professional Geologist as defined by State Statute (C.R.S 34-1-201) with over 19 years of experience in the geological and geotechnical engineering field. Ms. Kelli Zigler holds a B.S. in Geology from the University of Tulsa. Ms. Zigler has supervised and performed numerous geological and geotechnical field investigations throughout Colorado.

Geoff Webster, P.E. is a licensed Professional Engineer with 35 years of experience in the civil and geotechnical engineering fields. Mr. Webster holds a Master's degree from the University of Central Florida. Mr. Webster has supervised and performed numerous geological and geotechnical field investigation programs in Colorado and other states.

3.0 STUDY OVERVIEW

The purpose of this investigation is to characterize the general geotechnical and geologic site conditions, and present our opinions of the potential effect of these conditions on the proposed residential development within the referenced site.

Revisions to the conclusions presented in this report may be issued based upon submission of the Development Plan. This study has been prepared in accordance with the requirements outlined in the El Paso County Land Development Code (LDC) specifically Chapter 8, last updated August 27, 2019. Applicable sections include 8.4.8 and 8.4.9., and the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), specifically Appendix C last updated July 9, 2019.

3.1 Scope and Objective

The scope of this study is to include a physical reconnaissance of the site and a review of pertinent, publically available documents including, but not limited to, previous geologic and geotechnical reports, overhead and remote sensing imagery, published geology and/or hazard maps, design documents, etc. Our services exclude evaluation of environmental and/or human, health-related work products, or recommendations previously prepared by others for this project.

The objectives of our study are to:

- Identify geologic conditions present on the site
- Analyze potential negative impacts of these conditions on the proposed site development
- Analyze potential negative impacts to surrounding properties and/or public services resulting from the proposed site development as it relates to existing geologic conditions
- Provide our opinion of suitable techniques that may be utilized to mitigate any potential negative impacts identified herein

This report presents the findings of the study performed by RMG relating to the geologic conditions of the above-referenced site. Revisions and modifications to this report may be issued subsequently by RMG, based upon:

- Additional observations made during grading and construction which may indicate conditions that require re-evaluation of some of the criteria presented in this report
- Review of pertinent documents (development plans, plat maps, drainage reports/plans, etc.) not available at the time of this study

- Comments received from the governing jurisdiction and/or their consultants subsequent to submission of this document

3.2 Site Evaluation Techniques

The information included in this report has been compiled from several sources, including:

- Field reconnaissance
- Geologic and topographic maps
- Review of selected publicly available, pertinent engineering reports
- Available aerial photographs
- Subsurface exploration by RMG
- Laboratory testing of representative site soil and rock samples by RMG
- Geologic research and analysis
- Site development plans prepared by others

Geophysical investigations were not considered necessary for characterization of the site geology. Monitoring programs, which typically include instrumentation and/or observations for changes in groundwater, surface water flows, slope stability, subsidence, and similar conditions, are not known to exist and were not considered applicable for the scope of this report.

3.3 Additional Documents

Additional documents reviewed during the performance of this study are included in Appendix A.

4.0 SITE CONDITIONS

4.1 Existing Site Conditions

The undeveloped site is bordered to the west by Meadowbrook Parkway and to the east by U.S. Highway 24. The interior of the northern portion of the site has been regraded to a level surface, and is not vegetated. The north and east sides of the site rise vertically a few feet, and then slope upward at a 20 percent slope (5:1) to meet the adjacent properties. Runoff from U.S. 24 has formed a natural drainage way in the embankment and into the southern portion of the site. The southern portion of the site is level and vegetated with native grasses, shrubs, and trees.

Adjacent property to the south includes a developed parcel with a Circle K gas station. Adjacent property to the north includes a storage facility complex.

4.2 Topography

Based on our site reconnaissance on June 23, 2020, site topography is generally level terrain within the proposed build areas. An embankment down from Highway 24 is moderately steep with an elevation difference of up to 20 feet. The elevation varies approximately 40-feet across the entire site from the northeast to southwest.

4.3 Vegetation

The majority of the site consists of native grasses, weeds and very few shrubs and deciduous trees.

4.4 Aerial photographs and remote-sensing imagery

Personnel of RMG reviewed aerial photos available through Google Earth Pro dating back to 1999, CGS surficial geologic mapping, and historical photos by historicaerials.com dating back to 1947. Historically, the site has remained undeveloped land.

5.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION AND LABORATORY TESTING

The subsurface conditions within the property were explored by drilling eight (8) exploratory test borings to depths of 20-feet below the existing ground surface. The number of borings included in this study exceed the minimum criteria of one test boring per 10 acres of development up to 100 acres and one additional boring for every 25 acres of development above 100 acres as stipulated in the ECM, Section C.3.3.

The test borings were drilled with a power-driven, continuous-flight auger drill rig. Samples were obtained during drilling of the test boring in general accordance with ASTM D-1586 and D-3550, utilizing a 2-inch O.D. Split Barrel Sampler and a 2½-inch O.D. California sampler, respectively. Results of Standard Penetration Tests are shown on the drilling logs. The location of the test borings is presented on the lot layout shown on the Test Boring Location Plan, Figure 3. An Explanation of Test Boring Logs are presented in Figure 4. Test Boring Logs are presented in Figures 5 through 8.

5.1 Laboratory Testing

Soil laboratory testing was performed as part of this investigation. Laboratory testing included moisture content, grain-size analysis, and Atterberg Limits. A Summary of Laboratory Test Results is presented in Figure 9. Soil Classification Data is presented in Figures 10 and 11.

5.2 Groundwater

Groundwater was not encountered in test borings during the field exploration or when checked 11 days subsequent to drilling. The site soil appears to be well drained, and natural moisture contents were low. Fluctuations in groundwater and subsurface moisture conditions may occur due to variations in rainfall and other factors not readily apparent at this time. Development of the property and adjacent properties may also affect groundwater levels.

6.0 SOIL, GEOLOGY, AND ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

The site is located within the western flank of the Colorado Piedmont section of the Great Plains physiographic province. The Colorado Piedmont, formed during Late Tertiary and Early Quaternary time (approximately 2,000,000 years ago), is a broad, erosional trench that separates the Southern Rocky Mountains from the High Plains. During the Late Mesozoic and Early Cenozoic Periods (approximately 70,000,000 years ago), intense tectonic activity occurred, causing the uplifting of the Front Range and associated downwarping of the Denver Basin to the east. Relatively flat uplands and broad valleys characterize the present-day topography of the Colorado Piedmont in this region.

6.1 Subsurface Soil Conditions

The subsurface materials encountered in the test borings were classified within the laboratory using the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). The materials classify primarily as native silty to clayey sand (SM- SC) throughout the depths tested. Neither interbedded clay layers, or claystone bedrock were encountered in the test borings.

Additional descriptions and the interpreted distribution (approximate depths) of the subsurface materials are presented on the Test Boring Logs. The classifications shown on the logs are based upon the engineer's description of the samples at the depths indicated. Stratification lines shown on the logs represent the approximate boundaries between material types and the actual transitions may be gradual and vary with location.

6.2 Bedrock Conditions

Bedrock was not encountered in the test borings performed for this study. In general, bedrock (as mapped by Colorado Geologic Survey - CGS) is at depth beneath this site, and is considered part of the Dawson formation. Bedrock is not anticipated in the excavations or utility trenches for the proposed development.

6.3 U.S. Soil Conservation Service

The U.S. Soil Conservation Service along with United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) identifies the site soils as:

- 8 – Blakeland loamy sand, 1 to 9 percent slopes. The Blakeland loamy sand was mapped by the USDA to encompass the majority of the property. Properties of the loamy sand include, somewhat excessively drained soils, depth of the water table is anticipated to be greater than 6.5 feet, runoff is anticipated to be low, frequency of flooding and ponding is none, and landforms include depressions.

The USDA Soils Survey Map is presented in Figure 12.

6.4 General Geologic Conditions

Based on our field observations and the Geologic Map of the Elsmere Quadrangle, an interpreted geologic map of significant surficial deposits and features was mapped for the site. The identified geologic conditions affecting the development are presented in the Engineering and Geology Map, Figure 13.

The site generally consists of eolian deposits overlying sandstone bedrock. Four geologic units were mapped at the site as:

- *Qes₁* – Younger eolian sand (middle and early Holocene and late? Pleistocene) – very pale-brown, pale-brown, and light yellowish-brown sand. Unit is chiefly very coarse and coarse sand that appears to have been deposited as sand sheets. Unit thickness is estimated to be 3-20 feet deep. The eolian sand was encountered in the test borings to a depth of 20 feet.
- *Qam* – Middle alluvium (late Pleistocene) – chiefly light brownish gray, pale-brown, light-yellowish-brown, and grayish-brown, poorly sorted and subordinate amounts of gravel.

- *TKda₁* – Dawson formation, facies unit one – white to light-gray, cross-bedded or massive, very coarse arkosic sandstone or pebbly conglomerate. Occasional interbedded thin to very thinly bedded sandy claystone. Estimate thickness varies from 25 to 200 feet. The Dawson formation was not encountered in the test borings.
- *ss* – steep slopes – Isolated steep slopes that are to not be disturbed with the proposed development, other than for the proposed retaining wall construction

6.5 Engineering Geology

Charles Robinson and Associates (1977) have mapped two environmental engineering units at the site as:

- 2D – Eolian deposits generally on flat to gentle upland areas.
- 2E – Low terraces and valleys of minor tributary streams.

6.6 Structural Features

Structural features such as schistosity, folds, zones of contortion or crushing, joints, shear zones or faults were not observed on the site, in the surrounding area, or in the soil samples collected for laboratory testing.

6.7 Surficial (Unconsolidated) Deposits

Lake and pond sediments, swamp accumulations, sand dunes, marine terrace deposits, talus accumulations, creep, or slope wash were not observed on the site. Slump and slide debris were also not observed on the site.

6.8 Features of Special Significance

Features of special significance such as accelerated erosion, (advancing gully head, badlands, or cliff reentrants) were not observed on the property. However, erosional features are present near the toe of the slope down from Highway 24. Features indicating settlement or subsidence such as fissures, scarplets, and offset reference features were not observed on the study site or surrounding areas. Features indicating creep, slump, or slide masses in bedrock and surficial deposits were not observed on the property.

6.9 Drainage of Water and Groundwater

The overall topography of the site is fairly level, with a gentle slope from northeast to southwest. Groundwater was not encountered in the test borings performed for this study. Groundwater water depths are greater than 20-feet in the area and are not anticipated to affect foundation construction.

7.0 ECONOMIC MINERAL RESOURCES

Under the provision of House Bill 1529, it was made a policy by the State of Colorado to preserve for extraction commercial mineral resources located in a populous county. Review of the *El Paso Aggregate Resource Evaluation Map, Master Plan for Mineral Extraction, Map 2* indicates the site is identified as “Coal”. The overburden above coal deposits is estimated to be up to 200 feet to unknown, with coal

seam thickness ranging up to 4 feet. Extraction of the coal more than likely would not be considered to be economical compared to materials available elsewhere within the county.

According to the *Evaluation of Mineral and Mineral Fuel Potential of El Paso County State Mineral Lands*, the site is mapped within the Denver Basin Coal Region. However, the area of the site has been mapped "Poor" for coal resources, no active or inactive mines have been mapped in the area of the site. No metallic mineral resources have been mapped on the site.

8.0 IDENTIFICATION AND MITIGATION OF POTENTIAL GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS

The El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual recognizes and delineates the difference between geologic hazards and constraints. A geologic hazard is one of several types of adverse geologic conditions capable of causing significant damage or loss of property and life. Geologic hazards are defined in Section C.2.2 Sub-section E.1 of the ECM. A geologic constraint is one of several types of adverse geologic conditions capable of limiting or restricting construction on a particular site. Geologic constraints are defined in Section C.2.2 Sub-section E.2 of the ECM (1.15 Definitions of Specific Terms and Phrases). The following geologic hazards and constraints are not anticipated to pose a significant risk to the proposed development:

- Avalanches
- Debris Flow-Fans/Mudslides
- Floodplains
- Ground Subsidence
- Landslides
- Rockfall
- Ponding water
- Expansive Soils and Bedrock
- Steeply Dipping Bedrock
- Unstable or Potentially Unstable Slopes
- Scour, Erosion, accelerated erosion along creek banks and drainage ways
- Springs and High Groundwater
- Corrosive Minerals
- Fill Soils

The following sections present geologic constraints that have been identified on the property:

8.1 Hydrocompactive Soils

It is anticipated shallow foundations are to be utilized for this development. Based on the test borings performed by RMG for this investigation, the silty to clayey sand generally possesses low hydrocompactive potential.

Mitigation

Should hydrocompactive soils be encountered beneath foundations, mitigation will be required. If these materials are encountered, they can readily be mitigated with typical construction practices common to this region of El Paso County, Colorado such as applying additional compactive effort to the soil.

If appropriate mitigations and/or foundation design adjustments are implemented, the presence of hydrocompactive soil is not considered to pose a risk to the proposed structures.

8.2 Steep Slopes

Steep slopes are present on the site along the Highway 24 embankment near the southern property boundary.

Mitigation

It is our understanding the steep slope along the Highway 24 embankment is to be improved with an engineered retaining wall during development. If retaining wall construction were to proceed as proposed the steep slope is not considered to pose a risk to proposed single-family structures.

8.3 Erosion

Due to the nature of the sandy soils on site, the upper sands encountered at the site are susceptible to erosion by wind and flowing water. The southern slope is susceptible to concentrated surface runoff down from Highway 24. The process of erosion appears evident by the partially vegetated slope with deeply incised channels.

Mitigation

Erosion control measures and engineered site drainage will be installed during construction to prevent concentrated runoff from exacerbating erosion along the steep southern slope. A retaining wall is proposed along the southern boundary. Along with the retaining wall, swales and/or culverts will be necessary to channel historic surface water flow from Highway 24 through the site. A drainage pond is proposed near the southwest corner of the property. It is uncertain at this time if the pond is to be a retention or detention pond.

Post development, the development maintenance entity should monitor the southern boundary to identify signs of new or localized erosion. Areas undergoing active erosion should be promptly corrected and restored to ensure continued stability of the proposed retaining walls and other features.

Provided these recommendations are implemented, the occurrence of erosion will be limited and is not considered to pose a risk to the proposed development.

8.4 Faults and Seismicity

Based on review of the Earthquake and Late Cenozoic Fault and Fold Map Server provided by CGS located at <http://dnrwebmapgdev.state.co.us/CGSOnline/> and the recorded information dating back to November of 1900, Colorado Springs has not experienced a recorded earthquake with a magnitude greater than 1.6 during that period. The nearest recorded earthquakes over 1.6 occurred in December of 1995 in Manitou Springs, which experienced magnitudes ranging between 2.8 to 3.5. Additional earthquakes over 1.6 occurred between 1926 and 2001 in Woodland Park, which experienced magnitudes ranging from 2.7 to 3.3. Both of these locations are located near the Ute Pass Fault, which is greater than 10 miles from the subject site.

Earthquakes felt at this site will most likely result from minor shifting of the granite mass within the Pikes Peak Batholith, which includes pull from minor movements along faults found in the Denver

basin. It is our opinion that ground motions resulting from minor earthquakes may affect structures (and the surrounding area) at this site if minor shifting were to occur.

Mitigation

In accordance with the International Building Code, 2018, seismic design parameters have been determined for this site. The Seismic Site Class has been interpreted from the results of the soil test borings drilled within the project site. The Applied Technology Council seismic design tool has been used to determine the seismic response acceleration parameters using ASCE 7-16. The soil on this site is not considered susceptible to liquefaction. The following recommended Seismic Design Parameters are based upon Seismic Site Class D, and a 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years. The Seismic Design Category is “B”.

Period (sec)	Mapped MCE Spectral Response Acceleration (g)		Site Coefficients		Adjusted MCE Spectral Response Acceleration (g)		Design Spectral Response Acceleration (g)	
	S _s	0.190	F _a	1.6	S _{ms}	0.304	S _{ds}	0.203
1.0	S ₁	0.056	F _v	2.4	S _{m1}	0.135	S _{d1}	0.09

Notes: MCE = Maximum Considered Earthquake
g = acceleration due to gravity

8.5 Radon

"Radon Act 51 passed by Congress set the natural outdoor level of radon gas (0.4 pCi/L) as the target radon level for indoor radon levels".

Central El Paso County and the 80951 zip code in which the site is located, has an EPA assigned Radon Zone of 1. A radon Zone of 1 predicts an average indoor radon screening level greater than 0.4 pCi/L (picocuries per liter), which is above the recommended levels assigned by the EPA. *The EPA recommends corrective measures to reduce exposure to radon gas.*

All of the State of Colorado is considered EPA Zone 1 based on the information provided at https://county-radon.info/CO/El_Paso.html. Elevated hazardous levels of radon from naturally occurring sources are not anticipated at this site.

Mitigation

Radon hazards are best mitigated at the building design and construction phases. Providing increased ventilation of basements, crawlspaces, creating slightly positive pressures within structures, and sealing of joints and cracks in the foundations and below-grade walls can help mitigate radon hazards. Passive radon mitigation systems are also available.

8.6 Proposed Grading, Erosion Control, Cuts and Masses of Fill

Based on the test borings for this investigation, the excavations are anticipated encounter silty to clayey sand. The on-site soils are suitable for use as site-grading fill.

An Overlot Grading Plan was not available for review during this study. Prior to placement of overlot fill or removal and recompaction of the existing materials, topsoil, low-density native soil, fill and organic matter should be removed from the fill area. The subgrade should be scarified, moisture conditioned to within 2% of the optimum moisture content, and recompacted to the same degree as the overlying fill to be placed. The placement and compaction of fill should be periodically observed and tested by competent personnel.

If unsuitable fill soils are encountered at the time of construction, they should be removed (overexcavated) and replaced with compacted structural fill. The zone of overexcavation shall extend to the bottom of the unsuitable fill zone and shall extend at least that same distance beyond the building perimeter (or lateral extent of any fill, if encountered first).

We anticipate that the deepest excavation cuts for the proposed residential construction utilizing a shallow spread footing foundation will be approximately 3 to 4-feet below the finished ground surfaces for crawlspace foundations. If basements are proposed, excavation cuts could range up to 8 feet below the finished ground surface. We believe the surficial soils will classify as Type C materials as defined by OSHA in 29CFR Part 1926, dated January 2, 1990. OSHA requires temporary slopes made in Type C materials be laid back at ratios no steeper than 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical) unless the excavation is shored or braced.

Long term cut slopes in the upper soil should be limited to no steeper than 3:1 (horizontal to vertical). Flatter slopes will likely be necessary should groundwater conditions occur. It is recommended that long-term fill slopes be no steeper than 3:1 (horizontal to vertical).

Additional Guideline Site Grading Specifications are included in the Appendix B.

9.0 BEARING OF GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS UPON PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Geologic hazards (as described in Section 8.0 of this report) were not found to be present at this site. Geologic constraints (as described in section 8.0 of this report) such as potentially hydrocompactive soils, steep slopes, erosion, seismicity, and radon were found on the site. It is our opinion that the existing geologic and engineering conditions can be satisfactorily mitigated through proper engineering design and construction practices.

10.0 BURIED UTILITIES

Based upon the conditions encountered in the test borings, we anticipate that the soils encountered in individual utility trench excavations will consist mostly of native silty to clayey sand. It is anticipated the sands will be encountered at loose to medium dense relative densities. Bedrock conditions are not anticipated within the utility trenches.

We believe the sand will classify as Type C materials and perhaps as Type B materials as defined by OSHA in 29 CFR Part 1926. OSHA requires that temporary excavations made in Type B and C materials be laid back at ratios no steeper than 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) and 1½:1 (horizontal to vertical), respectively, unless the excavation is shored and braced. Excavations deeper than 20 feet, or when water is present, should always be braced or the slope designed by a professional engineer.

11.0 PAVEMENTS

Internal streets within this development may be private or public streets. As such, they will require a site-specific pavement design prepared in accordance with the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM).

For purposes of this report, we anticipate the subgrade soils will have American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Soil Classifications primarily of A-2-4(0) and A-4(0), which are considered “good” for use as subgrade material. AASHTO Soil Classifications are presented in Figure 9.1.

The ECM notes that mitigation measures may be required for expansive soils, shallow ground water, subgrade instability, etc. Based on the AASHTO classification of the soils in the subdivision and laboratory swell testing, the subgrade soils are expected to encounter nil to low expansive potential. Therefore, special mitigation measures are not anticipated for subgrade preparation.

Pavement materials should be selected, prepared, and placed in accordance with the El Paso County specification and the Pikes Peak Region Asphalt Paving Specifications. Tests should be performed in accordance with the applicable procedures presented in the final design.

12.0 ANTICIPATED FOUNDATION SYSTEMS

Based on the information presented previously, conventional shallow foundation systems are anticipated to be suitable for proposed residential structures. Typical foundation cuts are anticipated to be approximately 3 to 8-feet below the final ground surface. The following are general foundation recommendations. Structure specific investigations should be performed prior to structure design after approval of the PUD.

Loose sand soils are anticipated in the majority of the excavations at and/or near foundation or floor slab bearing levels. Where loose sands are encountered, they may require additional compaction to achieve the suitable bearing pressure. In some cases, removal and recompaction may be required for loose soils.

Structures may be supported on shallow foundations bearing on a minimum of 18-inches of compacted native soil or imported compacted structural fill prepared in accordance with the following recommendations. Site preparation should include clearing and grubbing the site of all vegetation, topsoil, and any other deleterious material within the construction area and disposing this material appropriately. Following clearing and grubbing, the area within the foundation footprint and a 2-foot perimeter beyond should be overexcavated 12-inches below the bottom of footing elevation. An Open Excavation Observation should be made at this point to verify soil conditions are as reported in the soil boring logs herein.

Upon verification, the upper 6-inches of the exposed surface soils should be scarified and moisture conditioned to facilitate compaction (usually within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content) and compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor test (ASTM D-1557).

After compaction of the in situ soil, the excavation should then be backfilled in compacted lifts to bottom of footing elevation with native soil or structural fill consisting of well-graded non-cohesive granular material. The material should not be excessively wet, should be free of organic matter and construction debris, and contain no rock fragments greater than 2-inches in any dimension. Structural fill material should be placed in 8-inch loose lifts with moisture content within 2 percent of optimum as determined by ASTM D-1557. Each loose lift should be compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of Modified Proctor maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D-1557. Each lift of soil should be density tested to verify compaction meets these requirements.

Structures may be supported on shallow foundations when the site is prepared in accordance with the recommendations above. When so prepared, a maximum allowable bearing pressure of 2,500 psf with no minimum dead load requirement may be used for design. The foundation design should be prepared by a qualified Colorado Registered Professional Engineer using the recommendations presented in this report. This foundation system should be designed to span a minimum of 10 feet under the design loads. The bottoms of exterior foundations should be at least 30 inches below finished grade for frost protection. When prepared and properly compacted, total settlement of 1-inch or less with differential settlement of ½ inch or less is estimated. Settlement in granular material will occur relatively rapidly with construction loads. Long-term consolidation settlement should not be an issue in the site material if prepared as recommended above.

12.1 Structural Fill - General

Except as described above for foundations, areas to receive structural fill should have topsoil, organic material, and debris removed. The upper 6-inches of the exposed surface soils should be scarified and moisture conditioned to facilitate compaction (usually within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content) and compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor test (ASTM D-1557).

Structural fill should be placed in loose lifts not exceeding 8 to 10-inches and moisture conditioned to facilitate compaction (usually within 2 percent of the optimum moisture content) and compacted to a minimum of 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by the Modified Proctor test (ASTM D-1557).

Structural fill placed on slopes should be benched into the slope. Maximum bench heights should not exceed 4 feet, and bench widths should be wide enough to accommodate compaction equipment. Structural fill should not be placed on frozen subgrade or allowed to freeze during moisture conditioning and placement. To verify the condition of the compacted soils, density tests should be performed during placement.

12.2 Surface Grading and Drainage

The ground surface should be sloped from structures with a minimum gradient of 10 percent for the first 10 feet. This is equivalent to 12 inches of fall across this 10-foot zone. If a 10-foot zone is not possible on the upslope side of the structure, then a well-defined swale should be created a minimum 5 feet from the foundation and sloped parallel with the wall with a minimum slope of 2 percent to intercept the surface water and transport it around and away from the structure. Roof drains should extend across backfill zones and landscaped areas to a region that is graded to direct flow away from the structure. Water should be kept from ponding near the foundations.

Landscaping should be selected to reduce irrigation requirements. Plants used close to foundation walls should be limited to those with low moisture requirements and irrigated grass should not be located within 5 feet of the foundation. To help control weed growth, geotextiles should be used below landscaped areas adjacent to foundations. Impervious plastic membranes are not recommended.

Irrigation devices should not be placed within 5 feet of the foundation. Irrigation should be limited to the amount sufficient to maintain vegetation. Excess water may increase the likelihood of slab and foundation movements.

12.3 Foundation Drains

A subsurface perimeter drain is recommended around portions of structures that will have habitable or storage space located below the finished ground surface. This includes crawlspace areas if applicable. Perimeter drains should have positive outfall, or be connected to an underdrain system installed within the sanitary sewer trench. El Paso County typically prefers underdrain systems to be engineered by a design professional.

Shallow groundwater conditions were not encountered in the test boring performed for this study. It must be understood that the drain systems are designed to intercept some types of subsurface moisture and not others. Therefore, the drains could operate properly and not mitigate all moisture problems relating to foundation performance or moisture intrusion into the basement area.

13.0 ADDITIONAL STUDIES

The findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report were provided to evaluate the suitability of the site for the proposed development. The test borings, laboratory test results, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are for preliminary evaluations, and not intended for use for final design and construction. We recommend that a *lot-specific* subsurface soil investigation be performed for the proposed structures. The extent of any fill soils encountered during the lot-specific investigations should be evaluated for suitability to support the proposed structures prior to construction. Additionally, the groundwater conditions encountered in the lot-specific investigation should be evaluated to determine the feasibility of basement construction on that lot.

The lot-specific subsurface soil investigation should consider the proposed structure type, anticipated foundation loading conditions, location within the property, and local construction methods. Recommendations resulting from the investigations should be used for design and confirmed by on-site observation and testing during development and construction.

14.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based upon our evaluation of the geologic conditions, it is our opinion that the proposed development is feasible. The geologic conditions identified potentially hydrocompactive soils, steep slopes, erosion, seismicity, and radon. These conditions, however, are considered typical for the Front Range region of Colorado. Mitigation of geologic conditions is most effectively accomplished by avoidance. However, where avoidance is not a practical or acceptable alternative, geologic conditions should be mitigated by implementing appropriate planning, engineering, and suitable construction practices.

Surface runoff from outside the site should be redirected and controlled during development and prior to the construction of the proposed single-family residences. In addition to the previously identified mitigation alternatives, surface and subsurface drainage systems should be considered. Exterior, perimeter foundation drains should be installed around below-grade habitable or storage spaces. Surface water should be efficiently removed from the building area to prevent ponding and infiltration into the subsurface soil. Over-irrigation after development should be avoided.

The foundation systems for the proposed single-family residential structures, retaining walls greater than 4 feet, and any retention/detention facilities should be designed and constructed based upon recommendations developed in a site-specific subsurface soil investigation.

Revisions and modifications to the conclusions and recommendations presented in this report may be issued subsequently by RMG based upon additional observations made during grading and construction, which may indicate conditions that require re-evaluation of some of the criteria presented in this report.

15.0 CLOSING


This report is for the exclusive purpose of providing geologic hazards information and preliminary geotechnical engineering recommendations. The scope of services did not include, either specifically or by implication, evaluation of wild fire hazards, environmental assessment of the site, or identification of contaminated or hazardous materials or conditions. Development of recommendations for the mitigation of environmentally related conditions, including but not limited to, biological or toxicological issues, are beyond the scope of this report. If the owner is concerned about the potential for such contamination or conditions, other studies should be undertaken.

This report has been prepared for **Meadowbrook Development, LLC** in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering and engineering geology practices. The conclusions and recommendations in this report are based in part upon data obtained from review of available topographic and geologic maps, review of available reports of previous studies conducted in the site vicinity, a site reconnaissance, and research of available published information, soil test borings, soil laboratory testing, and engineering analyses. The nature and extent of variations may not become evident until construction activities begin. If variations then become evident, RMG should be retained to re-evaluate the recommendations of this report, if necessary.

Our professional services were performed using that degree of care and skill ordinarily exercised, under similar circumstances, by geotechnical engineers and engineering geologists practicing in this or similar localities. RMG does not warrant the work of regulatory agencies or other third parties supplying information which may have been used during the preparation of this report. No warranty, express or implied, is made by the preparation of this report. Third parties reviewing this report should draw their own conclusions regarding site conditions and specific construction techniques to be used on this project.

If we can be of further assistance in discussing the contents of this report or analysis of the proposed development, from a geotechnical engineering point-of-view, please feel free to contact us.

FIGURES



NOT TO SCALE



Southern Office
 Colorado Springs, CO
 80918
 (719) 548-0600
Central Office:
 Englewood, CO 80112
 (303) 688-9475
Northern Office:
 Greeley / Evans, CO 80620
 (970) 330-1071


SITE VICINITY MAP

MEADOWBROOK PARK DEVELOPMENT
 COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
 MEADOWBROOK DEVELOPMENT, LLC


JOB No. 177164

FIG No. 1

DATE 8-26-2020



BASE MAP PROVIDED BY KIMLEY HORN


 NOT TO SCALE
 DENOTES APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF TEST BORINGS

JOB No. 177164



ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Southern Office
 Colorado Springs, CO
 80918
 (719) 548-0600
Central Office:
 Englewood, CO 80112
 (303) 688-9475
Northern Office:
 Greeley / Evans, CO 80620
 (970) 330-1071
Woodland Park Office:
 (719) 687-6077
Monument Office:
 (719) 488-2145
Pueblo / Canon City:
 (719) 544-7750

MEADOWBROOK PARK DEVELOPMENT
 COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
 MEADOWBROOK DEVELOPMENT, LLC

ENGINEER: GW
 DRAWN BY: KZ
 CHECKED BY: GW
 ISSUED: 8-25-2020

PROPOSED CONCEPT PLAN

SHEET No.
FIG-2



BASE MAP PROVIDED BY KIMLEY HORN



NOT TO SCALE

⊕ DENOTES APPROXIMATE LOCATION OF TEST BORINGS

JOB No. 177164

ARCHITECTS
RMG
ENGINEERS

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Southern Office
Colorado Springs, CO
80918
(719) 548-0600


Central Office:
Englewood, CO 80112
(303) 688-9475

Northern Office:
Greeley / Evans, CO 80620
(970) 330-1071

Woodland Park Office:
(719) 687-6077

Monument Office:
(719) 488-2145

Pueblo / Canon City:
(719) 544-7750



MEADOWBROOK PARK DEVELOPMENT
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
MEADOWBROOK DEVELOPMENT, LLC

ENGINEER:	GW
DRAWN BY:	KZ
CHECKED BY:	GW
ISSUED:	8-25-2020

TEST BORING
LOCATION PLAN

SHEET No.
FIG-3

SOILS DESCRIPTION



SILTY TO CLAYEY SAND

UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE, ALL LABORATORY TESTS PRESENTED HEREIN WERE PERFORMED BY:
RMG - ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP
2910 AUSTIN BLUFFS PARKWAY
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

SYMBOLS AND NOTES



XX

STANDARD PENETRATION TEST - MADE BY DRIVING A SPLIT-BARREL SAMPLER INTO THE SOIL BY DROPPING A 140 LB. HAMMER 30", IN GENERAL ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D-1586. NUMBER INDICATES NUMBER OF HAMMER BLOWS PER FOOT (UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED).



XX

UNDISTURBED CALIFORNIA SAMPLE - MADE BY DRIVING A RING-LINED SAMPLER INTO THE SOIL BY DROPPING A 140 LB. HAMMER 30", IN GENERAL ACCORDANCE WITH ASTM D-3550. NUMBER INDICATES NUMBER OF HAMMER BLOWS PER FOOT (UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED).



FREE WATER TABLE



DEPTH AT WHICH BORING CAVED



BULK DISTURBED BULK SAMPLE



AUG AUGER "CUTTINGS"

4.5

WATER CONTENT (%)

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics



Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs: (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600

















SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

EXPLANATION OF TEST BORING LOGS

JOB No. 177164

FIGURE No. 4

DATE Aug/25/2020

TEST BORING: 1 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	TEST BORING: 2 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			6	3.9	SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			11	4.1
	10			11	5.6		10			7	4.2
	15			13	4.1		15			11	5.3
	20			9	3.9		20			15	6.2

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics



Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs - (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

















(719) 548-0600
SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

TEST BORING LOG

JOB No. 177164

FIGURE No 5

DATE Aug/25/2020

TEST BORING: 3 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	TEST BORING: 4 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			12	7.1	SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			9	4.5
	10			8	8.8		10			12	4.2
	15			7	7.2		15			15	5.8
	20			13	6.0		20				3.3

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics



Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs - (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600

















SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

TEST BORING LOG

JOB No. 177164

FIGURE No. 6

DATE Aug/25/2020

TEST BORING: 5 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	TEST BORING: 6 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			7	3.3	SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			5	15.0
	10			8	4.6		10			11	12.1
	15			9	6.3		15			11	10.1
	20			15	6.5		20			11	8.9

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics



Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs - (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600

















SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

TEST BORING LOG

JOB No. 177164

FIGURE No. 7

DATE Aug/25/2020

TEST BORING: 7 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	TEST BORING: 8 ELEVATION (FT): DATE DRILLED: 6/30/20 NO GROUNDWATER ON 7/10/20	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			7	13.1	SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			8	11.4
	10			8	13.0		10			11	14.8
	15			10	10.3		15			10	12.1
	20			15	6.2		20			16	10.6

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics



Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs - (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600

SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

TEST BORING LOG

JOB No. 177164

FIGURE No. 8

DATE Aug/25/2020

Test Boring No.	Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.4 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	FHA Expansion Pressure (psf)	% Swell/Collapse	USCS Classification
1	4.0	3.9		NP	NP	7.8	13.8			SM
1	9.0	5.6								
1	14.0	4.1								
1	19.0	3.9								
2	4.0	4.1		22	5	1.8	34.3			SC-SM
2	9.0	4.2								
2	14.0	5.3								
2	19.0	6.2								
3	4.0	7.1								
3	9.0	8.8		NP	NP	0.0	25.4			SM
3	14.0	7.2								
3	19.0	6.0								
4	4.0	4.5		24	10	5.2	27.9			SC
4	9.0	4.2								
4	14.0	5.8								
4	19.0	3.3								
5	4.0	3.3								
5	9.0	4.6								
5	14.0	6.3		NP	NP	0.0	21.5			SM
5	19.0	6.5								
6	4.0	15.0		NP	NP	0.0	39.6			SM
6	9.0	12.1								
6	14.0	10.1								
6	19.0	8.9								
7	4.0	13.1								
7	9.0	13.0		NP	NP	0.0	33.5			SM
7	14.0	10.3								
7	19.0	6.2								
8	4.0	11.4								
8	9.0	14.8								
8	14.0	12.1		NP	NP	0.0	21.1			SM
8	19.0	10.6								

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics




Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600

SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

JOB No. 177164
FIGURE No. 9
PAGE 1 OF 1
DATE Aug/25/2020



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT OR CLAY
	coarse	fine	coarse	medium	fine	

Test Boring	Depth (ft)	Classification	LL	PL	PI
● 1	4.0	SILTY SAND(SM)	NP	NP	NP
⊠ 2	4.0	SILTY, CLAYEY SAND(SC-SM)	22	17	5
▲ 3	9.0	SILTY SAND(SM)	NP	NP	NP
★ 4	4.0	CLAYEY SAND(SC)	24	14	10
⊙ 5	14.0	SILTY SAND(SM)	NP	NP	NP

Test Boring	Depth (ft)	%Gravel	%Sand	%Silt	%Clay
● 1	4.0	7.8	78.4	13.8	
⊠ 2	4.0	1.8	63.9	34.3	
▲ 3	9.0	0.0	74.6	25.4	
★ 4	4.0	5.2	66.8	27.9	
⊙ 5	14.0	0.0	78.5	21.5	

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Architectural
Structural
Forensics



Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600


SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

SOIL CLASSIFICATION DATA

JOB No. 177164

FIGURE No. 10

DATE Aug/18/2020



COBBLES	GRAVEL		SAND			SILT OR CLAY
	coarse	fine	coarse	medium	fine	

Test Boring	Depth (ft)	Classification	LL	PL	PI
● 6	4.0	SILTY SAND(SM)	NP	NP	NP
☒ 7	9.0	SILTY SAND(SM)	NP	NP	NP
▲ 8	14.0	SILTY SAND(SM)	NP	NP	NP

Test Boring	Depth (ft)	%Gravel	%Sand	%Silt	%Clay
● 6	4.0	0.0	60.4	39.6	
☒ 7	9.0	0.0	66.5	33.5	
▲ 8	14.0	0.0	78.9	21.1	

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

ARCHITECTS




ENGINEERS

Geotechnical
Materials Testing
Civil, Planning

Colorado Springs: (Corporate Office)
2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 548-0600
SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

SOIL CLASSIFICATION DATA

JOB No. 177164
FIGURE No. 11
DATE Aug/18/2020



NOT TO SCALE



ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Southern Office
Colorado Springs, CO
80918
(719) 548-0600
Central Office:
Englewood, CO 80112
(303) 688-9475
Northern Office:
Greeley / Evans, CO 80620
(970) 330-1071

USDA SOILS SURVEY MAP

MEADOWBROOK PARK DEVELOPMENT
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
MEADOWBROOK DEVELOPMENT, LLC

JOB No. 177164

FIG No. 12


DATE 8-26-2020

GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS

- *Qes₁* - Younger eolian sand (middle and early Holocene and late? Pleistocene) - very pale-brown, pale-brown, and light yellowish-brown sand. Unit is chiefly very coarse and coarse sand that appears to have been deposited as sand sheets. Unit thickness is estimated to be 3-20 feet deep. The eolian sand was encountered in the test borings to a depth of 20 feet.
- *Qam* - Middle alluvium (late Pleistocene) - chiefly light brownish gray, pale-brown, light-yellowish-brown, and grayish-brown, poorly sorted and subordinate amounts of gravel.
- *TKda₁* - Dawson formation, facies unit one - white to light-gray, cross-bedded or massive, very coarse arkosic sandstone or pebbly conglomerate. Occasional interbedded thin to very thinly bedded sandy claystone. Estimate thickness varies from 25 to 200 feet. The Dawson formation was not encountered in the test borings.
- *ss* - steep slopes - Isolated steep slopes that are to not be disturbed with the proposed development, other than for the proposed retaining wall construction

ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

- 2D - Eolian deposits generally on flat to gentle upland areas.
- 2E - Low terraces and valleys of minor tributary streams.



ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

Southern Office
 Colorado Springs, CO
 80918
 (719) 548-0600
Central Office:
 Englewood, CO 80112
 (303) 688-9475
Northern Office:
 Greeley / Evans, CO 80620
 (970) 330-1071
Woodland Park Office:
 (719) 687-6077
Monument Office:
 (719) 488-2145
Pueblo / Canon City:
 (719) 544-7750

MEADOWBROOK PARK DEVELOPMENT
 COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
 MEADOWBROOK DEVELOPMENT, LLC

ENGINEER:	GW
DRAWN BY:	KZ
CHECKED BY:	GW
ISSUED:	8-25-2020

ENGINEERING AND GEOLOGY MAP

SHEET No. **FIG-13**

APPENDIX A

Additional Reference Documents

1. *Meadowbrook Park Single-Family (Units) Preliminary Concept, El Paso County, Colorado*, prepared by Kimley Horn, received by Client via electronic email.
2. *Flood Insurance Rate Map, El Paso County, Colorado and Unincorporated Areas, Community Panel No. 081041C0752G*, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), effective December 7, 2018.
3. *Geologic Map of the Elsmere quadrangle, El Paso County, Colorado*, Carroll, C.J., and Crawford, T.A. 200, Colorado Geological Survey Open-File Report OF-003.
4. *Elsmere, Quadrangle, Environmental and Engineering Geologic Map for Land Use*, compiled by Dale M. Cochran, Charles S. Robinson & Associates, Inc., Golden, Colorado, 1977.
5. *Elsmere, Quadrangle, Map of Potential Geologic Hazards and Surficial Deposits*, compiled by Dale M. Cochran, Charles S. Robinson & Associates, Inc., Golden, Colorado, 1977.
6. *Geologic map of the Pueblo 1 degree x 2 degrees quadrangle, south-central Colorado*, Scott, G.R., Taylor, R.B., Epis, R.C., and Wobus, R.A., 1976.
7. *Pikes Peak Regional Building Department*: <https://www.pprbd.org/>.
8. Schedule Nos.: 5408000053 <https://property.spatalest.com/co/elpaso/#/property/5408000053>, 5408403001 <https://property.spatalest.com/co/elpaso/#/property/5408403001>, and 5408008002 <https://property.spatalest.com/co/elpaso/#/property/5408008002>.
9. *Colorado Geological Survey, USGS Geologic Map Viewer*: <http://coloradogeologicalsurvey.org/geologic-mapping/6347-2/>.
10. *Historical Aerials*: <https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer>, Images dated 1947, 1955, 1960, 1969, 1999, 2005, 2009, 2011, 2013, and 2015.
11. *USGS Historical Topographic Map Explorer*: <http://historicalmaps.arcgis.com/usgs/> Colorado Springs Quadrangles dated 1893, 1909, 1948, 1950, 1951, 1954, 1958, 1961, 1966, 1969, 1975, 1981, and 1989.
12. *Google Earth Pro*, Imagery dated 1999, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2011, 2015, and 2017.

APPENDIX B

Guideline Site Grading Specifications

Description: Unless specified otherwise by local or state regulatory agencies, these guideline specifications are for the excavation, placement and compaction of material from locations indicated on the plans, or staked by the Engineer, as necessary to achieve the required elevations. These specifications shall also apply to compaction of materials that may be placed outside of the project.

General: The Geotechnical Engineer shall approve fill materials, method of placement, moisture contents and percent compactions, and shall give written approval of the compacted fill.

Clearing Site: The Contractor shall remove trees, brush, rubbish, vegetation, topsoil and existing structures before excavation or fill placement is commenced. The Contractor shall dispose of the cleared material to provide the Owner with a clean job site. Cleared material shall not be placed in areas to receive fill or where the material will support structures. Clearing shall also include removal of existing fills that do not meet the requirements of this specification and existing structures.

Preparation of Slopes or Drainage Areas to Receive Fill: Natural slopes or slopes of drainage gullies where grades are 20 percent (5:1, horizontal to vertical) or steeper shall be benched prior to fill placement. Benches shall be at least 10 feet wide. Benches may require additional width to accommodate excavation or compaction equipment. At least one bench shall be provided for each 5 feet or less of vertical elevation difference. The bench surface shall be essentially horizontal perpendicular to the slope or at a slight incline into the slope.

Scarifying: Topsoil and vegetation shall be removed from the ground surface in areas to receive fill. The surface shall be plowed or scarified a minimum of 12 inches until the surface is free from ruts, hummocks or other uneven features which would prevent uniform compaction by the equipment to be used.

Compacting Area to Receive Fill: After the area to receive fill has been cleared and scarified, it shall be disked or bladed until it is free from large clods, moisture conditioned to a proper moisture content and compacted to the maximum density as specified for the overlying fill. Areas to receive fill shall be worked, stabilized, or removed and replaced, if necessary, in accordance with the Geotechnical Engineer's recommendations in preparation for fill.

Fill Materials: Fill material shall be free from organic material or other deleterious substances, and shall not contain rocks or lumps having a diameter greater than six inches. Fill materials shall be obtained from cut areas shown on the plans or staked in the field by the Engineer or imported to the site and shall be approved by the Geotechnical Engineer prior to placement. It is recommended that the fill materials have nil to low expansion potential, i.e., consist of silty to slightly clayey sand.

- The moisture-conditioned materials should be placed in maximum 6" compacted lifts. These materials should be compacted to a minimum of 92 percent of the maximum Modified Proctor dry density or 95 percent of the maximum Standard Proctor dry density. Material not meeting the above requirements shall be reprocessed.

Materials used for moisture-conditioned structural fill should be approved by RMG prior to use. Moisture-conditioned structural fill should not be placed on frozen subgrade or allowed to freeze during moisture conditioning and placement.

Moisture Content: Fill materials shall be moisture conditioned to within limits of optimum moisture content specified. Sufficient laboratory compaction tests shall be made to determine the optimum moisture content for the various soils encountered in borrow areas or imported to the site.

The contractor may be required to add moisture to the excavation materials in the borrow area if, in the opinion of the Geotechnical Engineer, it is not possible to obtain uniform moisture content by adding water to the fill material during placement. The Contractor may be required to rake or disk the fill soils to provide uniform moisture content through the soils.

The application of water to embankment materials shall be made with watering equipment, approved by the Geotechnical Engineer, which will give the desired results. Water jets from the spreader shall not be directed at the embankment with such force that fill materials are eroded.

Should too much water be added to the fill, such that the material is too wet to permit the desired compaction to be obtained, compacting and work on that section of the fill shall be delayed until the material has been allowed to dry to the required moisture content. The Contractor will be permitted to rework the wet material in an approved manner to hasten its drying.

Compaction of Fill Areas: Selected fill material shall be placed and mixed in evenly spread layers. After each fill layer has been placed, it shall be uniformly compacted to not less than the specified percentage of maximum density. Fill materials shall be placed such that the thickness of loose material does not exceed 10 inches and the compacted lift thickness does not exceed 6 inches.

Compaction, as specified above, shall be obtained by the use of sheepfoot rollers, multiple-wheel pneumatic-tired rollers, or other equipment approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Granular fill shall be compacted using vibratory equipment or other equipment approved by the Geotechnical Engineer. Compaction shall be accomplished while the fill material is at the specified moisture content. Compaction of each layer shall be continuous over the entire area.

Moisture Content and Density Criteria:

- A. Fill placed in roadways and utility trenches should be moisture conditioned and compacted in accordance with El Paso County Specifications.
- B. Fill placed outside of roadways and utility trenches should be compacted to at least 92% of the maximum Modified Proctor density (ASTM D-1557) or at least 95% of the maximum Standard Proctor density (ASTM D-698) at a moisture content within 2% of optimum.

Compaction of Slopes: Fill slopes shall be compacted by means of sheepfoot rollers or other suitable equipment. Compaction operations shall be continued until slopes are stable, but not too dense for planting, and such that there is no appreciable amount of loose soil on the slopes. Compaction of slopes may be done progressively in increments of three to five feet in height or after the fill is brought to its total height. Permanent fill slopes shall not exceed 3:1 (horizontal to vertical).

Density Testing: Field density testing shall be performed by the Geotechnical Engineer at locations and depths of his choosing. Where sheepsfoot rollers are used, the soil may be disturbed to a depth of several inches. Density tests shall be taken in compacted material below the disturbed surface. When density tests indicate the density or moisture content of any layer of fill or portion thereof is below that required, the particular layer or portion shall be reworked until the required density or moisture content has been achieved.

Observation and Testing of Fill: Observation by the Geotechnical Engineer shall be sufficient during the placement of fill and compaction operations so that he can declare the fill was placed in general conformance with Specifications. All observations necessary to test the placement of fill and observe compaction operations will be at the expense of the Owner.

Seasonal Limits: No fill material shall be placed, spread or rolled while it is frozen, thawing, or during unfavorable weather conditions. When work is interrupted by heavy precipitation, fill operations shall not be resumed until the Geotechnical Engineer indicates the moisture content and density of previously placed materials are as specified.

Reporting of Field Density Tests: Density tests made by the Geotechnical Engineer shall be submitted progressively to the Owner. Dry density, moisture content, percent compaction, and approximate location shall be reported for each test taken.