

IMPACT IDENTIFICATION REPORT
SUMMARY OF IMPACTS
LATIGO TRAILS FILING 9 DEVELOPMENT

1. Pollution

The purpose of this Final Plat is to convert approximately 107 acres to 39 single family residential lots. Potential sources of air, water, and noise pollution will be minimal as the density of proposed lots is equivalent to the majority of the surrounding area. This proposed development will result in an equivalent density to the previously approved PUD Development plan.

2. Wildlife

Conversion of approximately one tenth of the overall Site to housing would have a minimal, negative impact on wildlife species that utilize disturbed grassland habitat. Management priorities would include weed control and enhancement of native vegetation. Use of the Site for passive recreation improves conditions for wildlife. Thus the overall Project impact to wildlife communities would be positive.

3. Hazards

a. Floodplains

There are no existing Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplains within or adjacent to the proposed development area.

b. Geologic Soil Hazards

None of the soil types on the Site are listed by the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) as a hydric soil. The three soil types found are: Stapleton sandy loam (93.4% of the Site), Columbine gravelly sandy loam (4.3% of the Site) and Pring coarse sandy loam (2.3% of the Site). Each soil type is a well-drained soil derived from alluvium. The associated Preliminary Soils and Geology Report prepared for this project identifies areas where potential issues exist, methods of mitigation, and specifications for proper structural fill soils.

c. Vegetation and Wildfire

The vegetation community on the site is largely mixed-grass prairie. There are also small areas of riparian lowland swale and isolated wetland in the area. The proposed filing would construct houses on approximately one tenth of the Site. The remaining areas would be preserved and maintained until future development. Housing construction will permanently impact some remnant areas of native vegetation. Ecos did not observe "keystone" prairie species, big bluestem (*Andropogon gerardii*) outlined in the Kelso Prairie Potential Conservation Area (PCA) upon which the CNHP Survey of Critical Biological Resources, El Paso County, Colorado (Colorado Natural Heritage Program (CNHP), 2001a) justified the Biodiversity Rank of B2: Very High Significance. Additionally, there was no finding of Indian Grass (*Sorghastrum nutans*), the other species associated with the PCA description.

The Colorado State Forest Service Wildfire Risk Map for El Paso County is based on existing vegetation and classifies the grassland areas that comprise the Site primarily as "Low and Moderate Risk".

d. Watercourses

Two wetland stock ponds and four wetland and upland/riparian swales exist on the site. Wetland Stock Pond 1 is a remnant stock pond, seasonally flooded and considered a palustrine emergent wetland with an unconsolidated shore. It meets all three parameters to be jurisdictional wetland habitat, however, it is separated from downstream areas by an embankment with no culverts, breaches or spillways that provide a surface connection to downstream areas. Additionally, the area downstream of the embankment is a wide upland meadow with no defined bed or bank.

Wetland Stock Pond 4 is a remnant stock pond classified as a seasonally flooded palustrine emergent wetland with an unconsolidated shore (PUSC) and meets all three parameters to be jurisdictional wetland habitat, however, it is separated from downstream areas by an embankment that has no culverts, breaches or spillways that provide a surface water connection to downstream areas. Further, the area downstream of the embankment is an upland swale with no defined bed or bank.

Wetland Swale 2 is a seasonally flooded persistent palustrine emergent wetland (PEM1C) and meets all 3 parameters to be jurisdictional wetland habitat. However, it is separated from downstream areas by a roadway embankment that has no culverts, breaches or spillways that provide a surface water connection to downstream areas. The wetland also terminates in uplands with no defined bed or bank.

Upland/Riparian Swale 3 drains into a seasonally flooded man-made detention basin. However, the swale does not meet all 3 parameters to be jurisdictional wetland. Like other swales on site, it does not exhibit a dominance or prevalence of wetland vegetation. While this detention basin has a major culvert to convey downstream surface flow, all surface flow when present terminates in uplands, and has no channel with a defined bed or bank.

Upland/Riparian Swale 5 drains toward a seasonally flooded man-made detention basin. However, the swale does not meet all 3 parameters to be jurisdictional wetland. Like other swales on site, it does not exhibit a dominance or prevalence of wetland vegetation. This swale also terminates in uplands and is separated from the detention basin further downstream by an access road berm with no culvert to convey surface flow. Additionally, the detention basin has no culvert, only an emergency spillway that conveys surface flow, when present, into uplands, and has no channel with a defined bed or bank.

Upland/Riparian Swales A&B are 2 seasonally flooded ephemeral swales which do not meet all 3 parameters to be jurisdictional wetland. There is no dominance or prevalence of wetland vegetation. Although wetland vegetation is present, these swales, like others on site, support a predominance of upland vegetation indicating that hydrology is insufficient to sustain persistent wetland. These swales drain through 2 separate culverts and join south of the Site boundary. The drainage is ultimately intercepted by 2 stock pond embankments that have no culverts, breaches or spillways that provide a surface water connection to downstream areas. If these swales did meet the 3 criteria to be considered jurisdictional wetland, they would still be isolated waters because of the upland breaks between them and downstream receiving traditional navigable waters (TNW) or relatively permanent waters (RPW).

Upland/Riparian Swales C&D are 2 seasonally flooded ephemeral swales not meeting any of the 3 parameters to be jurisdictional wetland. They do not meet indicators of hydric soil, wetland vegetation or sustaining hydrology. While wetland vegetation is present in thin patches, these swales, unlike others on site, support a greater prevalence of upland vegetation. Hydrology is

insufficient to sustain persistent wetland. These swales drain through 2 separate culverts under Eastonville Road east of the Site boundary. Thereafter, drainage patterns are nebulous and interrupted by an upland break between Eastonville Road and a wet swale further downstream. If these swales did meet the 3 criteria to be deemed jurisdictional wetland, they would still be isolated waters because of the upland breaks between them and downstream receiving TNW or RPWs.

All features listed above do not meet the criteria that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) uses to assert jurisdiction, as they do not constitute:

- Traditional Navigable Waters
- Wetlands adjacent to traditional navigable waters;
- Non-navigable tributaries of traditional navigable waters that are relatively permanent where the tributaries typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically three months); and
- Wetlands that directly abut such tributaries.

Further, these are not considered to be “tributaries”, as a tributary includes natural, man-altered, or man-made water bodies that carry flow directly or indirectly into a traditional navigable waters.” These drainages are considered ephemeral channel/wetlands characterized by low volume, infrequent, or short duration flow over which the USACE does not assert jurisdiction.

e. Historical/Archeological Interest

There are no known sites of historical or archeological importance within the sketch plan area.

f. Scenic Importance

With its lack of topography, vegetation or natural features, this site has no scenic importance.

4. Social Impacts

The proposed housing is anticipated to consist of standard single-family homes, similar to those already existing in the vicinity. No low-income, elderly, or specialized housing is anticipated.

5. Jurisdictional Impacts

a. The development area is served by Falcon Fire Protection District who has committed to serve the area through certified correspondence. The area is served by School District 49. No new social service facilities are proposed within this development area.

b. Financial/Physical Ability

The owner has the capabilities to develop the project site to conform with the development applications. Financial assurances will be held to ensure construction in accordance with approved plans.