October 28, 2022 Revised Novemeber 3, 2023



Doug Hill 13985 Silverton Road Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Re: Soil, Geology, and Geologic Hazard Study Hill Subdivision Parcel Nos. 51290-04-018 and 51290-09-002 Alpaca Heights and Black Forest Road El Paso County, Colorado Entech Job No. 221947

Dear Mr. Hill:

The project consists of subdividing 16.49-acres; four rural residential lots are proposed as part of the subdivision. An existing home on Lot 1 will remain, and two new lots are proposed. The site is located southeast of the intersection of Hodgen Road and Black Forest Road, in El Paso County. The Black Forest Road right-of-way the for future road realignment is located in the western portion of the site between Lot 1 and Tract A.

GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The site is located in a portion of the NW¼ of Section 29 Township 11 South, Range 65 West of the 6th Principal Meridian in El Paso County, Colorado. The site is located approximately 7 miles east of the town of Monument, southeast of the intersection of Hodgen Road and Black Forest Road, in El Paso County, Colorado. The location of the site is as shown on the Vicinity Map, Figure 1.

The topography of the site is gradually sloping to the northeast for Lots 1 through 3 and gradually sloping to the west on Tract A. A minor drainage swale is located in the northeastern portion of the property on Lot 2. Water was not observed in the drainage at the time of this investigation. The site boundaries are indicated on the USGS Map, Figure 2. Previous land uses have included undeveloped agricultural and rural residential. The site contains field grasses, weeds, and ponderosa pines. The existing house with a water well and septic system located on Lot 1, will remain. Site photographs were taken and site mapping was completed on was September 21 and 28, 2022. Site photographs are included in appendix A. Test Borings and Test Pits were performed on September 28 and 29, 2022.

Total acreage involved in the proposed subdivision is 16.49-acres. Three rural residential lots are proposed. The proposed lot sizes range from 4.8-acres to 5.0-acres. The existing house and barns located on Lot 1 will remain. The new lots will be serviced by individual wells and on-site wastewater treatment systems. The Site Plan is presented in Figure 3.

LAND USE AND ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

This site was found to be suitable for the proposed development. Areas were encountered where the geologic conditions will impose some constraints on development and land use. These include areas of artificial fill, potentially expansive soils, potentially seasonal shallow groundwater. Based on the proposed development plan, it appears that these areas will have minor impacts on the development. These conditions will be discussed in greater detail in the report.

In general, it is our opinion that the development can be achieved if the observed geologic conditions on site are either avoided or properly mitigated. All recommendations are subject to the limitations discussed in the report.

SCOPE OF THE REPORT

A general geologic analysis utilizing published geologic data. Detailed site-specific mapping will be conducted to obtain general information in respect to major geographic and geologic features, geologic descriptions and their effects on the development of the property.

FIELD INVESTIGATION

Our field investigation consisted of the preparation of a geologic map of bedrock features and significant surficial deposits. The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), previously the Soil Conservation Service (SCS) survey was also reviewed to evaluate the site. The position of mappable units within the subject property are shown on the Geologic Map. Our mapping procedures involved both field reconnaissance and measurements, and aerial photo reconnaissance and interpretation. The same mapping procedures have also been utilized to produce the Geology/Engineering Geology Map which identified pertinent geologic conditions affecting development. The field mapping was performed by personnel of Entech Engineering, Inc. on September 21, 2022.

Three test borings were drilled, and two test pits were excavated on the site to determine general suitability of the soil characteristics for residential construction. The locations of the test borings/pits are indicated on the Site Plan/Test Boring Location Map, Figure 3. The Test Boring and Test Pit Logs are presented in Appendix B. Results of this testing will be discussed later in this report.

Laboratory testing was also performed on some of the soils to classify and determine the soils engineering characteristics. Laboratory tests included grain-size analysis, ASTM D-422. Results of the laboratory testing are included in Appendix C.

SOIL AND GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS

Soil Survey

The Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) (Reference 1, Figure 4), previously the Soil Conservation Service (Reference 2) has mapped one soil type on the site. Complete descriptions of the soil type are presented in Appendix D. In general, the soils consist of sandy loam to loam. The soils are described as follows:

Type	Description
15	Brussett Loam, 3 – 5% Slopes
68	Peyton-Pring Complex, 3 – 8% Slopes

The soils have been described to have rapid permeabilities. The soils are described as well suited for use as home sites. Possible hazards with soils erosion are present on the site. The erosion potential can be controlled with vegetation. The soils have been described to have moderate erosion hazards (Reference 2).

<u>Soils</u>

The soils encountered in the Test Borings and Test Pits can be grouped into three general soil and rock types. The soils were classified using the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). The test pit soils were also classified using the USDA Textural Soil Classification.

<u>Soil Type 1</u> is a slightly silty to silty sand (SM-SW, SM). The sand soils were encountered in all of the test borings at depths ranging from the existing surface grade to 3 feet, and extending to a depth of 12 feet in Test Boring No. 1 or to the termination of Test Boring Nos. 2 and 3 (20 feet). These soils were encountered at medium dense to dense states and at dry to moist conditions. Samples tested had approximately 8 percent of the soil size particles passing the No. 200 Sieve. Atterberg Limits Testing resulted in a liquid limit of 19 and a plastic index of 2.

<u>Soil Type 2</u> is a sandy clay to very sandy clay (CL). The clay soils were encountered in Test Boring No. 3, and in Test Pit Nos. 1 and 2. The clays were encountered at the existing ground surface and extended to depths of 3 feet bgs in Test Boring No. 3, and to the termination of the test pits (6 to 8 feet). The clay was encountered at firm to stiff consistencies and dry to moist conditions. The samples tested had 57 to 77 percent of the soil size particles passing the No. 200 sieve. Expansion pressure of 580 psf was determined by laboratory tests on samples of the clay soils. This magnitude of expansion is in the low expansion range.

<u>Soil Type 3</u> is a silty sandstone (SM). The sandstone was encountered in Test Boring No. 1 at an approximate depth of 12 feet bgs and extended to the termination of the boring (20 feet). The sandstone was encountered at dense states and moist conditions. The sandstone had approximately 60 percent of the soil sized particles passing the No. 200 sieve. Atterberg Limits Testing resulted in liquid limit of no value and plastic indexes of non-plastic. Expansive claystone and siltstone is commonly interbedded in the Dawson Formation in the area.

Groundwater

Groundwater was not encountered in the test borings which were drilled to depths of 20 feet, or in the test pits which were excavated to depths of 6 to 8 feet. Groundwater is not anticipated to affect shallow foundations on the majority of the site. An area in the northern portion of Lot 2 has been identified as a potentially seasonal shallow groundwater area, and is discussed further later in this report. Fluctuations in groundwater conditions may occur due to variations in rainfall or other factors not readily apparent at this time. Isolated sand layers within the soil profile can carry water in the subsurface. Contractors should be cognizant of the potential for the occurrence of subsurface water features during construction.

<u>Geology</u>

Approximately 12 miles west of the site is a major structural feature known as the Rampart Range Fault. This fault marks the boundary between the Great Plains Physiographic Province and the Southern Rocky Mountain Province. The site exists within a large structural feature known as the Denver Basin. Bedrock in the area is typically gently dipping in a northerly direction (Reference 3). The bedrock underlying the site consists of the Dawson Formation of Tertiary to Cretaceous Age. The Dawson Formation typically consists of coarse-grained arkosic sandstone with interbedded layers of claystone or siltstone.

The geology of the site was evaluated using the *Geologic Map of the Black Forest Quadrangle*, by Thorson in 2003, (Reference 4, Figure 5). The Geology Map for the site is presented in Figure 6. Two mappable units were identified on this site which are described as follows:

- **Qaf Artificial Fill of Holocene Age:** These are man-made fill deposits associated with a small embankment in the western portion of Lot 1.
- Qc/Tkd Colluvium of Quaternary Age overlying Dawson Formation of Tertiary to Cretaceous Age: The materials consist of colluvial or residual soils overlying the bedrock materials on-site. The colluvial soils were deposited by the action of sheetwash and gravity. The residual soils were derived from the in-situ weathering of the bedrock on site. These materials typically consist of silty to clayey sand with potential areas of sandy clays. The bedrock consists of the Dawson Formation. The Dawson Formation typically consists of coarse-grained, arkosic sandstone with interbedded lenses of fine-grained sandstone, siltstone and claystone.

The soils listed above were mapped from site-specific mapping, the *Geologic Map of the Black Forest Quadrangle* distributed by the Colorado Geologic Survey in 2003 (Reference 4, Figure 5), the *Geologic Map of the Colorado Springs-Castle Rock Area,* distributed by the US Geological Survey in 1979 (Reference 5), and the *Geologic Map of the Pueblo* $1^{\circ} x 2^{\circ}$ *Quadrangle,* distributed by the US Geological Survey in 1978 (Reference 6). The test borings and test pits logs used in evaluating the site and are included in Appendix B. The Geology Map prepared for the site is presented in Figure 6.

ENGINEERING GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

Mapping has been performed on this site to identify areas where various geologic conditions exist of which developers should be cognizant during the planning, design and construction stages where new construction is proposed. The engineering geologic constraints identified on this site include artificial fill, potentially expansive soils, and potentially seasonal shallow groundwater, as indicated on the Engineering Geology Map, Figure 6. Potential Hazards including expansive soils and minor drainage swales, have also been addressed below. These hazards and recommended mitigation techniques are discussed as follows:

Artificial Fill - Constraint

These are areas of man-made fill associated with an embankment located in the western portion of Lot 1. Areas of fill other than those mapped may exist on the site.

<u>Mitigation</u>: It is anticipated these would be avoided by development or regraded. Should any uncontrolled fill be encountered beneath foundations, removal and recompaction at a minimum of 95% of its maximum Modified Proctor Dry Density, ASTM D-1557 will be required.

Expansive Soils - Constraint

Expansive soils were encountered in the upper portion of Test Boring No. 3 and in the test pits. Additionally, the Dawson Formation typically consists of coarse-grained arkosic sandstone with interbedded layers of claystone or siltstone. Expansive clays or claystone, if encountered beneath foundations, can cause differential movement in the structure foundation.

<u>Mitigation</u>: Should expansive soils be encountered beneath the foundation; mitigation will be necessary. Mitigation of expansive soils will require special foundation design. Overexcavation and replacement with non-expansive soils at a minimum of 95% of its maximum Modified Proctor Dry Density, ASTM D-1557 is a suitable mitigation, which is common in the area. Floor slabs on expansive soils should be expected to experience movement. Overexcavation and replacement has been successful in minimizing slab movements.

Drainage Areas

A minor drainage areas exist in the northeastern portion of proposed Lot 2. No water was observed flowing in the drainage, however, this area has the potential for seasonal shallow groundwater. This area is indicated in the Geology/Engineering Geology Map (Figure 6) and are discussed below. Due to the size of the proposed lot this area can be avoided or redirected around proposed structures or proposed soil treatment areas. The site does not lie within any floodplain zones according to the FEMA Map No. 08041CO305G dated December 7, 2018 (Figure 7, Reference 7). Exact locations of floodplain and specific drainage studies are beyond the scope of this report.

Potentially Seasonal Shallow Groundwater Area - Constraint

The minor drainage area in the northeastern portion of proposed Lot 2 has been identified as a potentially seasonal shallow groundwater area. In this area we would anticipate the potential for periodically high subsurface moisture conditions, frost heave potential and highly organic soils. This area lies within defined minor drainage and can be avoided by the proposed development. Construction in any portions of these areas, if required, or immediately adjacent to these areas should follow these precautions.

<u>Mitigation:</u> Foundations must have a minimum 30-inch depth for frost protection. In areas where high subsurface moisture conditions are anticipated periodically, subsurface perimeter drains are recommended to help prevent the intrusion of water into areas below grade. Typical drain details are presented in Figure 8. Any grading in these areas should be done to direct surface flow around construction to avoid areas of ponded water. All organic material would be completely removed prior to any fill placement. **Specific drainage studies are beyond the scope of this report.**

RELEVANCE OF GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS TO LAND USE PLANNING

The proposed development will be rural-residential utilizing individual on-site wastewater treatment systems and water wells. Three rural residential lots are proposed. The lot sizes range from 4.8-acres to 5.0-acres. The existing house and barns located on Lot 1 will remain. The new lots will be serviced by individual wells and on-site wastewater treatment systems. The existing geologic and engineering geologic conditions will impose minor constraints on development and construction. The geologic constraints on the site include artificial fill, potentially expansive soils, and potentially seasonal shallow groundwater areas which can be satisfactorily mitigated through avoidance or proper engineering design and construction practices.

The upper granular soils encountered in the test borings on the site were encountered at medium dense to dense states, and the sandstone was encountered at dense states. Sandstone bedrock was encountered at 12 feet in Test Boring No. 1. High allowable bearing capacities should be expected in areas of shallow bedrock. Difficult excavation of the very dense sandstone should be expected.

The sands and sandstone encountered in the test borings are considered to have low expansion potential, however, highly expansive claystone and siltstone are commonly interbedded in the sandstone of the Dawson Formation. Mitigation of expansive soils if encountered will be required. Overexcavation and replacement with non-expansive soils at a minimum of 95% of its maximum Modified Proctor Dry Density, ASTM D-1557 is a suitable mitigation, which is common in the area. Overexcavation depths of 3 to 4 feet are typical from the expansive soils encountered in the area. Floor slabs on expansive soils should be expected to experience movement. Overexcavation and replacement has been successful in minimizing slab movements. These soils will not prohibit development.

A Minor drainage exist in the northeastern portion of the site on proposed Lot 2. No water was observed flowing in the drainage, however, the potential for seasonal shallow groundwater exists in this areas during periods of high runoff. Based on the lot size, these areas can be avoided by the structures. Structures should not block drainages. Grading should direct surface waters around structures and roadways to prevent areas of ponded water.

In summary, the granular soils will likely provide good support for shallow foundations. The geologic conditions encountered on site can be mitigated with avoidance or proper engineering and construction practices.

ECONOMIC MINERAL RESOURCES

Some of the sandy materials on-site could be considered a low-grade sand resource. According to the *El Paso County Aggregate Resource Evaluation Map* (Reference 8), of the area of the site is not mapped with any potential aggregate resources. According to the *Atlas of Sand, Gravel and Quarry Aggregate Resources, Colorado Front Range Counties* distributed by the Colorado Geological Survey (Reference 9), the site is not mapped with any resources. According to the *Evaluation of Mineral and Mineral Fuel Potential* (Reference 10), the area of the site has been mapped as "little or no potential" for industrial minerals.

According to the Evaluation of Mineral and Mineral Fuel Potential of El Paso County State Mineral Lands (Reference 10), the site is mapped within the Denver Basin Coal Region. However, the area of the site has been mapped as "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 (Reference 10).

The site has been mapped as "Fair" for oil and gas resources (Reference 10). No oil or gas fields have been discovered in the area of the site. The sedimentary rocks in the area may lack the geologic structure for trapping oil or gas; therefore, it may not be considered a significant resource. Hydraulic fracturing is a new method that is being used to extract oil and gas from rocks. It utilizes pressurized fluid to extract oil and gas from rocks that would not normally be productive. The area of the site has not been explored to determine if the rocks underlying the site would be commercially viable utilizing hydraulic fracturing. The practice of hydraulic fracturing has come under review due to concerns about environmental impacts, health and safety.

EROSION CONTROL

The soil types observed on the site are mildly to highly susceptible to wind erosion, and moderately to highly susceptible to water erosion. A minor wind erosion and dust problem may be created for a short time during and immediately after construction. Should the problem be considered severe enough during this time, watering of the cut areas or the use of chemical palliative may be required to control dust. However, once construction has been completed and vegetation re-established, the potential for wind erosion should be considerably reduced.

With regard to water erosion, loosely compacted soils will be the most susceptible to water erosion, residually weathered soils and weathered bedrock materials become increasingly less susceptible to water erosion. For the typical soils observed on site, allowable velocities or unvegetated and unlined earth channels would be on the order of 3 to 4 feet/second, depending upon the sediment load carried by the water. Permissible velocities may be increased through the use of vegetation to something on the order of 4 to 7 feet/second, depending upon the type of vegetation established. Should the anticipated velocities exceed these values, some form of channel lining material may be required to reduce erosion potential. These might consist of some of the synthetic channel lining materials on the market or conventional riprap. In cases where ditch-lining materials are still insufficient to control erosion, small check dams or sediment traps may be required. The check dams will serve to reduce flow velocities, as well as provide small traps for containing sediment. The determination of the amount, location and placement of ditch linings, check dams and of the special erosion control features should be performed by or in conjunction with the drainage engineer who is more familiar with the flow quantities and velocities.

Cut and fill slope areas will be subjected primarily to sheetwash and rill erosion. Unchecked rill erosion can eventually lead to concentrated flows of water and gully erosion. The best means to combat this type of erosion is, where possible, the adequate re-vegetation of cut and fill slopes. Cut and fill slopes having gradients more than three (3) horizontal to one (1) vertical become increasingly more difficult to revegetate successfully. Therefore, recommendations pertaining to the vegetation of the cut and fill slopes may require input from a qualified landscape architect and/or the Soil Conservation Service.

CLOSURE

It is our opinion that the existing geologic engineering and geologic conditions will impose some minor constraints on development and construction of the site. The majority of these conditions can be avoided by construction. Others can be mitigated through proper engineering design and construction practices. The proposed development and use are consistent with anticipated geologic and engineering geologic conditions.

It should be pointed out that because of the nature of data obtained by random sampling of such variable and non-homogeneous materials as soil and rock, it is important that we be informed of any differences observed between surface and subsurface conditions encountered in construction and those assumed in the body of this report. Individual investigations for new building sites and septic systems will be required prior to construction. Construction and design personnel should be made familiar with the contents of this report. Reporting such discrepancies to Entech Engineering, Inc. soon after they are discovered would be greatly appreciated and could possibly help avoid construction and development problems.

This report has been prepared for Doug Hill, for application to the proposed project in accordance with generally accepted geologic soil and engineering practices. No other warranty expressed or implied is made.

We trust that this report has provided you with all the information that you required. Should you require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact Entech Engineering, Inc.

Respectfully Submitted,

ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC.

Logan L. Langford, P.G. Senior Geologist

CJ

Reviewed by:

Joseph C. Goode, Jr., P.E. President

LLL

Encl.

Entech Job No. 221947 AAprojects/2022/221947 sg&ghs TABLES

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

CLIENTDOUG HILLPROJECTALPACA HTS. & BLACK FORESTJOB NO.221947

SOIL	TEST BORING/ TEST	DEPTH	WATER	DRY DENSITY	PASSING NO. 200 SIEVE	LIQUID LIMIT	PLASTIC	SULFATE	FHA SWELL	SWELL/ CONSOL	UNIFIED	
TYPE	PIT NO.	(FT)	(%)	(PCF)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(WT %)	(PSF)	(%)	CLASSIFICATION	SOIL DESCRIPTION
1	TB-2	5			7.8	NV	NP				SM-SW	SAND, SLIGHTLY SILTY
2	TB-3	2-3			57.2				580		CL	CLAY, VERY SANDY
2	TP-1	2			77.4						CL	CLAY, SANDY
2	TP2	4			67.6						CL	CLAY, SANDY
3	TB-1	15			29.8	NV	NP				SM	SANDSTONE, SILTY

Table 2: Summary Test Boring Results

Test Boring	Depth to	Depth to			
No.	Bedrock (ft.)	Groundwater (ft.)			
1	12	>20			
2	>20	>20			
3	>20	>20			

Table 3: Summary Test Pit Results

Test Pit	Depth to	Depth to	USDA	LTAR
No.	Bedrock (ft.)	Groundwater (ft.)	Soil Type	Value
1	>8	>8	4*	0.20*
2	>6	>6	4*	0.20*

*- Conditions that will require an engineered OWTS

FIGURES

















<u>NOTES:</u>

-GRAVEL SIZE IS RELATED TO DIAMETER OF PIPE PERFORATIONS-85% GRAVEL GREATER THAN 2x PERFORATION DIAMETER.

-PIPE DIAMETER DEPENDS UPON EXPECTED SEEPAGE. 4-INCH DIAMETER IS MOST OFTEN USED.

-ALL PIPE SHALL BE PERFORATED PLASTIC. THE DISCHARGE PORTION OF THE PIPE SHOULD BE NON-PERFORATED PIPE.

-FLEXIBLE PIPE MAY BE USED UP TO 8 FEET IN DEPTH, IF SUCH PIPE IS DESIGNED TO WITHSTAND THE PRESSURES. RIGID PLASTIC PIPE WOULD OTHERWISE BE REQUIRED.

-MINIMUM GRADE FOR DRAIN PIPE TO BE 1% OR 3 INCHES OF FALL IN 25 FEET.

-DRAIN TO BE PROVIDED WITH A FREE GRAVITY OUTFALL, IF POSSIBLE. A SUMP AND PUMP MAY BE USED IF GRAVITY OUT FALL IS NOT AVAILABLE.

PERIMETER DRAIN DETAIL

DESIGNED:

CHECKED:

DATE:

JOB NO.: 221947 FIG NO.: 8

DRAWN:

APPENDIX A: Photographs

Job No. 221947

Job No. 221947

Job No. 221947

APPENDIX B: Test Boring & Test Pit Logs

TEST BORING NO. 1 DATE DRILLED 9/28/2022 Job # 221947			TEST BORING NO. 2 DATE DRILLED 9/28/2022 CLIENT DOUG HI LOCATION ALPACA I	_L HTS. 8	& BLACł	< FO	REST	
REMARKS	t %		REMARKS			LL.	%	
DRY TO 17', 9/29/22 Debth Samples	Blows per foot Watercontent	Soil Type	DRY TO 19', 9/29/22	Depth (ft)	Symbol Samples	Blows per foot	Watercontent	Soil Type
TO COARSE GRAINED, TAN, MEDIUM DENSE, MOIST	28 5.1	1	SAND, SLIGHTLY SILTY, FINE TO COARSE GRAINED, TAN, MEDIUM DENSE, DRY TO MOIST	.		27	2.3	1
	20 9.1	1		5		18	1.0	1
	18 9.6	1		10		20	5.1	1
SANDSTONE, SILTY, FINE TO COARSE GRAINED, TAN, VERY DENSE, MOIST	<u>50</u> 6.4 6"	3		15		18	6.8	1
20	<u>50</u> 7.5 6"	3		20		24	4.0	1
							JOB NO.: 221	1947
ENGINEERING, INC.			IESI BURING LUG				EIG NO	D.:

10/4/22

LLL

TEST BORING NO. 3 DATE DRILLED 9/28/2022 Job # 221947							TEST BORING NO. DATE DRILLED CLIENT LOCATION	DOUG HIL ALPACA H	_L <u>+TS. 8</u>	k BL/	ACI	<u>< FO</u>	REST	
REMARKS DRY TO 18', 9/29/22	Depth (ft)	Symbol	Samples	Blows per foot	Watercontent %	Soil Type	REMARKS		Depth (ft)	Symbol	Samples	Blows per foot	Watercontent %	Soil Type
CLAY, VERY SANDY, TAN, STIFF, MOIST	-			19	8 0	2			-					
SAND, SILTY, FINE TO COARSE GRAINED, TAN, MEDIUM DENSE TO DENSE, MOIST TO DRY	5			20	5.6	1			5					
	10			33	2.5	1			10					
	15			27	4.2	1			15					
	20			18	3.8	1			20					

3	ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC. 505 ELKTON DRIVE			TEST BC	ORING LOG		JOB NO.: 221947 FIG NO.:
	COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907] [DRAWN:	DATE:	CHECKED: LLL	DATE: 10/4/22	B-2

TEST PIT NO. 1 DATE EXCAVATED 9/29/2022 Job # 221947							DATE EXCAVATED 9/29/2022 CLIENT DOUG HI LOCATION ALPACA	2 LL HTS 8	& BLA	ACK	FO	RES [.]	T RD
REMARKS	Depth (ft)	Symbol	Samples	Soil Structure Shape	Soil Structure Grade	USDA Soil Type	REMARKS	Depth (ft)	Symbol	Samples	Soil Structure Shape	Soil Structure Grade	USDA Soil Type
topsoil (0-4 inches) sandy clay, fine to medium	1 2			bl	m	4	topsoil (0-4 inches) sandy clay, fine to medium	1			bl	m	4
grained, brown, moist	3						grained, brown, moist	3			bl	m	4
	5			bl	m	4		5			hl	m	Δ
	7 7 8							7			51		-
	9 10							9 10					

Soil Structure Shape

granular - gr platy - pl blocky - bl prismatic - pr single grain - sg massive - ma Soil Structure Grade weak - w moderate - m strong - s loose - l

	TESTI	PIT LOG		JOB 22 FI
DRAWN: jhr	DATE: 10/3/2022	CHECKED: LLL	DATE: 10/4/22	

JOB NO.: 221947 FIG NO.: B-3 APPENDIX C: Laboratory Test Results

U.S. <u>Sieve #</u> 3" 1 1/2" 3/4"	Percent <u>Finer</u>	Atterberg <u>Limits</u> Plastic Limit NP Liquid Limit NV Plastic Index NP
1/2"	100.0%	
3/8"	92.7%	
4	82.7%	Swell
10	48.9%	Moisture at start
20	27.1%	Moisture at finish
40	19.1%	Moisture increase
100	11.1%	Initial dry density (pcf)
200	7.8%	Swell (psf)

\diamond	ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC.		JOB NO.: 221947 FIG NO.:			
	505 ELKTON DRIVE COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907	DRAWN:	DATE:		DATE: 10/4/22	C-1

U.S. <u>Sieve #</u> 3" 1 1/2" 3/4" 1/2"	Percent <u>Finer</u>	Atterberg <u>Limits</u> Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Plastic Index
3/8"	100.0%	
4	97.3%	Swell
10	91.3%	Moisture at start 7.9%
20	83.7%	Moisture at finish 20.9%
40	77.8%	Moisture increase 13.0%
100	66.5%	Initial dry density (pcf) 103
200	57.2%	Swell (psf) 580

$\mathbf{\mathbf{C}}$	ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC.		JOB NO.: 221947 FIG NO.:			
	505 ELKTON DRIVE COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907	DRAWN:	DATE:		DATE:	6-2

U.S. <u>Sieve #</u> 3"	Percent <u>Finer</u>	Atterberg <u>Limits</u> Plastic Limit
1 1/2"		Liquid Limit
3/4"		Plastic Index
1/ <i>2</i> 2/9"	100.0%	
3/8 4	98.9%	Swoll
10	96.0%	Moisture at start
20	92.8%	Moisture at finish
40	90.1%	Moisture increase
100	84.8%	Initial dry density (pcf)
200	77.4%	Swell (psf)

ENTECH		LABORATORY TEST			
ENGINEERING, INC.		RESULTS			FIG NO.:
505 ELKTON DRIVE COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907	DRAWN:	DATE:		DATE: 10/4/22	6-3

U.S. <u>Sieve #</u> 3" 1 1/2" 3/4" 1/2"	Percent <u>Finer</u>	Atterberg <u>Limits</u> Plastic Limit Liquid Limit Plastic Index
3/8"	100.0%	
4	99.6%	Swell
10	92.0%	Moisture at start
20	85.7%	Moisture at finish
40	81.6%	Moisture increase
100	74.7%	Initial dry density (pcf)
200	67.6%	Swell (psf)

\diamond	ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC. 505 ELKTON DRIVE COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907	LABORATORY TEST RESULTS				
		DRAWN:	DATE:	CHECKED:	DATE: 1014/11	

JOB NO.: 221947 FIG NO.:

C- 4

U.S. <u>Sieve #</u> 3" 1 1/2" 3/4" 1/2" 3/8"	Percent <u>Finer</u>	Atterberg <u>Limits</u> Plastic Limit NP Liquid Limit NV Plastic Index NP
4	100.0%	Swell
10	89.2%	Moisture at start
20	68.6%	Moisture at finish
40	55.2%	Moisture increase
100	38.9%	Initial dry density (pcf)
200	29.8%	Swell (psf)

\mathbf{O}	ENTECH ENGINEERING, INC.		LABORATORY TEST RESULTS				
	505 ELKTON DRIVE COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907	DRAWN:	DATE:		DATE: 10/4/22	6-5	

APPENDIX D: Soil Survey Descriptions

El Paso County Area, Colorado

15—Brussett loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 367k Elevation: 7,200 to 7,500 feet Frost-free period: 115 to 125 days Farmland classification: Prime farmland if irrigated

Map Unit Composition

Brussett and similar soils: 85 percent Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Brussett

Setting

Landform: Hills Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Eolian deposits

Typical profile

A - 0 to 8 inches: loam *BA - 8 to 12 inches:* loam *Bt - 12 to 26 inches:* clay loam *Bk - 26 to 60 inches:* silt loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum content: 5 percent
Maximum salinity: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: High (about 9.1 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R048AY222CO - Loamy Park Hydric soil rating: No

USDA

Minor Components

Other soils

Percent of map unit: Hydric soil rating: No

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: El Paso County Area, Colorado Survey Area Data: Version 20, Sep 2, 2022

El Paso County Area, Colorado

68—Peyton-Pring complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 369f Elevation: 6,800 to 7,600 feet Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Peyton and similar soils: 40 percent Pring and similar soils: 30 percent Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Peyton

Setting

Landform: Hills Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Arkosic alluvium derived from sedimentary rock and/or arkosic residuum weathered from sedimentary rock

Typical profile

A - 0 to 12 inches: sandy loam Bt - 12 to 25 inches: sandy clay loam BC - 25 to 35 inches: sandy loam C - 35 to 60 inches: sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 5 percent Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches Drainage class: Well drained Runoff class: Low Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr) Depth to water table: More than 80 inches Frequency of flooding: None Frequency of ponding: None Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Moderate (about 7.3 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4c Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R049XY216CO - Sandy Divide Hydric soil rating: No

USDA

Description of Pring

Setting

Landform: Hills Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope Down-slope shape: Linear Across-slope shape: Linear Parent material: Arkosic alluvium derived from sedimentary rock

Typical profile

A - 0 to 14 inches: coarse sandy loam C - 14 to 60 inches: gravelly sandy loam

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 6.0 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 3e Hydrologic Soil Group: B Ecological site: R048AY222CO - Loamy Park Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Other soils

Percent of map unit: Hydric soil rating: No

Pleasant

Percent of map unit: Landform: Depressions Hydric soil rating: Yes

Data Source Information

Soil Survey Area: El Paso County Area, Colorado Survey Area Data: Version 20, Sep 2, 2022

APPENDIX E: El Paso County Health Department Septic Records

EL PASO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT Dermit #
INDIVIDUAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM INSPECTION FORM Data
$\frac{1}{2000} = \frac{1}{2000} = 1$
APPROVED: Yes No Environmental Health Specialist: Brad Wallace
Address 6910 Alpaca Heights Owner Stewart
Legal Description $\underline{TRINW45}_{\underline{C}29}$ -11-65
Residence V # Bedrooms 4 Commercial System Installer J+K Excounting
SEPTIC TANK:
Commercial Voncommercial Construction Material Concrete Capacity Gallon 1, 500
DISPOSAL FIELD:
Trench: Depth (Range) Width Total Length Sq. Ft
Bed: Depth (Range) Length Width Sq. Ft.
Depth of Rock Under PVC Type of cover on Rock
DRYWELLS: # of Pits Rings (Pit 1) Rings (Pit 2) Working Depth #1 #2
Size (L X VV) #1 #2 Total Sq. Ft
KUGKLESS STSTEMS:
Standard Chamber: Type <u>FarFiring rows</u> #Unambers <u>57</u> Sq. Ft./Chamber 75, 5 Bed Irench <u>X</u>
Reduction Allowed How & So Et Poquirod 1 53 K Donth (Donto) 3 n/ 3 n/ 3 n/ 1 Ponch
So Et Installed Equivalent So Et Installed with Reduction
Engineer Design: Y (\overline{N})Engineering Firm
Approval letter provided? Y N
Well installed at time of septic system inspection? Y (N Public Water?
*Approval will be revoked if in the future the well is found to be within 50 feet of the septic tank and/or 100 feet of the
disposal field.
NOTES:

EL PASO COUNTY

.

· · · ·

,

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT

301 S Union Blvd, Colorado Springs, Colorado 719-575-8636

	INDIVIDUAL S	SEWAGE DISI	POSAL SYSTE	M PERMIT	222
OWNER NAME:	CHARLES AND HELEN ST	EWART		PERMIT NUMBER:	ON0006324
ADDRESS:	6910 ALPACA HEIGHTS			DATE PERMITTED:	4/7/2005
UTTY,STATE,ZIP: INSTALLED BY:	COLORADO SPRINGS	CO 80	908	PHONE NUMBER:	7194885594
This permit is issued in twelve (12) months fror construction has not cor revokable if all stated re Sewage disposal system	accordance with 25-10-107 Colora n date of issue- whichever occurs fi mmenced prior to the expiration dat equirements are not met. to be installed by an El Paso Coun	do Revised Statues. PER rst-(unless work is in pro e of the building permit, ty Licensed System Cont	MIT EXPIRES upon con gress). If both a building the ISDS permit shall ex ractor or the property ov	mpletion-installation of sewage-dispos g and an ISDS permit are issued for the pire at the same time as the building per vner.	al system or at the end c e same property and ermit. This permit is
THIS PERMIT E	OES NOT DENOTE AF	PROVAL OF ZC	NING AND ACH	REAGE REQUIREMENTS	•
			Rosemary	C. Bakes - Man	tin
		DIRECTOR, EL PAS	O O COUNTY DEPART	MENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIR	ONMENT
PERMIT EXPIRATION Expires twelve	ON DATE : months from date of issue			and William a	<u>578-3</u> 127
<u>* 1</u>	NOTE: FOR INSPECTIONS CF	LL 575-8699 BEFO	RE 8:30 A.M. OF	THE DAY TO BE INSPECTED.	
	LEAVE THE ENTIRE SEW	AGE DISPOSAL SYS	TEM_UNCOVERED FOR	R FINAL INSPECTION.	
WATER SOURCE:	WELL				
MINIMUM SEPTIC	TANK SIZE :1,500	_ GALLONS	MINIMUM ABSC	RPTION AREA REQUIRED	
PLANNING DEPAR	TMENT	ERATION	FLOOD PLAIN	WASTEWATER	NA.
COMMENTS:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
INSTALL LEAC HOUSE MUST N VEHICLE OR LI	H FIELD IN AREA AND A IOT FLOW INTO LEACH IVESTOCK TRAFFIC, A 1	AVERAGE DEPTH FIELD AREA. L BARRIER IS REC	I (34 INCHES) OF EACH FIELD AR OMMENDED.	PERCOLATION TEST. R EA MUST NOT BE COMPA	UNOFF FROM CTED BY
The Health Offi owner or repres determine comp	ice shall assume no responsibility in ca ientative. Free access to the property iliance with requirements of this law.	ise of failure or inadequae shall be authorized at reas	y of a sewage-disposal syst onable time for the purpos	iem, beyond consulting in good faith with se of making such inspections as are nece	the property ssary to
	x 105	FOR ADMINIST	RATIVE USE ONLY		
Permit Ready:		Mailed			
Permit Ready: * * _	uested: BY: JOAN -	Mailed	Date Called In:	5/13/05 7:5Z	

Inspector Record I.D. Record I.D.
EL PASO COUNTY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
301 South Union Boulevard • Colorado Springs, CO • 80910-3123 • (719) 578-3125 • Fax: (719) 578-3188
AND THE REPART OF THE OF SUBMITTAL IN CASH OR CHECK THE STATE OF THE OF SUBMITTAL IN CASH OR CHECK THE STATE OF
APPLICATION FOR AN ON-SITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM PERMIT
SHEW CONSTRUCTION DMINOR REPAIR DMAJOR REPAIR/ADDIT CRUTHE
A DE TEN STATE TEN (10 19 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10
Address Brown (A DAAA HTS Ching (A Water Chi
Address of Fiberity, the address of the filler of the fill
Legar Description - 11 Mor OC MIT HELD - DESCRIPTION - 2 ATTOMIC (1) SOUR
owners watering address min a sing and a single a s
Lot Size \underline{P} is schedule #
I ype of Building: Efframe & Mobile Commercials Effrance Dotter
Water Supply: Well or Spring LUStern LPublic Inside City Limits: (SUN) Lifes-City
LIMAIL PERMITICS OR PERMITICS LITHERE; IS AN ADDITIONAL RESIDENCE ON THIS PROPERTY //
MAXIMUM POTENTIAL NUMBER OF BEDROOMS
Percolation Test Attached Y/N Basement Y/N Garbage Disposal Y N Clothes Washer Y/N_
I have supplied a plot plan as described on the back of this form. I acknowledge the completeness of the application is conditional
applicant for purposes of evaluating the application, and issuance of the permit is subject to such terms and conditions as deemed
necessary to ensure compliance with rules and regulations adopted pursuant to C.R.S. 25-10-107 et. seq. I hereby certify all
Department of Health and Environment in evaluating the same for purposes of issuing the permit applied for herein. I further
understand any falsification or misrepresentation may result in the denial of the application or revocation of any permit granted based upon said application and in legal action for perjury as provided by law.
OWNER'S SIGNATURE (hart Efternant) Date 3/29/05
You will be notified by telephone when your permit is ready for pick up. Please allow a minimum of 10 days for new septics.
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ⁹ USE ONLY
1,500 Gallons 1524 FTL 4-6-05
Minimum Tank Capacity Minimum Absorption Area Date of Site Inspection
REMARKS _ Instant Leach Field in and anonge depoth 39")
At plane real. Runort from house must wet Flow into
by wechile or livestock Traffic , a bargier is recommended.
-R
EHS INSPECTOR Wallan DATE 4-6-05 (APPROVED) DENIED
FEES AS OF 01/01/04:
NEW CONSTRUCTION \$483.00 + Planning Department Surcharge of \$30. = \$513.00 CL + 1001
MAJOK KEPAIR/ADDITION \$489.00 MINOR REPAIR/ADDITION \$263.00 DATE TO PLANNING / WASTEWATER:
DATE TO ELOODEL A INTENU DAED ATIONS 104
DATE TO FLOODPLAIN/ENUMERATIONS_1X
PLEASE COMPLETE THE BACK OF THIS FORM
01/01/04

ľ

.

· .

1) We require an original of your PERCOLATION (PERC) TEST with an original professional engineer's (PE) stamp and signature as well as a plot of the percolation test hole locations with measurements from a fixed reference(point) we are started and a fight of the second applications. 1 march 1 2) **PROP** OT-NUMBER MUST-BE POSTED AND CLEARLY VISIBLE FROM ROAD BE CLEARLY MARKED OR AN ADDITIONAL CHARGE FOR A 44 LUUHIY HEALTH MAY BE ASSESSED. AND VALUE AND VALUE **RETU** DEFARIMENT 3) A PLO not to scale) on an $8\frac{1}{2} \times 11$ sheet of paper. The plot plan must include: Il buildings (proposed or existing) 7) driveway (proposed or 1) a no 2)-prop (4-)1-1005 FRI \$20 roposed septic system site existing and name of P teh 3) prop 51,007 lternate septic system site adjoining street) 4.1 0 4) Initial a UNE NEW 407.00 ires that apply to your property and INCLUDE them on your PLOT PLAN. JUEL L. T. B. Sarah . <u>15</u>.0 48.1 25.00 $\mathbb{W}|_{\mathbf{W}}$ TUTAL Adjacent property well(s) and the Subsoil drain and the sec ۱. . I ûÆ€1 Ci CaTEND Wateriline 7 66 5, 15, 1 5) - Initial an HHAE within 100 feet of your proposed septic system and INCLUDE on your PLOT P 化学校 经利用 计算机 建合物的 建合物的 化丁酸化 化丁酸化 .7511:JeW 2 10 CI Lake(s) $\rightarrow \sim$ Stream(s) and the second s Natural drainage course(s) transition a contribution bare many division for the うっしき 大田 さんわく 635 A day wiread I need a full of a 12 1 6) GIVE COMPLETE DIRECTIONS TO THE PROPERTY FROM A MAIN HIGHWAY 17.111 the monument / Hwy 105 Exit F-25 AAAA to 60 EAST and they 105 to attack 83 <u>, (</u> +), Take 83 South to Hedgen Kd Whileft (east) on Hedgen to Black Forest Rd Right (south) on Black Forest Koad perty located on left hand side. in left onto Alpaca theights 그렇게 흔드 - - ... 计前代建设任业经济的主义公理工 Will be good "是带上来,那些人们喜欢的,这些就是这些事件和好好的吗?" 计编制系统编制表 1.13 28 18 1 50 and the second 的现在分词 人名马克人 • 、• 一致心情的 经回转控制 医视网络的 01/01/04