Architecture Structural Geotechnical



Materials Testing Forensic Civil/Planning

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP EMPLOYEE OWNED

SOILS AND GEOLOGY STUDY

Windermere Subdivision El Paso County, Colorado

PREPARED FOR:

Windsor Ridge Homes 4164 Austin Bluffs Parkway, #361 Colorado Springs, CO 80918

JOB NO. 162062

October 26, 2020

Respectfully Submitted, RMG – Rocky Mountain Group

Reviewed by, RMG – Rocky Mountain Group



Tony Munger, P.E. Geotechnical Project Manager

Kelli Ziler

Kelli Zigler Project Geologist

Please incorporate CGS comments into report, and provide notes on prelim plan regarding basements, and underrais...

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 SUMMARY	4
1.1 Project Location	4
1.2 Project Description	4
1.3 Scope of Report	4
1.4 Site Evaluation Techniques	5
1.5 Land Use and Engineering Geology	5
1.6 Previous Studies and Field Investigation	5
2.0 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION	6
2.1 Existing Site Conditions	6
2.2 Topography	6
2.3 Vegetation	6
2.4 Aerial photographs and remote-sensing imagery	6
3.0 SCOPE OF REPORT	7
4.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION	7
4.1 Drilling	7
4.2 Laboratory Testing	7
4.3 Groundwater	8
5.0 SOIL, GEOLOGY, ENGINEERING GEOLOGY	8
5.1 General Geology	8
5.2 Soil Conservation Survey	9
5.3Site Stratigraphy	9
5.4 Soil Conditions	10
5.5 Groundwater	10
6.0 ENGINEERING GEOLOGY - IDENTIFICAITON OF GEOLOGIC HAZARDS	10
6.1 Relevance of Geologic Conditions to Land Use Planning	10
6.2 Expansive Soils and Bedrock	11
6.3 Compressible Soils	11
6.4 Hard Bedrock	12
6.5 Floodplain and Drainage Areas	12
6.6 Corrosive Minerals	13
6.7 Fill Soils	13
6.8 Proposed Grading, Erosion Control, Cuts and Masses of Fill	13
6.9 Radon	14
7.0 RELEVANCE OF GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS TO LAND USE PLANNING	14
8.0 ECONOMIC MINERAL RESOURCES	15
9.0 EROSION CONTROL	16
10.0 DETENTION STORAGE CRITERIA	16
10.1 Soil and Rock Design Parameters	16
10.2 Embankment Recommnedations	17
11.0 ADDITIONAL STUDIES	17
12.0 CONCLUSIONS	17
13.0 CLOSING	18

FIGURES

Site Vicinity Map	1
Site Plan	2
Test Boring Location Plan	3
Engineering and Geology Map	4
Falcon NW Quadrangle	5
FEMA Map	6
Perimeter Drain	7
Underslab Drain	8

APPENDIX A

Additional Referenced Documents

APPENDIX B

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: *N. Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road*, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG – Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated February 5, 2019

APPENDIX C

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: Addendum to Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG – Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated July 20, 2018

APPENDIX D

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG – Rocky Mountain Group, last dated May 28, 2015

APPENDIX E

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: *Preliminary Soils and Geology Report, Hilltop Subdivision, North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado,* prepared by RMG Engineers, last dated May 5, 2014

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 Project Location

The project lies in the E $\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 29, Township 13 South, Range 65 West of the 6th Principal Meridian in El Paso County, Colorado. The site is located at the northwest intersection of Marksheffel Road and N. Carefree Circle. The approximate location of the site is shown on the Site Vicinity Map, Figure 1.

1.2 Project Description

We understand the development is to be grouped into two phases, with Phase I consisting of 163 lots in and Phase II consisting of 40 lots. The proposed development also includes Tract areas and two detention ponds.

The total calculated area of the site, as recorded on the *Windermere Preliminary Plan*, prepared by Drexel, Barrell & Co. last dated June 18, 2020, Project No. 21187-01CSCV, is 55.58 acres. The proposed development is to consist of 203 single family residential lots with an average lot size of 6,978 square feet. The parcels included in this study are:

- EPC Schedule No. 5329400013, currently labeled as Antelope Ridge Drive and is zoned RS-5000 CAD O, *Residential Suburban, Commercial Airport District*.
- EPC Schedule No. 532911002, currently labeled as Antelope Ridge Drive and is zoned RS-5000 CAD O, *Residential Suburban, Commercial Airport District*.

(one more "1")

It is our understanding water and wastewater are to be provided by the Cherokee Metro district. Therefore, an on-site wastewater treatment system evaluation is not anticipated to be required.

The purpose of this report is to provide a Soils and Geology Study that meets the current requirements outlined in the *El Paso County Land Development Code* (LDC), the *El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual* (ECM). This report also addresses the Panning and Community Development Engineering review comments, dated March 21, 2019, in regards to the previous *Preliminary Soils and Geology Report* (2014), referenced below. The original *Soils and Geology Report* was also reviewed by the Colorado Geological Survey (CGS). The comments from CGS were posted on the El Paso County Electronic Development Application Review Program (EDARP) on July 28, 2020, and their comments have also been considered in preparation of this updated report. The general boundary of our investigation in presented in Figure 2.

1.3 Scope of Report

The scope of this study included 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 the evaluation of the 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 that are present on this site,
- Analyze the potential negative impacts of these conditions on the proposed site development,
- Analyze the potential negative impacts to the surrounding properties and/or public services resulting from the proposed site development as it relates to existing geologic hazards,

• Provide our opinion of suitable techniques that may be utilized to mitigate the 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.

1.4 Site Evaluation Techniques

The information included in this report has been compiled from:

- Field reconnaissance
- Geologic and topographic maps
- Review of selected publicly available, pertinent engineering reports
- Available aerial photographs
- Exploratory soil test borings 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.

1.5 Land Use and Engineering Geology

Overall, the site was found to be suitable for the proposed development. Several geologic conditions were encountered in areas that will impose some constraints on development and land use. These geologic conditions include artificial fill, expansive soils and bedrock, seasonal and potentially seasonal shallow groundwater. Based on the review of the *Preliminary Plan* referenced above, as well as the *Preliminary Erosion Control Plan* prepared by Drexel, Barrell & Co. last dated June 18, 2020, Project No. 21187-01ECCV these areas will have some impact on the development. These conditions are discussed in greater detail in this report.

1.6 Previous Studies and Field Investigation

Reports of previous geotechnical engineering/geologic investigations for this site were available for our review and are listed below:

- 1. Preliminary Subsurface Soil Investigation, N. Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated February 5, 2019.
- 2. Addendum to Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated February 5, 2019.
- 3. Addendum to Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, N. Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated July 20, 2018.
- 4. Preliminary Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, N. Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated April 17, 2018.
- 5. Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 142206, last dated May 28, 2015.
- 6. Addendum to Preliminary Soils and Geology Report, Windermere, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 142206, last dated November 14, 2014.
- 7. Preliminary Soils and Geology Report, Hilltop Subdivision, North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG Engineers, Job No. 142206, last dated March 5, 2014.

2.0 GENERAL SITE CONDITIONS AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Existing Site Conditions

The site is mostly undeveloped other than a detention pond located along the northern property line. A stockpile of imported soil resides near the northwest corner of the property. An unnamed drainageway enters the property near the center of the eastern property line and continues to flow into the detention pond.

2.2 Topography

A hill with sandstone outcroppings exists near the western boundary in the southern third of the property. The hill is the highest portion of the property, with slopes down to the roads to the west, south, and east and northward down to a southwest/northeast drainage crossing the site. The northern portion of the site slopes down to Marksheffel Road on the east and to the same southwest/northeast drainage.

2.3 Vegetation

The majority of the site consists of low lying native grasses and weeds. Few deciduous trees are present on the site.

2.4 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 <u>historicaerials.com</u> dating back to 1947. The site has remained generally undisturbed prior to 1999. Prior to 1947, a dam was constructed in the location of the existing detention pond. The dam remained in place until prior to 1999 when improvements were made in

conjunction with the development to the north. Since 1999, the detention area has remained seasonal wet and has retained little free standing water.

3.0 SCOPE OF REPORT

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 development of single-family residences within the referenced site. As such, our services exclude evaluation of the environmental and/or human, health-related work products or recommendations previously prepared, by others, for this project.

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 LDC specifically Chapter 8 last updated August 27, 2019 applicable sections include 8.4.8 and 8.4.9. and ECM, specifically Appendix C last updated July 9, 2019.

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 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.

4.0 FIELD INVESTIGATION

4.1 Drilling

The subsurface conditions within the property were previously explored multiple times by RMG, by drilling a total of sixty (60) exploratory borings between March 2014 and March 2018. The test borings extended to depths of approximately 10 to 47 feet below the existing ground surface. The approximate locations of the test boring locations are presented on the Test Boring Location Plan, Figure 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. An Explanation of Test Boring Logs and the Test Boring Logs from each previous investigation are presented in Appendices B through E.

4.2 Laboratory Testing

Soil laboratory testing was performed as part of each previous investigation. The laboratory tests included moisture content, dry density, grain-size analyses, Atterberg Limits and Swell/Consolidation tests. A Summary of Laboratory Test Results from each previous investigation is presented in Appendices B through E.

4.3 Groundwater

The presence of creeks, streams, holding ponds, or other waterways (particularly those that only intermittently contain water) is not necessarily indicative of a shallow groundwater condition. Such waterways can be fed solely from "upstream" precipitation, irrigation, and other surface sources. Shallow groundwater was encountered in 5 of the previous test borings at depths ranging from 6 to 42 feet. Below is a table summarizing the groundwater depths within the previous reports, referenced above.

Job No./	Test Boring (TB) No.	Depth of Groundwater	Date of Groundwater
Date of Report		(Ft)	Measurement
142206 / 5/28/15	TB-2	42.0	2/20/14
142206 / 5/28/15	TB-6	6.0	2/20/14
142206 / 5/28/15	TB-7	21.5	2/20/14
162062 / 5/5/19	107	14.0	3/18/18
162062 / 5/5/19	130	16.0	3/18/18

Groundwater was not encountered in the remaining test borings. Areas of seasonal and potentially shallow groundwater are indicated on the Engineering and Geology Map, Figure 4 and is discussed in the following section.

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.

As a result of the groundwater conditions encountered in TB-6 performed for Job No. 142206, it is our opinion that **basement construction should be avoided on the proposed lots 72-74 and lots 169-173**. Based on our knowledge of the area and engineering design and construction techniques employed in the El Paso County area, it is our opinion that there is insufficient reason to preclude full-depth basements on the remaining lots at this time. If shallow groundwater conditions are found to exist on additional lots at the time of the site-specific subsurface soil investigations, the feasibility of basement construction and/or any recommended mitigation measures are to be addressed at that time

5.0 SOIL, GEOLOGY, ENGINEERING GEOLOGY

CGS had additional lots

5.1 General Geology

Physiographically, the site lies near the center of the Denver Basin, an asymmetrical, oval-shaped, geological structural depression. This structural basin lies directly east of the Front Range and covers a large part of eastern Colorado. The formation of the Denver Basin began during the Ancestral Rockies uplift, approximately 300 million years ago. The Rampart Range fault is about 12 miles west of the site.

Bedrock in the area tends to be very gently dipping in a northerly direction. The bedrock in the area of the site are sedimentary in nature and are typically Paleocene and Upper Cretaceous. The bedrock underlying the site consists of the Dawson Arkose Formation. Overlying this formation are unconsolidated deposits of residual soils, man-made, sheetwash deposits, and alluvial soils. The alluvial soils were deposited by water in the drainages on the site. Man-made soils exist as earthen dams, berms and stockpiles.

5.2 Soil Conservation Survey

The U.S. Soil Conservation Service along with USDA has identified the soils on the property as:

• 97 – Truckton, sandy loam, 3 to 9 percent slopes. The Truckton, sandy loam was mapped by the USDA to encompass the entire property. Properties of the Truckton, sandy loam include, well-drained soil, depth of the water table is anticipated to be greater than 80 inches, runoff is anticipated to be low, frequency of flooding and ponding is none, and landforms are hills. The Truckton, sandy loam is anticipated in the areas of all the new residences.

5.3 Site Stratigraphy

Based on our field observations and review of relevant geologic maps, a geologic map was prepared which identifies the geologic conditions affecting the development. The geologic units present of the site are presented in the Engineering and Geology Map, Figure 4.

The site generally consists of fine-coarse grained sand with some clay content overlying the Dawson Formation. The sandstone is generally permeable, well drained, and has good foundation characteristics. Six geologic units and one engineering unit were mapped at the site as:

Geologic Units

- *Tkda Dawson Arkose Formation (Eocene) –* as mapped on the Falcon NW Quadrangle, The Dawson Sandstone which consists of silty sandstone with interbedded layers of claystone/siltstone. The Dawson formation is thick-bedded to massive, generally light colored arkose, pebbly, and pebble conglomerate. The sandstone is generally poorly sorted with high clay content. The sandstone is generally permeable, well drained, and has good foundation characteristics. The claystone/siltstone is generally well sorted with high sand content. The claystone/siltstone generally is less permeable than the sandstone and is generally not suitable for direct bearing of shallow foundations.
- Af Artificial fill areas of visible known fill to include: the existing detention pond banks, berms along the western and southern property lines, stockpile
- *sw seasonally wet* areas where near-surface moisture conditions may seasonally occur, includes areas where shallow groundwater was encountered in the test borings
- *sh* sandstone "hill"
- hb hard to very hard sandstone bedrock encountered at the surface
- *sp* stockpile

Engineering Unit

• 2A – Stable alluvium, colluvium and bedrock on gentle to moderate slops (5% to 12%)

5.4 Soil Conditions

The soils encountered in the test borings can be grouped into five general soil and rock types. The soils were classified using the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). Below is a brief description of each soil and bedrock type encountered on the property.

Artificial Fill (CL and SC/SM)

Fill was encountered in three of the test borings. The fill extended to depths of approximately 6 to 30 feet below the existing surface. The fill materials were described as stiff and medium dense consistencies. Minimal testing was performed on the fill due to the locations (located within areas where overlot grading cuts are anticipated to remove the majority of the fill).

Native Silty to Clayey Sand (SM and SC/SM)

The silty to clayey sand material is residual soil derived from the Dawson Arkose Formation. The silty sand (SM) and the silty to clayey sand (SC/SM) were encountered throughout the site, extending to depths ranging from 1 to 10 feet. These materials were described as loose to dense consistencies. This material is considered to have nil to low swell potential.

Native Sandy Clay (CL)

The sandy clay material is also considered residual soil derived from the Dawson Arkose Formation. The sandy clay (CL) was encountered near the surface intermittently across the site. The sandy clay extended to depths ranging between 6 to 8 feet and was described as stiff to very stiff consistencies. This material is considered to have low to moderate swell potential.

Dawson Arkose Formation - Sandstone

The sandstone was encountered in the majority of the test borings. The sandstone was generally described as hard to very hard consistencies. The sandstone with low clay content is considered to have low swell potential. The swell potential is anticipated to increase with increasing clay content.

Dawson Arkose Formation - Claystone/Siltstone

The claystone/siltstone was encountered intermittently across the site at various depths below the ground surface. The claystone/siltstone was generally described as hard to very hard consistencies. The claystone/siltstone is considered to have low to moderate potential.

6.0 ENGINEERING GEOLOGY – IDENTIFICATION OF GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

6.1 Relevance of Geologic Conditions to Land Use Planning

The El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual recognizes and delineates the difference between 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 hazard and constraints were considered in the preparation of this report, and are not are not anticipated to pose a significant risk to the proposed development:

- Avalanches
- Debris Flow-Fans/Mudslides
- Floodplains
- Ground Subsidence
- Landslides
- Steep Slopes

duplicate

- Rockfall
- Ponding water
- Steeply Dipping Bedrock
- Unstable or Potentially Unstable Slopes
- Scour, Erosion, accelerated erosion along creek banks and drainageways
- Springs and High Groundwater

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

6.2 Expansive Soils and Bedrock

Based on the test boring logs and laboratory testing performed on the site, the silty to clayey sand and sandstone generally possess nil to low swell potential. The clay and claystone/siltstone generally possess low to moderate swell potential.

Mitigation

Foundation design and construction are typically adjusted for expansive soils. Expansive soils and bedrock are anticipated to be encountered on the site. If expansive soils or bedrock are encountered in the excavations, mitigation of expansive soils can be accomplished by overexcavation and replacement with structural fill or subexcavation and replacement with on-site moisture-conditioned soils. The overexcavated soils should be observed and tested to verify adequate compaction. Overexcavation and replacement has been successful in minimizing slab movement. If slab movement cannot be tolerated, the use of structural floors should be considered for basement construction on lowly to moderately expansive clays and claystone/siltstone. Drilled piers are generally not advised due to the presence of very hard bedrock. Final foundation recommendations should be determined after additional investigation is completed for each building site.

Additional test borings (site-specific soil investigations) will be necessary prior to the foundation excavation, and open excavation observations will be necessary prior to the placement of any foundation components.

6.3 Compressible Soils

Based on the test boring logs, the silty to clayey sand generally possesses low to moderate compressibility potential. The clay, sandstone, and claystone/siltstone are generally anticipated to possess low compressibility potential.

Mitigation

Foundation design and construction are typically adjusted for compressible soils. Compressible soils are anticipated to be encountered on the site. If compressible soils are encountered, mitigation of compressible soils can generally be accomplished by overexcavation and recompaction.

Additional test borings (site-specific soil investigations) will be necessary prior to the foundation excavation, and open excavation observations will be necessary prior to the placement of any foundation components.

This should be mapped in a figure and then reflected on prelim plan...

6.4 Hard Bedrock

Hard to very hard bedrock was encountered in the test borings throughout the site. A sandstone "hill" exists on the property and outcroppings of the sandstone are visible. The elevation of the sandstone "hill" is approximately 20 feet higher than the surrounding area.

The sandstone "hill" and the area immediately surrounding the "hill" encountered hard cemented sandstone at the surface. This sandstone "hill" and area are mapped and presented in the Engineering and Geology Map, Figure 4. According to the *Cut/Fill Map*, referenced in Appendix A, the sandstone hill is to be reshaped to a limited degree. Relatively shallow cuts are proposed along the top of the "hill", but cuts along the sides may reach depths of approximately 15 to 16 feet in some areas.

Mitigation

Development within this area is anticipated to be difficult. The bedrock may require the use of specialized heavy-duty equipment and/or blasting to facilitate rock break-up and removal. In areas where the very hard sandstone bedrock is anticipated to be encountered, the builder is considering the use of stiffened slab-on-grade or crawlspace foundations to minimize the depth of excavations within the sandstone.

6.5 Floodplain and Drainage Areas

Based on our review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Community Panel No. 08041C0539G and 08041C0543G effective December 7, 2018 and the online ArcGIS El Paso County Risk Map, the entire property lies outside of any designated 100-year and 500-year floodplains. The FEMA Map is presented in Figure 6.

Although the property does not lay within a designated floodway, it does include defined drainage features that should be taken into consideration. One such feature is a drainageway entering the property near the middle of the northern property line (hereafter referred to as the "northern drainageway"). This northern drainageway discharges into the existing detention pond along the northern property line. A second feature is a drainageway entering the site near the northeastern corner of the property (hereafter referred to as the "eastern drainageway"). This eastern drainageway is predominantly confined to an existing swale along Marksheffel Road. The third feature is a drainageway crossing the middle of the site in a southwest-to-northeast direction (hereafter referred to as the "central drainageway"). The northern and central drainageways converge near the northeast corner of the site, then extend southeasterly towards Marksheffel Road where the eastern drainageway also converges. This combined drainageway then proceeds to cross Marksheffel road to the east.

Additionally, areas of seasonal and potentially seasonal shallow groundwater were observed on the site. In these areas, the potential for periodically high subsurface moisture conditions may be encountered. These areas currently lie within the low-lying areas in the northeastern corner of the site and the existing detention area. Water has been observed in these areas during seasonally high moisture periods. It is our opinion that these areas can be avoided or properly mitigated during development. The potential exists for higher groundwater levels during high moisture periods and should the structures encroach on these areas, the following precautions should be followed.

Mitigation

It is our understanding that some reshaping of the existing detention pond is proposed. Likewise, it is our understanding that some reshaping of the eastern drainage way/swale paralleling Marksheffel Road is also proposed. All detention area improvements shall be completed as recommended in **Section 10.0**

Detention Storage Criteria of this report and (as applicable) the approved drainage report for this development. RMG has not verified the adequacy of the northern drainageway, eastern drainageway, or the detention pond to support the anticipated flows, as specific drainage studies are beyond the scope of this study. Refer to the approved drainage report for the site for this evaluation.

It is our understanding that the central drainageway is to be infilled as part of the overlot grading process. Based on our investigation, the central drainageway does not appear to be related to a shallow groundwater condition. Rather, it is a relatively low-lying pathway for surface runoff. Provided that the site drainage and grading plan provides for adequate surface runoff in this area, it is our opinion that no further mitigation measures are required. Site grading should be configured to avoid ponding of water around the structures.

6.6 Corrosive Minerals

Sandstone bedrock underlies the entire site. Sandstone bedrock is generally considered to contain corrosive minerals.

Mitigation

To help mitigate potential corrosion, buried ferrous metal piping, conduit, and similar construction materials should be coated, wrapped or otherwise protected to avoid or reduce contact with the on-site soils. For environments corrosive to concrete, sulfate-resistant cement and additives should be used.

6.7 Fill Soils

Fill soils were encountered in seven of the test borings, primarily along the southern and western banks of the detention pond, in the identified stockpile, and near the berms paralleling the western and southern property boundaries. Fill depths up to 32 feet were encountered in the stockpile near the northwestern portion of the detention pond, and up to depths of 5 to 6 feet near the berms.

To date, no documentation has been provided to RMG indicating that these fill soils were observed and tested during placement. Unless such documentation is received, these fills should be considered unsuitable for support of the proposed structures. Furthermore, any new fill placed atop this existing fill should also be considered unsuitable for support of the proposed structures.

Mitigation

The existing (undocumented) fill soils, where encountered below proposed foundations, will require removal and replacement with compacted structural fill. Prior to overlot grading operations and placing any new overlot grading fill, it is recommended test pits be performed and observed by RMG in the areas identified as containing fill soils, to verify the depth of the existing fill for removal prior to placing any new fill.

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

A grading plan has been prepared for the proposed new lots. Overlot grading and masses of fill are proposed. Based on the test borings performed previously by RMG for this property, the excavations will encounter a range of materials to include, silty to clayey sand (fill and native), sandy clay (fill and native), sandstone, and siltstone/claystone.

The on-site soils are mildly susceptible to wind and water erosion. Minor wind erosion and dust may be an issue for a short time during and immediately after construction. Should the problem be considered severe during construction, watering of the cut areas may be required. Once construction is complete, vegetation should be re-established.

Prior to placement of any overlot grading 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 a representative of RMG during construction.

Mitigation

We anticipate that the deepest excavation cuts for basement level construction will be approximately 6 to 8 feet below the existing ground surface. We believe the surficial sand soils will classify as Type C materials and the clay soils will classify as Type B as defined by OSHA in 29CFR Part 1926, date 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) and slopes made in Type B materials be laid back at ratios no steeper than 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) unless the excavation is shored or braced. Flatter slopes will likely be necessary should groundwater conditions occur. It is recommended that fill slopes be no steeper than 3:1 (horizontal to vertical).

6.9 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.

Northern El Paso, CO and the 80931 zip code located in El Paso County, has an EPA assigned Radon Zone of 1. A radon zone of 1 predicts an average indoor radon screening level greater than 4 pCi/L, which is above the recommended levels assigned by the EPA. Black Forest is located in a high risk area of the country. *The EPA recommends you take corrective measures to reduce your exposure to radon gas*.

Most of Colorado is generally considered to have the potential of high levels of radon gas, based on the information provided at: <u>http://county-radon.info/CO/El_Paso.html</u>. There is not believed to be unusually hazardous levels of radon from naturally occurring sources 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.

7.0 RELEVANCE OF GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS TO LAND USE PLANNING

It is our opinion the existing geologic and engineering geologic conditions will likely impose some limitations on the proposed development and construction. The most significant conditions affecting development will be the hard sandstone bedrock and potentially shallow groundwater. However, it is our opinion that all of the identified conditions can be mitigated with avoidance or proper engineering design and construction practices.

Address CGS comments.

The upper silty to clayey sand and sandy clay materials were encountered at loose to medium dense and stiff to stiff consistency, respectively. Areas of loose soils and/or artificial fill soils may be encountered but are anticipated to be reworked and regraced with the overlot development. Prior to placing any new overlot grading fill, it is recommended test pits be performed and observed by RMG in the areas identified as containing fill, to verify the depth of the existing fill for removal. Expansive clay, claystone/siltstone and clayey sandstone are anticipated to be encountered at varying depths across the site.

The existing (undocumented) fill soils, where encountered below proposed foundations, will require removal and replacement with compacted structural fill. Prior to overlot grading operations and placing any new overlot grading fill, it is recommended test pits be performed and observed by RMG in the areas identified as containing fill soils, to verify the depth of the existing fill for removal prior to placing any new fill.

Foundation types are anticipated to include stiffened slab-on-grade, crawlspace, and basement construction. The areas where foundation excavations penetrate the overlot grading fill may encounter expansive clay and claystone/siltstone, which will require mitigation. However, these soils will not prohibit development.

The sandstone "hill" and the area immediately surrounding the "hill" encountered hard cemented sandstone at the surface. This sandstone "hill" and area are mapped and presented in the Engineering and Geology Map, Figure 4. According to the *Cut/Fill Map*, referenced in Appendix A, the sandstone hill is to be reshaped to a limited degree. Relatively shallow cuts are proposed along the top of the "hill", but cuts along the sides may reach depths of approximately 15 to 16 feet in some areas. Development within this area is anticipated to be difficult. The bedrock may require the use of specialized heavy-duty equipment and/or blasting to facilitate rock break up and removal. In areas where the very hard sandstone bedrock is anticipated to be encountered, the builder is considering the use of stiffened slab-on-grade or crawlspace foundations to minimize the depth of excavations within the sandstone.

Areas of seasonally shallow groundwater and potentially seasonal shallow groundwater were encountered on the site. As a result of the groundwater conditions encountered in TB-6 performed for Job No. 142206, it is our opinion that **basement construction should be avoided on the proposed lots 72-74 and lots 169-173**. Based on our knowledge of the area and engineering design and construction techniques employed in the El Paso County area, it is our opinion that there is insufficient reason to preclude fulldepth basements on the remaining lots at this time. If shallow groundwater conditions are found to exist on additional lots at the time of the site-specific subsurface soil investigations, the feasibility of basement construction and/or any recommended mitigation measures are to be addressed at that time.

Foundations are required to have a minimum 30-inch depth for frost protection. In areas where potentially high subsurface moisture conditions are anticipated, subsurface drains are recommended to help minimize the intrusion of water into areas below grade. Typical drain details are presented in Figures 7 and 8.

8.0 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 1* indicates the site is identified as upland deposits comprised of sand, gravel, silt and clay remnants of older stream deposits on topographic

highs or beach like features. Extraction of the sand and gravel resources are not 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. The sedimentary rocks in the areas may lack the geologic structure for trapping oil or gas: therefore, it may not be considered a significant resource in this area.

9.0 EROSION CONTROL

The soils encountered on the site are mildly susceptible to wind erosion and water erosion. During construction disturbance of the site most likely will occur around the building sites and more than likely will require regrading and revegetation. With regard to water erosion, loosely compacted soils will be most susceptible to water erosion, residually weathered soils and weathered bedrock materials become increasingly less susceptible to water erosion.

Minor wind erosion and dust problems may arise during and immediately after construction. If the problem becomes severe during this time, watering of the cut areas may be required to control dust. Installation of erosion protection or vegetation after completion of the structures is anticipated to mitigate the majority of the erosion and dust problems.

10.0 DETENTION STORAGE CRITERIA

This section has been prepared in accordance with the requirements outlined in the El Paso County Land Development Code (LDC), the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) Section 2.2.6 and Appendix C.3.2.B, and the El Paso County (EPC) Drainage Criteria Manual, Volume 1 Section 11.3.3.

10.1 Soil and Rock Design Parameters

TB-6 (Job No. 142206, dated May 28, 2015) and TB-107 (Job No. 162062, last dated February 5, 2019) were located in the general vicinity of the proposed Full Spectrum Detention Basin, Tract A. TB-160 (Job No. 162062, last dated February 5, 2019 was located in the general vicinity of the proposed Private Full Spectrum Extended Detention Basin, Tract B. RMG has performed laboratory tests of soil from across the proposed development. Based upon field and laboratory testing, the following soil and rock parameters are typical for the soils likely to be encountered, and are recommended for use in detention pond embankment design.

Soil Description	Unit Weight (lb/ft ³)	Friction Angle (degree)	Active Earth Pressure, Ka	Passive Earth Pressure, Kp	At Rest Earth Pressure, Ko
Silty to Clayey Sand (SC/SM)	105	30	0.33	3.0	0.50
Silty Sandstone	110	30	0.33	3.0	0.50

The pond embankments are 6.5' and 14' above the existing grade according to Preliminary Plan labels.



Based on a review of the *Preliminary Erosion Control Plan* for Windermere, referenced in Appendix A, the proposed detention pond in Tract B is to be excavated approximately 40 plus feet below the surrounding ground surface on the western portion and approximately 10 feet below the surrounding ground surface on the eastern portion. As such, above-ground embankment construction is not anticipated, nor is it anticipated that impounded stormwater runoff will be stored above the natural ground surface. Detention pond side slopes are to be constructed with a maximum 3:1 slope. Side slopes should be constructed in accordance with applicable sections of the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual, the El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual, and the El Paso County Land Development Code.

11.0 ADDITIONAL STUDIES

The findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report were provided to evaluate the suitability of the site development. Unless indicated otherwise, the test borings, laboratory test results, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are only intended for the use of the minor subdivision and are <u>not intended</u> for use for design and construction of the proposed single family residences or for any future proposed structures. We recommend that a *lot-specific* **subsurface soil investigation** be performed for each proposed new structures. The extent of any fill soils encountered during the lot-specific investigation(s) should be evaluated for suitability to support the proposed structures prior to construction.

Future lot-specific subsurface soil investigations 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.

12.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based upon our evaluation of the geologic conditions, it is our opinion that the proposed development is feasible. The geologic conditions identified are expansive soils/bedrock, compressible soils, hard bedrock, seasonally and potentially seasonal shallow groundwater, corrosive minerals, and radon which are not considered usual 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 local construction practices.

In addition to the previously identified mitigation alternatives, surface and subsurface drainage systems should be implemented. 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.

The foundation and floor slabs of the structure should be designed using the recommendations provided in the lot-specific subsurface soil investigation performed for each lot. In addition, appropriate surface drainage should be established during construction and maintained by the homeowner.

We believe the surficial sand soils will classify as Type C materials and the clay soils will classify as Type B as defined by OSHA in 29CFR Part 1926, date 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) and slopes made in Type B materials be laid back at ratios no steeper than 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) unless the excavation is shored or braced. Flatter slopes will likely be necessary should groundwater conditions occur.

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).

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.

It is important for the Owner(s) of these properties read and understand this report, as well as the previous reports referenced above, and to carefully to familiarize themselves with the geologic hazards associated with construction in this area. This report only addresses the geologic constraints contained within the boundaries of the site referenced above.

13.0 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 **Windsor Ridge Homes** 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

















- 4. ALL DRAIN COMPONENTS SHALL BE RATED/APPROVED BY THE MANUFACTURER FOR THE INSTALLED DEP AND APPLICATION
- 5. DRAIN SYSTEM, INCLUDING THE OUTFALL OF THE DRAIN, SHALL BE OBSERVED BY QUALIFIED PERSONNEL PRIOR TO BACKFILLING TO VERIFY INSTALLATION.

ARCHITECTSRENERACEROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUPSouthern OfficeColorado Springs,CO80918(719) 548-0600Central Office:Englewood, CO 80112(303) 688-9475Northern Office:Greeley / Evans, CO 80620(970) 330-1071	UNDERSLAB DRAIN	FIG No. 8
--	-----------------	-----------

APPENDIX A Additional Reference Documents

- 1. *Overall Site Phase Plan, Windermere, Preliminary Plan, N. Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado,* prepared by Drexel, Barrel &. Co. File Nate 21187-01SP1, last dated June 18, 2020.
- 2. *Cut/Fill Map, Windermere, Preliminary Plan, N. Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado,* prepared by Drexel, Barrel &. Co. File Nate 21187-01 CUT FILL, last dated June 18, 2020.
- 3. *Preliminary Erosion Control Plan, Windermere, Preliminary Plan, N. Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado,* prepared by Drexel, Barrel &. Co. File Nate 21187-011, last dated February 21, 2019.
- 4. *Flood Insurance Rate Map, El Paso County, Colorado and Unincorporated Areas, Community Panel No.* 08041C0539G and 08041C0543G, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), effective December 7, 2018.
- 5. *Geologic Map of the Falcon NW 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, El Paso County, Colorado*, Colorado Geological Survey, compiled by Madole, R.F, Open-File report OF03-08, 2003.
- 6. *Falcon NW Quadrangle Geologic Map, El Paso County, Colorado,* Matthew L. Morgan and Peter E. Barkman, Colorado Geological Survey, Denver, CO. 2012.
- 7. Evaluation of Mineral and Mineral Fuel Potential of El Paso County State Mineral Lands Administered y the Colorado State Land Board, Colorado Geological Survey. Compiled by Keller, John W.; TerBest, Harry and Garrison, Rachel E. Open-File Report 03-07. 2003
- 8. *Falcon NW, Quadrangle, Environmental and Engineering Geologic Map for Land Use*, compiled by Dale M. Cochran, Charles S. Robinson & Associates, Inc., Golden, Colorado, 1977.
- 9. *Falcon NW Quadrangle, Map of Potential Geologic Hazards and Surficial Deposits*, compiled by Dale M. Cochran, Charles S. Robinson & Associates, Inc., Golden, Colorado, 1977.
- 10. *Pikes Peak Regional Building Department:* <u>https://www.pprbd.org/</u>. <u>https://property.spatialest.com/co/elpaso/#/property/5329400013</u> Schedule No.: 5329400013 and <u>https://property.spatialest.com/co/elpaso/#/property/5329111002</u> Schedule No.: 5329111002.
- 11. Colorado Geological Survey, USGS Geologic Map Viewer: <u>https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/mapview/</u>
- 12. *Historical Aerials:* <u>https://www.historicaerials.com/viewer</u>, Images dated 1947, 1955, 1960, 1969, 1999, 2005, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2015, 2017.
- 13. USGS Historical Topographic Map Explorer: <u>http://historicalmaps.arcgis.com/usgs/</u> Colorado Springs Quadrangles dated 1893, 1909, 1961, 1975, and 1989.
- 14. *Google Earth Pro*, Imagery dated 1999, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2011, 2015, 2017, and 2019.

APPENDIX B

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: *N. Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road*, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG – Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated February 5, 2019


































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
100	4.0	15.5								
100	9.0	11.9								
100	14.0	19.7								
100	19.0	31.0								
100	29.0	18.1								
107	4.0	9.5								
107	9.0	13.6								
107	14.0	20.8								
107	19.0	25.6								
108	4.0	16.1								
108	9.0	7.6								
108	14.0	12.4								
108	24.0	20.1								
109	4.0	14.5								
109	9.0	10.7								
109	14.0	24.4								
109	19.0	13.5								
109	29.0	16.1								
110	4.0	19.5								
110	14.0	18.4								
110	24.0	19.6								
110	34.0	14.3								
111	4.0	12.7		NP	NP	0.0	29.1			SM
111	9.0	16.0		NP	NP	1.8	25.1			SM
111	14.0	16.0		NP	NP	0.0	25.9			SM
111	24.0	23.6								
111	29.0	20.7								
114	4.0	15.8								
114	9.0	15.4								
114	14.0	30.4								
114	19.0	14.5								
116	4.0	12.1		NP	NP	0.0	35.0			SM
116	9.0	13.1		NP	NP	1.0	37.6			SM
116	14.0	15.6								

JOB No. 162062 SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS FIGURE No. 21 PAGE 1 OF 5 DATE 4/17/18

Architectural Structural Forensics

КМG ENGINEERS

Colorado Sprints: (Cornorate Office) 2910 Austin Bluffs Parkway Colorado Springs, CO 60918 (719) 548-0600 SOUTHERN COLORADO, DENVER METRO, NORTHERN COLORADO

ROCKY MOUNTAIN GROUP

ARCHITECTS

Geotechnical Materials Testing Civil, Planning

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 Classificatior
116	19.0	10.9						. /		
120	4.0	10.3								
120	9.0	12.6								
120	14.0	12.3								
120	19.0	23.5								
122	4.0	11.5								
122	9.0	8.7		NP	NP	5.6	23.9			SM
122	14.0	11.2		NP	NP	1.2	28.3			SM
122	19.0	13.9								
124	4.0	11.5								
124	9.0	9.7		NP	NP	0.4	21.6			SM
124	14.0	6.7		NP	NP	2.2	26.3			SM
124	19.0	21.3								
126	4.0	15.7								
126	9.0	15.3								
126	14.0	17.4								
126	19.0	14.4								
128	4.0	9.4								
128	9.0	12.0								
128	14.0	12.2								
128	19.0	13.5								
130	4.0	9.5								
130	9.0	13.7								
130	14.0	12.9								
130	19.0	22.0		48	27	0.0	44.4			SC
132	4.0	7.7								
132	9.0	23.0								
132	14.0	19.8								
132	19.0	7.8								
132	24.0	2.4								
133	4.0	11.1								
133	9.0	14.8								
133	14.0	17.7								
133	19.0	14.2								



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
133	29.0	9.9								
134	4.0	13.7								
134	9.0	11.3								
134	14.0	10.4		32	14	1.8	41.6			SC
134	19.0	10.0								
134	29.0	7.8								
137	4.0	22.7								
137	9.0	18.7		66	41	0.0	81.6			СН
137	14.0	12.6								
137	19.0	11.2								
137	24.0	18.1								
139	4.0	10.8								
139	9.0	10.2								
140	4.0	13.9								
140	9.0	11.5								
140	14.0	10.1								
140	19.0	11.4								
142	4.0	11.3		36	16	2.6	30.5			SC
142	9.0	9.9				0.4	36.2			
142	14.0	24.8								
142	19.0	18.7				0.0	83.2			
142	29.0	16.9								
143	4.0	21.1								
143	9.0	28.3								
143	14.0	27.0								
143	34.0	27.5								
145	4.0	17.2								
145	9.0	20.4		45	22	0.5	45.1			SC
145	14.0	15.3								
147	4.0	16.7								
147	9.0	14.6				0.0	73.1			
147	14.0	18.0		37	19	0.0	56.8			CL
147	19.0	30.3			-	-				_
147	29.0	64.8								



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
147	39.0	12.4								
149	4.0	15.2								
149	9.0	17.4								
149	14.0	33.0								
149	19.0	29.0								
149	29.0	13.8								
149	39.0	18.8								
150	4.0	17.6								
150	9.0	11.4								
150	14.0	10.2								
150	19.0	19.0								
152	4.0	12.7		33	12	0.9	49.1			SC
152	9.0	20.5		58	33	0.0	64.5			СН
152	14.0	26.9								
152	19.0	18.6								
153	4.0	11.8								
153	9.0	10.1								
153	14.0	11.8								
153	19.0	23.7								
154	4.0	9.0								
154	9.0	16.5								
154	14.0	19.6								
154	19.0	11.1								
154	24.0	15.2								
156	4.0	8.7								
156	9.0	13.3								
156	14.0	12.0								
156	19.0	12.4								
157	4.0	6.9								
157	9.0	9.2		NP	NP	0.1	39.7			SM
157	14.0	11.5				-				_
157	19.0	11.5								
160	4.0	15.4								
160	9.0	14.6								



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
160	14.0	14.7								
Architectural Structural Forensics	ROCKY MOL	NTAIN GROUP	Gestechn Materials Te Civil, Plant	ical sting ling	S LAB	UMM/ ORAT RESI	ARY O ORY T ULTS	F EST	JOB No. FIGURE PAGE 5 DATE	162062 No. 21 OF 5 4/17/18

APPENDIX C

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: Addendum to Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado, prepared by RMG – Rocky Mountain Group, Job No. 162062, last dated July 20, 2018











Test Boring No.	Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.4 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	% Swell/ Collapse	FHA Expansion Pressure (psf)	RMG Soil Type
113	4.0	17.0		42	16		30.4			
113	9.0	12.0								
113	14.0	8.7								
113	19.0	11.9								
113	24.0	15.2								
113	29.0	23.3								
113	34.0	21.3								
115	4.0	12.5								
115	9.0	11.6		34	11		36.5			
115	14.0	8.1								
115	19.0	10.5								
121	4.0	9.2								
121	9.0	12.8		40	14	0.8	38.6	- 0.2		
121	14.0	12.6								
127	4.0	18.6		NP	NP		57.7			
127	9.0	13.9								
127	14.0	10.1								
135	4.0	22.3								
135	9.0	14.6		NP	NP		19.9			
135	14.0	15.0								
136	4.0	16.7		NP	NP		59.6			
136	9.0	11.6								
136	14.0	13.6								
146	4.0	12.2								
146	9.0	19.1		47	18		52.7	1.2		
146	14.0	24.3								
146	19.0	19.0								
146	24.0	25.3								
155	4.0	12.4								
155	9.0	28.1								
155	14.0	24.4		64	26		56.7	0.7		
155	19.0	15.1								
158	4.0	9.9								
158	9.0	9.4								

Test Boring No.	Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.4 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	% Swell/ Collapse	FHA Expansion Pressure (psf)	RMG Soil Type
158	14.0	21.3								
158	19.0	23.9		58	21		60.3	0.7		
158	24.0	20.0								



APPENDIX D

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: *Subsurface Soil Investigation, Windermere Subdivision, El Paso County, Colorado,* prepared by RMG – Rocky Mountain Group, last dated May 28, 2015











Test Boring No.	Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.4 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	% Swell/ Collapse	FHA Expansior Pressure (psf)
1	4.0	21.0							(201)
1	9.0	21.8	102.3	38	17		65.1	2.7	
1	14.0	24.4							
2	4.0	11.5		NP	NP		41.8		
2	9.0	13.4							
2	14.0	14.6							
2	19.0	14.1							
3	4.0	13.8	90.6	40	19		46.8	- 3.7	
3	9.0	21.4							
3	14.0	18.0							
3	19.0	23.4	-						
4	4.0	21.7		55	25		65.4		
4	9.0	21.5	91.3					0.3	
4	14.0	34.4							
4	19.0	28.3							
5	4.0	15.7							
5	9.0	25.3					1997		
5	14.0	27.0		57	27		53.5		
5	19.0	21.6							
6	4.0	15.6		43	17		40.0		
6	9.0	24.8	95.5					0.8	
6	14.0	18.4		45	18		39.3		
6	19.0	13.3							
7	4.0	21.8	95.4					0.9	
7	9.0	25.9							
7	14.0	28.3							
7	19.0	14.3		NP	NP		22.8		
8	4.0	8.9					10 10 - 10 - T		
8	9.0	8.4		NP	NP		26.7		
8	14.0	22.1		50	28		48.5		
8	19.0	13.6		a) 18					
9	4.0	19.8							
9	9.0	19.1		48	23		52.3		
9	14.0	12.0							

Calorado.Springs. (Corporate Office) 2910 Austin Blufts Partway Colorado Spings. CO 80918 Voice (719) 548-0500 Fax (719) 548-0223



SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

JOB No. 142206 FIGURE No. 10 PAGE 1 OF 2 DATE 5/28/15

Test Boring No.	Depth	Water Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index	% Retained No.4 Sieve	% Passing No. 200 Sieve	% Swell/ Collapse	FHA Expansion Pressure (psf)
9	19.0	12.4		34	13		38.3		(201)
Colorado Springs. (Corporate Office) 2910 Austin Buits Parkway Colorado Springs, CC 80918 Vone (719) 548-0223 Fax (719) 548-0223		G		SU LABO	MMA RATC RESU	RY O DRY T LTS	F EST	JOB No. FIGURE I PAGE 2 DATE	142206 No. 10 OF 2 5/28/15

APPENDIX E

Test Boring Logs and Summary of Laboratory Test Results from: *Preliminary Soils and Geology Report, Hilltop Subdivision, North Carefree Circle and Marksheffel Road, El Paso County, Colorado,* prepared by RMG Engineers, last dated May 5, 2014

TEST BORING: 1 DATE DRILLED: 2/19/14 REMARKS: NO GROUNDWATER ON 2/20/14	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	ATER CONTENT %	SOIL TYPE	TEST BORING: 2 DATE DRILLED: 2/19/14 REMARKS: GROUNDWATER @ 42.0 '	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	LOWS PER FT.	ATER CONTENT %	SOIL TVDE
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, light brown, loose to medlum dense, moist	5			7 10	≶ 8.4 9.1	1	2/20/14 SANDSTONE, SILTY, brown, very hard, moist	5 —	-		50/3" 50/6"	≥ 14.4 16.8	4 3
	10			13	12.0	1	CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, olive to brown, very hard, moist	10			50/6"	21.4	2
CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, tan to brown, hard, moist	15			58	17.9	2		15—			50/6"	28.6	2
SANDSTONE, SILTY, with silstone, tan to brown and blue, hard to very hard, moist	20			50/2"	14.1	3	SANDSTONE, SILTY, blue to grey, very hard, molst CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, olive to brown,	20			50/8"	- 28.8	3
SAMPLER REFUSAL AT 24 FEET DUE TO VERY HARD BEDROCK	25			50/0"	-	3	hard, moist SANDSTONE, SILTY, blue to grey, very hard, moist	25			50/3"	-	3
							CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, blue to gray, very hard, moist to wet	30			50/3"	17.1	3
								35 40 ⊻			50/3"	25.1	2
							SANDSTONE, SILTY, blue to grey, very hard, moist to wet SAMPLER REFUSAL AT 49 FEET DUE TO VERY HARD BEDROCK	45			50/0"	-	3
Colomic Scrittor, (Concentre Office) 1910 Aurelin David producery				Y						-			く
Starste Sproge, CO BOY 8 text (719) 544-0223 ar (719) 544-0223		hnic B	al S				TEST BORING LOGS		JOB FIGU DATE	No. RE	1422 No. 6 3/5/14	06	



			-	_	-					_			
TEST BORING: 5 DATE DRILLED: 2/19/14 REMARKS: NO GROUNDWATER ON 2/20/14	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	SOIL TYPE	TEST BORING: 6 DATE DRILLED. 2/19/14 REMARKS: GROUNDWATER @ 6.0 ' 2/20/14	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	SOIL TYPE
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, light brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5			8 10	10.5	1	SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, dark brown to brown, loose, moist				8	14.8	1
	-			24	10.2	4/2	SANDSTONE, SILTY, brown, medium hard, moist to wet	5 ⊻			Ū	20.1	
CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, olive to brown, medium hard to very hard, moist	10			34	18.3	1/3	CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, brown to gray, hard, moist to wel	10			30	21.1	3
	15			52	27.2	2		15			50/11"	30.0	2
SANDSTONE, SILTY, blue to grey, very hard, moist	20=			50/4"	26.8	2		20——			50/8"	23.5	2
SAMPLER REFUSAL AT 24 FEET DUE TO VERY HARD BEDROCK	25			50/0"	-	3							
<u> </u>			ľ										
<u>Manda Sornes (Canoshi Office)</u> 910 Autor Burds Petsus) 300 (719) 548-0000 ар (719) 548-0023	al•Geotec	chnic	cal						JOB I	No.	1422	06	
ENG	INEE	R	S	ノ			LOGS		FIGUI	RE	No. 8 3/5/14		
TEST BORING: 7 DATE DRILLED: 2/19/14 REMARKS: GROUNDWATER @ 21.5 ' 2/20/14	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	SOIL TYPE	TEST BORING. 8 DATE DRILLED: 2/19/14 REMARKS: NO GROUNDWATER ON 2/20/14	DEPTH (FT)	SYMBOL	SAMPLES	BLOWS PER FT.	WATER CONTENT %	SOIL TYPE	
--	------------	---------------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------	---	------------	---------------	---------	--------------------------	-----------------	-----------	
SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, light brown, loose to medium dense, moist	5		12	14.7	1	SAND, SILTY TO CLAYEY, dark brown, loose, moist	5			8	15.2	1	
	10		11	11.2	1	SANDSTONE, SILTY, light grey to blue, hard, moist CLAYSTONE/SILTSTONE, SANDY, brown to grey, medium hard, moist	10			52	5.1	3	
SANDSTONE, SILTY, brown, very hard, moist to wet	15		50/4"	12.9	3	SANDSTONE, CLAYEY, brown, very hard, moist	15			60	31.7	2	
	20] 		50/1"	12.9	3 3		20			50/5"	19.8	3	
SAMPLER REFUSAL AT 24 FEET DUE TO VERY HARD BEDROCK	25												
Colorado Sarzan (Carvare Olice) 2010 Autin Bullis Parlowy Colorado Sarza, COloro 19 Vera (710) 546-0000 Fai (710) 546-0223		chnice R S			 	TEST BORING LOGS		JOB I FIGU	No.	14220 No. 9 3/5/14	06		

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	RMG Soil Typ
1	2.0	8.4								1
1	4.0	9.1		34	14	0.0	30.7			1
1	9.0	12.0								1
1	14.0	17.9	102.6	50	24		70.0		2.3	2
1	19.0	14.1								3
1	24.0	11.5						_		
2	2.0	14.4			ĺ		·			3
2	4.0	16.8								3
2	9.0	21.4	101.1	49	24		84.9		0.4	2
2	14.0	28.6								2
2	19.0	28.8								2
2	29.0	17.1	_	41	15		64.0			3
2	39.0	25.1								2
3	2.0	27.7	95.3	52	20		59.8		1.1	2
3	4.0	20.2								2
3	9.0	12.4		NP	NP		41.4			3
3	14.0	12.1								3
3	19.0	12.4								
4	2.0	11.9		33	12	0.2	30.6			1
4	4.0	14.0								3
4	9.0	7.7								3
4	14.0	11.0								3
4	19.0	12.0								
5	2.0	10.5								1
5	4.0	10.5								1
5	9.0	18.3		49	21		54.8			1/3
5	14.0	27.2								2
5	19.0	26.8	96.4						1.5	2
5	24.0	12.9								
6	2.0	14.8	106.5	40	17		41.5		- 0.8	1
6	4.0	23.7								1
6	9.0	21.1								3
6	14.0	30.0	88.5	54	21		74.8		0.2	2
6	19.0	23.5								2

Voice (719) 548-0600 Far (719) 548-0223

Fee (719) 548-0223

Structural · Geotechnical RMG ENGINEERS

SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

JOB No. 142206 FIGURE No. 10 PAGE 1 OF 2 DATE 3/5/14

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	RMG Soil Type
7	2.0	14.7	100.1	40	17		51.6		0.4	1
7	4.0	11.2								1
7	9.0	11.2								1
7	14.0	12.9								3
7	19.0	12.9								3
8	2.0	15.2								1
8	4.0	11.7	110.2	38	13		37.2		- 4.0	1
8	9.0	5.1								3
8	14.0	31.7	89.1	64	28		82.0		0.7	2
8	19.0	19.8								

soil and geo V_3 redlines.pdf Markup Summary 12-10-2020

dsdrice (4)		
1 and it is, alick ringes the alice of the set of th	Subject: Callout Page Label: 4 Author: dsdrice Date: 12/3/2020 4:18:38 PM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	(one more "1")
	Subject: Page Label: 8 Author: dsdrice Date: 12/3/2020 4:25:17 PM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	t basement construction should be avoided on the proposed lots 72-74 and lots 169-173
	Subject: Callout Page Label: 15 Author: dsdrice Date: 12/8/2020 12:06:10 PM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	Address CGS comments.
Application	Subject: Callout Page Label: 17 Author: dsdrice Date: 12/8/2020 5:57:25 PM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	The pond embankments are 6.5' and 14' above the existing grade according to Preliminary Plan labels.
dsdparsons (6)		
Keger Tease Me Central Please incorporate CoSt an andreminato notes on pretim plan regarding backerrais	Subject: Callout Page Label: 1 Author: dsdparsons Date: 12/4/2020 8:21:41 AM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	Please incorporate CGS comments into report, and provide notes on prelim plan regarding basements, and underrais
And the second s	Subject: Callout Page Label: 24 Author: dsdparsons Date: 12/4/2020 8:24:06 AM Status: Color: ■ Layer: Space:	clearly identify as indicated in comments by CGS ground water which will identify lots that will limit of basements

de profession de 1930 en 1930	Subject: Callout Page Label: 8 Author: dsdparsons Date: 12/4/2020 8:26:01 AM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	CGS had additional lots
ort, and are not	Subject: Owner Certification Page Label: 10 Author: dsdparsons Date: 12/4/2020 8:26:48 AM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	D
the Terms and Perases). The tion of this report, and are per duplicate	Subject: Callout Page Label: 10 Author: dsdparsons Date: 12/4/2020 8:28:10 AM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	duplicate
	Subject: Callout Page Label: 12 Author: dsdparsons Date: 12/4/2020 8:29:21 AM Status: Color: Layer: Space:	This should be mapped in a figure and then reflected on prelim plan