From:	Mayne, Elizabeth
То:	"wniccoli@telesto-inc.com"
Cc:	Hora, Pam; Julie Mikulas
Subject:	Response to Home Office Pit, File No. M-1977-439 – AM04
Date:	Thursday, November 10, 2022 1:33:00 PM
Attachments:	Response Telesto LRM.pdf
	image001.png
	image002.png
	image003.png
	image004.png
	image005.png

Dear Mr. Niccoli

Attached is a response to comments that you provided to the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety regarding

Martin Marietta's Home Office Pit application. Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Elizabeth Mayne | Project Administrator

(she/her) Direct +1 (720) 864-4506 | Main +1 (303) 772-5282 | Cell +1 (602) 524-9652 | Elizabeth.Mayne@tetratech.com

Tetra Tech | Leading with Science" | ECS

351 Coffman St., Suite 200 | Longmont, CO 80501 | tetratech.com

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

F 🗹 in 🞯 Please consider the environment before printing. <u>Read more</u>





November 9, 2022

Mr. Walter L. Niccoli, PE Principal/Senior Engineer Telesto Solutions, Inc. 750 14th St. SW Loveland, CO 80537

Email: wniccoli@telesto-inc.com

RE: Telesto/LRM comments on DRMS AM-4 application - Home Office Mine, Permit M1977-439

Dear Mr. Niccoli:

This letter is in response to the specific comments and questions in your letter of February 25, 2022, documenting comments on behalf of Loveland Ready-Mix Concrete, Inc. (LRM) on Exhibit G of Martin Marietta's 112c Permit Amendment Application (AM4) for the Home Office Mine, submitted on December 23, 2021, File No. M-1977-439. Below are your comments followed by Martin Marietta's responses.

Section 1- Introduction and Background

<u>Comment</u>

Paragraph 2 indicates that "This Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan presents the methods for monitoring groundwater during mining and reclamation, and for mitigating any potential groundwater impacts associated with permitted mining at the site." How can monitoring of groundwater during mining and reclamation be completed when monitoring wells were not installed between LRM's property and the Phase 1 pit until after reclamation was complete?

<u>Response</u>

Water level measurements are available as of 2004. Additional wells were installed at various times throughout mining, including 2016, 2018, and 2021. Exhibit G provides updated hydrographs of water levels and we have incorporated Loveland Ready Mix's well data into our analysis.

<u>Comment</u>

Paragraph 3 states that the discussion is limited to potential changes in the hydrologic balance resulting from the installation of the compacted clay liners. The paragraph refers to Figure G-1, which shows conceptual groundwater flow directions before mining and after reclamation. The focus of the paragraph and Exhibit G is on Stage G, yet the Stage G area is confined to the northeast corner of Figure G-1. It should be central to the figure to show areas surrounding the pit. With lined pits, the potential disruption to the hydrologic balance is "mounding" upgradient of the lined area and "shadow" of the down-gradient areas. Please provide projections of the anticipated changes up- (especially to the north) and down-gradient of the pit area. Also,

What is the basis of the green flow arrows?

<u>Response</u>

A well-understood characteristic of alluvial aquifers is that groundwater flows approximately parallel to river flow. The green flow arrows represent pre-mining groundwater flow patterns.

• How do you depict groundwater flow directions (they may be correct) without a potentiometric surface?

<u>Response</u>

A well-understood characteristic of alluvial aquifers is that groundwater flows approximately parallel to river flow.

• Why are there no projections of the pre-pit groundwater flows through the pit area and to the north?

<u>Response</u>

A revised Figure G-1 depicts additional groundwater flow arrows.

Telesto/Loveland Ready-Mix Concrete Response

• Where does the water from the north go?

<u>Response</u>

Under pre-mining conditions, water from the north flows approximately parallel to the Cache La Poudre River. Under post-mining conditions, water from the north will flow east along the north side of Area G-I and then return to flowing approximately parallel to the Cache La Poudre River.

• How large will the mounding be on the north side of the Phase 1 pit?

<u>Response</u>

Mounding on the north side of the Area G-I pit will likely be on the order of 2-3 feet, as shown in the Koonce and Slatten hydrographs in Chart 6: Nearby Monitoring Well Data.

Section 1.1 – Historical Use

<u>Comment</u>

From our understanding of the timeline and information from site inspections, it appears that Phase 1 is complete with liner installed. It is unclear from the section title if Martin Marietta plans to go back in and install liner over what appears to be a reclaimed and final Phase 1 (See photographs in July 2021 inspection report). What is the timeframe for installing liners and perimeter drains?

<u>Response</u>

An additional liner will not be installed in Area G-I. The G-I liner was installed in Fall 2020. The underdrain, also referred to as the underdrain, was installed in Fall 2021, as shown in Figure F3. An additional portion of underdrain located along the north side of Area G-II is planned to be installed upon completion of Area G-II mining. For clarity, the nomenclature used for the drain will be "underdrain" rather than perimeter and/or underdrain.

<u>Comment</u>

This section identifies a potential issue with rising water table west of Stage G, and points to Section 2.1 for the mitigation solution. There are no analyses in Section 2.1 confirming the reason for the issue, or the solution. Please provide such analyses.

<u>Response</u>

Groundwater levels rose due to the mounding effect on the upgradient side of the Area G-I compacted clay liner. The solution was the design and installation of an underdrain on the west side of Area G-I. Design and as-built drawings, prepared by Deere & Ault are provided in Exhibit G, Attachment 2.

Section 1.2

Comment

The first paragraph describes monitoring wells installed in 2005. Which wells are these? Where are they located? Where are the data? These would be very useful in helping LRM understand potential impacts. Please provide a plan view map of their locations and historical data.

<u>Response</u>

Numerous monitoring wells were installed, generally beginning in 2001 through 2021. Monitoring well data is available beginning in 2007 for the nearby wells referred to as "Stegner Cornfield aka MM Near KOA". Monitoring well data is available beginning in 2004 for the nearby wells referred to as "Koonce" and "Slatten". Records from Lafarge indicate these wells were installed in 2001. Figure G-3 shows the locations of the Koonce, Slatten, and Stegner Cornfield aka MM Near KOA wells.

Comment

Groundwater elevations shown in Charts 1, 2 and 3 are helpful when combined with the location map to help understand groundwater gradients but do little to explain how close the groundwater is to ground surface, and what the potential impacts could be to landowners. Please provide depth to water information for these wells.

<u>Response</u>

Depth to water information for wells discussed in Exhibit G has been added to Exhibit G. Figure G-3 shows the locations of wells discussed in Exhibit G.

TETRA TECH

Comment

Chart 1 shows a steep rise that correlates in time to the end of mining in Phase 1. There is almost a 7.25 foot between July 2020 and July 2021 in well HO-01, and the trend is upward. What is the cause of this? Will the trend continue upward? This could be an issue for LRM's ability to farm the field to the north of Phase 1. Could it explain the issue raised by the neighbor?

<u>Response</u>

Chart 1 from the original AM-04 document was renamed Chart 2 because of the addition of information to Exhibit G. Chart 2: Martin Marietta Monitoring Data (HO-1 and HO-6), previously named Chart 1: Martin Marietta Monitoring Data (HO-1 and HO-6) shows the upward trend referred to in the above comment. The increase in water level correlates to the installation of the Area G-I compacted clay liner. Since the original submission of AM-04, water level monitoring has continued. The hydrographs in revised Exhibit G include water level monitoring through March 2022. Additional water level monitoring data indicate that water levels have appeared to stabilize and show responses to local recharge events.

Section 2.1

Comment

This is the paragraph referred by Section 1.1 as mitigation for the observed rising water table west and north of Stage G Phases 1 and 2, respectively. The paragraph references a perimeter drain being designed by Deere and Ault. Anecdotal information from neighbors indicate that Martin Marietta already installed the drain. Given the rising water level in HO-01 and the fact that Martin Marietta is actively dewatering Phase 2 (and thus, lowering the head at the drain outlet creating a large gradient to increase flows), does not bode well for the mitigation solution purposed in the document. Please explain how this is a mitigation solution for rising water levels on the north side of the Phase 1 pit, and how LRM is protected from flooding caused by groundwater rising to flow around the pit liner.

<u>Response</u>

Mitigation does not appear to be necessary at this time. Mounding on the north side of the Area G-I pit will likely be on the order of 2-3 feet as demonstrated by the Koonce and Slatten hydrographs shown in Chart 6: Nearby Monitoring Well Data. Furthermore, it is our understanding that Loveland Ready-Mix intends to mine the area north of Area G-I.

Comment

It is not clear whether the "underdrain" shown in Figure F-3 is the "perimeter drain," or if another drain is planned. Please provide design details (or as-built drawings) for the perimeter drain. Include:

- Plan and profile along the proposed alignment
- An effective hydraulic conductivity analysis
- Hydraulic analysis

These should show the combination of the perimeter drain and liner is equivalent to the pre-mining condition in terms of its carrying capacity. Also, include the area north of the Phase 1 pit in this analysis to show the potential impact to LRM property.

<u>Response</u>

The underdrain and the perimeter drain are the same drain. For clarity, the nomenclature used for the drain will be "underdrain" rather than perimeter and/or underdrain. This language has been clarified in Exhibit G. The underdrain that has already been installed will not be changed. However, upon completion of mining in Area G-II, an additional section of underdrain will be installed. This section of drain is located along the north side of Area G-II and will connect to the existing underdrain at the northeast corner of Area G-II. Construction drawings prepared by Deere & Ault, A Schnabel Engineering Company are provided in Exhibit G, Attachment 2. In addition, Deere & Ault, A Schnabel Engineering Company provided hydraulic analysis calculations which have also been included in Exhibit G, Attachment 2.

Comment

The plan view on Figure F3 labels an "underdrain" perforated pipe skirting the west side of the Phase 1 pit, passing between Phases 1 and 2, turning solid and emptying into the recharge pond on the southeast side of Phase 2. The perforated drainpipe and trench bottom are roughly 5.4 and 6.4 feet, respectively, below the top of the liner, which is essentially at natural grade. Based on water levels taken on LRM's property, the bottom of the drain might intersect the top of the natural water table, and thus, it appears the drains are not planned deep enough. It is our

TETRA TECH

Telesto/Loveland Ready-Mix Concrete Response

experience that French drains that extend over at least half of the saturated thickness are necessary to efficiently move groundwater around impermeable structures. Please provide an analysis regarding the drain sizing, depth, and location (horizontal and vertical) that efficiently and effectively moves groundwater around the lined pit on all sides and maintains the hydrologic balance. Related, provide methods and infrastructure design to maintain (e.g., cleanouts) and ensure the drain has a long life.

<u>Response</u>

The discharge elevation of the underdrain was installed at 5011.87, which is at or below the historic water level. The underdrain was installed at a slope ranging from approximately 0.16-0.49 % and is therefore located at the maximum feasible depth to be able to convey groundwater along the historic groundwater flow pattern. The upstream-most invert of the drain is approximately 5 feet below ground surface. Construction plans with as-constructed information prepared by Deere & Ault, A Schnabel Engineering Company are provided in Exhibit G, Attachment 2.

Section 2.3

Comment

The mitigation plan is reactive: 1) wait for complaints by neighboring well owners, and 2) then rely on baseline data to determine if there is an effect and develop a mitigation strategy. There is no up-front planning presented to provide an inkling that a workable plan is in place to maintain the hydrologic balance. Please ensure the plan is proactive by providing projections of problem areas, and potential mitigation strategies before something happens.

Mitigation in this section talks solely about impacts to wells. Please elaborate on the mitigation strategy for flooding neighboring properties (e.g, eliminating problematic groundwater in crawl spaces, saturating farm ground or crop root zones with a water table that is too high).

<u>Response</u>

A surface drainage channel is proposed along the west side of Area G-I, adjacent to the underdrain to facilitate surface drainage and maintain historic flow patterns.

Summary

Comment

To ensure the applicant's amendment meets the requirement to maintain the hydrologic balance and not harm LRM's (and neighbor's) properties, LRM humbly requests that the DRMS requires the applicant to be pro-active in revision to the current AM-4 submittal, and provide the requested analyses, engineering plans, clarifications, and address the questions raised in this review, particularly:

• Clarifying the timing of mining, lining and perimeter drain installation

<u>Response</u>

Mining of Area G-I was completed by Spring 2017. The installation of the compacted clay liner in Area G-I was completed in Fall 2020. The underdrain that goes from north to south along the west side of Area G-I was installed in January and February of 2022.

Mining of Area G-II is expected to be complete by the end of 2022. The installation of the portion of the underdrain that will flow west to east along the north side of Area G-II will be performed upon completion of mining in Area G-II.

• Providing baseline information from the monitoring wells installed in 2005

<u>Response</u>

Baseline information from the monitoring wells referenced above has been added as an appendix to Exhibit G. The 2005 Groundwater Monitoring Program Interim Report for Home Office includes water level measurements for the Koonce and Slatten wells from 2004 and 2005. These data points were added to Chart 6: Nearby Well Monitoring Data in Exhibit G. Telesto/Loveland Ready-Mix Concrete Response

 Providing elevational information and/or depth to groundwater information when presenting all monitoring well information

<u>Response</u>

Elevation information and depth to groundwater information for all discussed wells have been added as an appendix to Exhibit G.

• Describe the observed trends in groundwater elevations, their estimated causes, and considerations for the proposed reclamation plan to maintain the hydrologic balance

<u>Response</u>

Please reference the updated Exhibit G.

• Providing detailed analysis on the function of the proposed drain and liner combination

<u>Response</u>

The function of the proposed underdrain is to control groundwater levels and maintain historic flow patterns.

• Show and justify projected groundwater levels after reclamation including how the perimeter drain will function efficiently long-term

<u>Response</u>

Monthly groundwater monitoring will continue through mining and reclamation to assess the functionality of the underdrain. The drain design includes cleanouts to maintain capacity and functionality.

• Extend the perimeter drain to include the north side of Phase 1 and include appropriate discharge

<u>Response</u>

An additional portion of the underdrain will be installed along the north side of Area G-II upon completion of mining and reclamation of Area G-II. Installing an underdrain along the north side of Area G-I 1 is not necessary as groundwater will naturally flow to the east along the north side of the liner. Furthermore, it is our understanding that Loveland Ready-Mix intends to mine the area north of Area G-I.

If you have any questions regarding the responses to your comments, please let me know.

Sincerely,

TETRA TECH

Tom 9 decomm

Tom Hesemann, PG, CEG Senior Engineering Geologist/Hydrogeologist

Attachment: Revised Exhibit G with Attachments

cc: Brock F. Bowles, DRMS

EXHIBIT G: WATER INFORMATION

Martin Marietta is amending the existing 112 Reclamation Permit No. M-1977-439 to change the final reclamation for Area G of the Home Office site from one open water lake to two sealed water storage reservoirs using compacted clay embankment liners.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Martin Marietta owns properties known as the "Home Office" site in Larimer County, Colorado. The properties are located on the west and east sides of North Taft Hill Road, approximately ½ mile south of Larimer County Road 54G, in Sections 33 and 34 of Township 8 North, Range 69 West of the 6th Principal Meridian, and Sections 3 and 4 of Township 7 North, Range 69 West of the 6th Principal Meridian.

This Groundwater Monitoring and Mitigation Plan presents the methods for monitoring groundwater during mining and reclamation, and for mitigating any potential groundwater impacts associated with permitted mining at the site. Martin Marietta is applying to the Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety (DRMS) for an Amendment to the existing 112 Reclamation Permit No. N-1977-439 to change the final reclamation for Area G of this site from one open water lake to two sealed water storage reservoirs using a compacted clay embankment liner.

Exhibit B shows the location of the Affected Area and Area G. Exhibits F1 and F2 show all the Affected Area in the permit. Exhibit F3 details Area G, which is located in the northern portion of the Affected Area. The changes within the Affected Area are limited to Area G. Consequently, this discussion is limited to potential changes in the hydrologic balance as a result of the installation of compacted clay embankment liners in Area G-I and Area G-II. Figure G-1, enclosed, shows the Affected Area; Area G; adjacent parcels to Area G and property owners; and conceptual groundwater flows before and after the installation of the compacted clay liners.

1.1 HISTORIC USE

Area G mining and associated dewatering began in Spring 2016 and is currently underway. A compacted clay liner was installed in Area G-I in September 2020 upon completion of mining. A compacted clay liner will be installed in Area G-II upon completion of mining.

Figure G-1 shows the adjacent properties to Area G, lined cells, unlined cells, cells that will be lined in the future, and irrigation ditches in the vicinity of the Affected Area. Agricultural land uses are located north and east of Area G. Loveland Ready Mix owns properties to the north and east of Area G. Irrigation ditches in the area include the New Mercer Canal, the Larimer County Canal No. 2 Ditch, the Arthur Canal, and Taylor & Gill Lateral (owned by Martin Marietta).

Loveland Ready Mix irrigates fields north and east of Area G outside of the permit area. Irrigation field tiles are reported to have been installed in the properties owned by Constance A Fredman located southeast of Area G of the Affected Area (Figure G-2). After reports of poor drainage, the field tiles were repaired by Loveland Ready Mix. Flooding was reported to Martin Marietta on the PKR Farm LLC property located east of the Affected Area (Figure G-2) as part of the field tile issue. In response, Martin Marietta worked with Loveland Ready Mix and PKR Farm LLC and installed drainage ditches between Loveland Ready Mix and PKR Farms LLC and along the east side of Area G-I. The drainage ditches convey irrigation runoff from the area east of the Affected Area to the south to the Cache La Poudre River, similar to the historic drainage patterns. Since the installation of the ditches, there have not been further reports of flooding.

Based on discussions with Seaworth Properties LLC, water is rising on the east side of a parcel owned by Seaworth Properties LLC, on the west side of Area G-I during the irrigation season. Martin Marietta is working with Seaworth Properties LLC and installed a groundwater perimeter drain between January 10, 2022 and

February 4, 2022 to address the groundwater rise and irrigation return flow to the river. Figure F-3 presents the location and design drawings for the perimeter drain (See Section 2.1 Mining Plan). An additional section of perimeter drain is proposed along the north side of Area G-II. This section will connect to the installed perimeter drain at the northeast corner of Area G-II. A swale was installed on Martin Marietta's property on the west side of Area G-I to facilitate surface drainage for landowners located west of Area G-I. Figure G-3 shows the approximate locations of the perimeter drain and swale.

Chart 1 illustrates the mining cells in the vicinity of the Affected Area and the liner status of each cell.



Chart 1: Mining Cells in the Vicinity & Liner Status

1.2 EXISTING WELLS

1.2.1 Monitoring Wells

Six monitoring wells (HO-1, 6, 11, 12, 13 and 14) were installed outside the limits of proposed mining, allowing for groundwater monitoring to occur during and after mining.

Monitoring well HO-1 was installed in the northwest corner of Area G-I. Monitoring well HO-6 was installed in the southeast corner of Area G-II. Both HO-1 and HO-6 were installed in 2018. Monthly groundwater monitoring for

wells HO-1 and HO-6 began in May 2018. The well monitoring program documented pre-mining groundwater levels near the project area and seasonable fluctuations.

The following monitoring wells were installed in Area G in 2021:

- HO-11, in the northeast corner of Area G-I
- HO-12, near the southern portion of Area G-I, and near the northeast corner of Area G-II
- HO-13, near the northwest corner of Area G-II
- HO-14, near the southwest corner of Area G-II

Monthly groundwater monitoring for wells HO-11, HO-12, HO-13, and HO-14 began in May 2021. Exhibit F3, dated August 2021, and Figure G-3 show the locations of the wells.

Chart 1 shows water level measurements for HO-1 and HO-6. Chart 2 shows water level measurements for HO-11, HO-12, HO-13, and HO-14. Exhibit G, Attachment 1 shares the raw data for wells HO-1, HO-6, HO-11, HO-12, HO-13, and HO-14.



Chart 2: Martin Marietta Monitoring Data (HO-1 and HO-6)



Chart 3: Well Monitoring Data (HO-11, 12, 13, 14)

Loveland Ready Mix installed monitoring wells on their lands in July 2016. Chart 4 and 5 show water level measurements that have been collected monthly since the wells were installed. Monitoring wells MW-02, MW-03 and MW-04 are located north of Area G-I. Monitoring wells MW-05, MW-06, MW-07 are located east of Area G-I. Groundwater monitoring for monitoring wells MW-02 through MW-07 began in July 2016. Groundwater levels fluctuate throughout the seasons. Exhibit G, Attachment 1 presents data provided by Loveland Ready Mix.



Chart 4: Loveland Ready Mix Monitoring Wells, MW-02, 03, 04



Chart 5: Loveland Ready Mix Monitoring Wells, MW-05, 06, 07

1.2.2 Nearby Wells

Numerous wells were installed in 2001 to establish groundwater baselines to monitor the groundwater conditions before, during, and after mining per the 2005 Well Monitoring Program Interim Report for Home Office. Water level measurements from 2004 and 2005 are included in the 2005 Well Monitoring Program Interim Report Well locations are shown on Figure G-3. Well owners, David L and Virginia S Slatten's property is located west of Area G-I at the northernmost portion of Area G-I (Figure G-1). Well Owners, Albert R and Sharon E Koonce's property is located west of Area G-I at the northernmost portion of Area G-I. A well owned by Martin Marietta, referred to as "MM near KOA" is located east of Area G-II and south of Area G-I. Groundwater monitoring for the Slatten, Koonce and MM near KOA wells began in April 2007. Groundwater levels fluctuate throughout the seasons. The range of water level measurements for the Slatten well is 6.6 feet. The range of water level measurements for the Koonce well is 8.5 feet. The range of water level measurements for the Slatten well is 6.6 feet. The range of water level measurements for the Koonce well is 8.5 feet. The range of water level measurements for the Koonce well is 8.5 feet. The range of water level measurements for the Koonce well is 8.5 feet. The range of water level measurements is shown in Chart 3, which presents historical well monitoring data from the Slatten, Koonce and MM near KOA wells. Exhibit G, Attachment 1 presents raw data for the nearby wells.



Chart 6: Nearby Well Monitoring Data

1.3 WELL INVENTORY

In December 2021, a well inventory of the Affected Area and adjacent areas was conducted to identify domestic wells near the project site. The inventory involved a review of constructed well records on file with the Colorado Division of Water Resources, located within ½ mile plus 200 feet of the Affected Area. The well inventory identified 98 constructed wells within ½ mile plus 200 feet, of the Affected Area. Figure G-2 enclosed shows the Affected Area and the constructed well locations on file with the <u>Colorado Division of Water Resources</u>.

1.4 HISTORIC AND FUTURE GROUND WATER LEVELS, AND IMPACTS TO WELLS

The presence of lined and unlined cells near Area G and previous dewatering of Area G demonstrates that the revised reclamation plan, i.e. lining of Area G cells will result in changes, but manageable changes, to the hydrologic balance.

The principal change to the hydrologic balance will be mounding on the upgradient (west) side of Area G. Martin Marietta has been preemptive in addressing the mounding on the east side by installing a perimeter drain. Exhibit G, Attachment 2 presents the location and design of the perimeter drain.

Regarding the down gradient impacts, monitoring well data demonstrates minimal impacts to wells will occur on the down gradient shadow effect (east and southeast) sides of Area G. Table 1 presents the historic range of

saturated thickness in the monitoring wells. The period or record for the data includes the time when the Area G cells were being actively dewatered. The impacts from dewatering are greater than the shadow effect of the lined cells. Monitoring wells HO-6 and Stenger Cornfield/MM Near KOA are adjacent to the dewater cells yet they had minimum statured thickness of 6.9 feet and 4.6 feet respectively. Chart 7 presents the hydrograph of wells HO-6 and the Stegner Cornfield/MM Near KOA wells. The impacts of dewatering and subsequent recovery of the water levels after installation of the liner in the northern Area G cell.

The saturated thickness in the shadow zone after installation of the liner will be on the order of five to six feet. Water wells completed in sand and gravel aquifers typically provide approximately 25 to 30 gallons per minute per foot of drawdown or saturated thickness in the well. The wells on the down gradient side of Area G are domestic with permitted maximum pumping rates of 15 gallons per minute (gpm). Consequently, five to six feet of saturated thickness will provide the allowed pumping rates of 15 gpm. Wells located further from Area G will have even more saturated thickness and hence will be able to pump the permitted rates.

	Saturated Thicknes	ss (feet)		
Well	Minimum	Maximum	Delta	Average
HO-1	5.8	14.6	8.8	10.3
HO-6	6.9	12.2	5.3	8.6
HO-11	10.0	14.2	4.1	11.7
HO-12	6.4	7.5	1.0	6.9
HO-13	5.8	8.3	2.5	7.1
HO-14	3.2	9.3	6.1	4.9
Koonce	5.5	14.0	8.51	10.8
Slaten	7.9	14.5	6.57	11.6
Stegner Cornfield/MM Near KOA	4.6	12.4	7.7	9.5
MW-01	9.1	16.8	7.7	11.4
MW-02	11.8	16.5	4.7	14.0
MW-03	10.4	14.4	4.0	12.1
MW-04	11.5	14.5	3.0	12.7
MW-05	7.5	12.1	4.6	10.0
MW-06	6.3	10.9	4.6	9.0
MW-07	8.9	13.9	4.9	10.7
MW-08	6.8	16.0	9.2	10.5
MW-09	6.0	12.8	6.8	8.2

Table 1: Saturated Thickness



Chart 7: Monitoring Well Data (HO-6, Stegner Cornfield aka MM Near KOA)

2.0 MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT

2.1 MINING PLAN

The Reclamation Plan has been designed to reduce potential groundwater impacts to adjacent properties. A perimeter drain was designed by Deere and Ault to mitigate groundwater rise and to allow irrigation return flow off of the properties being irrigated west of Area G-I. The perimeter drain is installed along the west Area G-I. An additional portion of perimeter drain is proposed along the north side of Area G-II. Mining is expected to be completed in Area G-II by the end of 2022. The portion of the perimeter drain north of Area G-II will be installed upon completion of mining. The perimeter drain discharges through the berm between Area G-II and II to an unlined pond that is tributary to the Cache la Poudre River.

2.2 MONITORING

2.2.1 Martin Marietta Monitoring Wells

Monthly water level monitoring at HO-1, HO-6, HO-11, HO-12, HO-13, and HO-14 will continue during mining. When mining is complete, quarterly water level monitoring at HO-1, HO-6, HO-11, HO-12, HO-13, and HO-14 will continue until reclamation is complete and the DRMS releases the financial warranty bond.

2.2.2 Domestic Water Wells

Monthly water level monitoring at the Slatten and Koonce wells will continue during mining. When mining is complete, quarterly water level monitoring at the Slatten and Koonce wells will continue until reclamation is complete and the DRMS releases the financial warranty bond.

2.3 MITIGATION

The available monitoring well data will be used to identify changes in alluvial groundwater flow associated with mining and reclamation activities. Baseline data collected from the monitoring program will provide a range of relative water levels associated with pre-mining groundwater conditions. These data will be utilized to evaluate the nature and extent of the change to the prevailing hydrologic balance and if necessary, provide for the development of corrective actions.

In the event of a well owner complaint within 600 feet of the Affected Area, Martin Marietta will review the available monitoring information and submit a report to the DRMS within 30 days. The report will include discussions with any well owner who has contacted Martin Marietta regarding a concern and a review of baseline data from the well and vicinity to evaluate whether changes may be due to seasonal variations, climate, mining, or other factors. The report will identify the extent of potential or actual impacts associated with the changes. If the extent of groundwater changes due to mining or reclamation activities is determined to be a significant contributing factor that has or may create adverse impacts, the mining-associated impacts will be addressed to the satisfaction of the DRMS.

If the DRMS determines that the impact on a well for which temporary mitigation has been initiated is not a result of Martin Marietta's activities, or is not solely a result of Martin Marietta's activities, Martin Marietta will reduce or cease mitigation accordingly.

If a well goes dry due to mining or reclamation activities, Martin Marietta will implement mitigation measures within 7 days. Mitigation measures would include providing a temporary alternative water supply that meets the documented historic well production or need, until further investigation can be conducted to determine if the well condition is due to the mining operation.

Martin Marietta will begin to implement one or more mitigation measures if mining or reclamation activity is determined to be a significant contributing factor to groundwater changes requiring mitigation.

Temporary mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to:

- Compensation for well owners to use their existing treated water system to replace the well production loss.
- Provide a water tank and deliver water as necessary to meet documented historic well production or need.
- Other means acceptable to both the well owner and Martin Marietta.

Long-term mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to:

- Cleaning a well to improve efficiency.
- Providing an alternative source of water or purchasing additional water to support historic well use with respect to water quantity and quality. If needed, water quality parameters will be checked in affected wells to ensure alternative sources support the historic use.
- Modifying a well to operate under lower groundwater conditions. This could include deepening existing wells or lowering the pumps. All work would be done at Martin Marietta's expense with the exception of replacing equipment that was non-functional prior to mining.
- If existing wells cannot be retrofitted or repaired, replacing the impacted well with a new replacement well.
- Design and installation of a cistern.

If a groundwater mitigation action is required, Martin Marietta will notify the DRMS of the condition, action taken and report the results and present a plan for monitoring the mitigation.

O:\Projects\Longmont\8741\117-8741002\Docs\Permits\DRMS Adequacy Review 1\ExhG\ExhGWaterInformation.docx

FIGURES









ATTACHMENT 1
<u>RAW MONITORING WELL DATA</u>

Home Office DRMS Amendment

			HOME	OFFICE MONITOR	RING WELL	_S (COMBINI	ED MEASUF	REMENTS F	PROVIDED E	BY DEERE & A	ULT AND M	MARTIN MAF	RETTA)
Monitoring Well Name		HO-1			HO-6			HO-11			HO-12		
Well Location	1	469960, 310928	82	14673	379, 3109131		1	1469954, 31104	51	14	68699, 3109230	}	
Top of PVC Casing Elevation (ft.)		5024.08			5019.39			5021.36			5023.53		
Ground Elevation of Well (ft.)		5021.21			5016.45			5018.43			5021.17		
PCV Stickup (approx.)		2.87			2.94			2.93			2.36		
Bottom Elevation of Well (ft.)		4996.21			4987.45			5004.43			5004.17		
Estimated Bedrock Elevation (II)		5006.71			5000.45			5002.43			5005.17		
I otal Well Depth Ground-Bottom (ft.)	Water Depth	25.00	Cround Water	Water Depth from Ten of	29.00 Saturated	Cround Water	Mator Dopth	14.00	Cround Water	Water Depth from	17.00	Cround Water	Mator Do
	from Top of	Thicknoss	Elovation (ft.)		Thicknoss	Ground Water	from Top of	Thicknoss	Elovation (ft.)		Thicknoss	Glound Water	from Ton
Date		THICKHESS	Elevation (it.)	PVC (fft)	THICKNESS	Elevation (it.)		THICKHESS	Elevation (it.)		THICKHESS	Elevation (it.)	
	PVC (ft)			(11.)			PVC (#)			(11.)			PVC (ft)
Monday, May 7, 2018	11.08	6.29	5013.00	9.17	9.77	5010.22						+	
Friday, June 1, 2018	10.82	6.55	5013.26	9.33	9.61	5010.06						1	
Tuesday, November 13, 2018	11.15	6.22	5012.93	11.74	7.20	5007.65						1	
Sunday, December 30, 2018	10.78	6.59	5013.30	12.03	6.91	5007.36							
Sunday, February 3, 2019	11.12	6.25	5012.96	11.90	7.04	5007.49							
Sunday, March 10, 2019	11.35	6.02	5012.73	11.79	7.15	5007.60							
Monday, April 1, 2019	11.35	6.02	5012.73	11.67	7.27	5007.72							
Saturday, May 25, 2019	11.31	6.06	5012.77	11.21	7.73	5008.18							
Thursday, June 13, 2019	11.12	6.25	5012.96	11.29	7.65	5008.10							
Friday, September 6, 2019	10.20	7.17	5013.88	11.56	7.38	5007.83							
Monday, October 7, 2019				11.53	7.41	5007.86							
Saturday, November 16, 2019	11.45	5.92	5012.63	11.98	6.96	5007.41					L		
Saturday, January 25, 2020	11.60	5.77	5012.48	11.99	6.95	5007.40					L		
Friday, August 14, 2020	9.96	/.41	5014.12	9.42	9.52	5009.97							
Friday, August 21, 2020	7.71	9.66	5016.37	9.98	8.96	5009.41					 		<u> </u>
Friday, August 28, 2020	5.91	11.46	5018.17	10.34	8.60	5009.05				ļ	 	+	<u> </u>
Friday, September 4, 2020	5.70	11.6/	5018.38	10.79	8.15	5008.60				ļ	 	+	<u> </u>
Friday, September 11, 2020	5.63	11.74	5018.45	10.18	8.70 0.59	5009.21					 		
Friday, September 18, 2020	5.64	11.75	5018.44	9.30	9.30	5010.03					<u> </u>	+	
Eriday, October 2, 2020	5.07	11.70	5010.41	0.90	11 25	5010.44			-		 	+	
Eriday, October 16, 2020	5.70	11.67	5018.35	0.66	9.28	5000.73					<u> </u>	+	
Friday, October 10, 2020	5.79	11.58	5018.29	10.22	8.72	5009.75						+	
Friday, October 20, 2020	5.68	11.69	5018.40	10.55	8.39	5007.17					<u> </u>	+	
Friday, November 6, 2020	5.61	11.76	5018.47	10.83	8.11	5008.56						1	
Friday, November 13, 2020	5.61	11.76	5018.47	11.10	7.84	5008.29						1	
Monday, November 23, 2020	5.60	11.77	5018.48	11.37	7.57	5008.02							
Monday, November 30, 2020	5.64	11.73	5018.44	11.51	7.43	5007.88							
Monday, December 7, 2020	5.73	11.64	5018.35	11.66	7.28	5007.73							
Tuesday, December 15, 2020	5.73	11.64	5018.35	11.80	7.14	5007.59							
Tuesday, December 22, 2020	5.62	11.75	5018.46	11.90	7.04	5007.49							
Tuesday, December 29, 2020	5.73	11.64	5018.35	11.70	7.24	5007.69							
Thursday, January 7, 2021	5.79	11.58	5018.29	11.45	7.49	5007.94							
Thursday, January 14, 2021	5.78	11.59	5018.30	11.63	7.31	5007.76					(12		
Monday, May 24, 2021	F 2	10.07	F010 70	(00	11.0/	E010 41	()	10 ()	F01F 0/	11.93	6.43	5011.60	11.85
Wednesday, May 26, 2021	0.3	12.07	5018.78	0.98	11.90	5012.41	0.3	12.03	5015.00	10.90	7.40	5012.03	11.83
Inursday, June 3, 2021	2.04	1/ 22	F001.04	0.05	0.00	E010.44	6.45	12.40	5014.91	11.05	7.40	5012.62	12.10
Wednesday, June 16, 2021	3.04	14.33	5021.04	8.95	9.99	5010.44	0.28 E 07	12.00	5015.08	11.05	7.31	5012.48	11.62
Thursday, Julie 30, 2021	4.80	14.20	5020.01	8.00	10.74	5011.37	5.87	14 17	5015.49	11.10	7.20	5012.43	12.20
Thursday, July 0, 2021	2.17	14.55	5020.91	6.72	12.21	5012.66	4.70	13 30	5015.82	11.22	6.76	5012.31	12.30
	4 35	13.02	5010 73	8.21	10.73	5012.00	6.21	12 72	5015.02	11.00	7.16	5012.33	12.20
Wednesday, August 25, 2021	1.00	10.02	3017.73	0.21	10.70	3011.10	0.21	12.72	3013.13	11.2	7.10	3012.33	12.7
Thursday, August 26, 2021	4.22	13.15	5019.86	8.15	10.79	5011 24	6.37	12.56	5014 99	11.54	6.82	5011 99	13
Thursday, September 30, 2021	5.83	11.54	5018.25	8	10.94	5011.39	7.5	11.43	5013.86	11.83	6.53	5011.70	13.15
Friday, October 22, 2021	6.01	11.36	5018.07	8.2	10.74	5011.19	8.7	10.23	5012.66				13.57
Saturday, October 23, 2021			5010107						5012100	11.9	6.46	5011.63	
Tuesday, November 30, 2021	6.1	11.27	5017.98	11.2	7.74	5008.19	8.7	10.23	5012.66	11.8	6.56	5011.73	13.74
Tuesday, December 14, 2021							8.9	10.03	5012.46	11.75	6.61	<u>50</u> 11.78	12.75
Friday, December 17, 2021	6.21	11.16	5017.87	11	7.94	5008.39							
Friday, January 14, 2022	6.26	11.11	5017.82	11.18	7.76	5008.21	8.87	10.06	5012.49	11.8	6.56	5011.73	12.62
Friday, February 11, 2022	6.4	10.97	5017.68	11.84	7.10	5007.55	8.7	10.23	5012.66	11.1	7.26	5012.43	14.1
Wednesday, March 2, 2022	6.52	10.85	5017.56	11.93	7.01	5007.46	8.83	10.10	5012.53	11.33	7.03	5012.20	14.13

	110.42			10 14*					
1	HU-13 460646 210012	2	1	HU-14*	20				
1	400040, 310812 5026 44	3	1	401125, 310198	0				
	5022.00			5023.84					
	2 02			2 20					
	5008 74			5004 53					
	5006.74			5005.58					
	15.00			17.00					
oth	00.CL	Ground Water	Water Denth	Saturated	Ground Water				
of	Thickness	Elevation (ft.)	from Top of	Thickness	Elevation (ft.)				
01	THERICSS		DVC	THERICSS					
			(ft)						
					ļ				
					┟────┤				
					ļ				
_									
	8.07	5014.81	12.30	5.86	5011.43				
	8.09	5014.83	12.40	5.76	5011.33				
	7.82	5014.56	12.79	5.36	5010.94				
	8.30	5015.04	12.84	5.32	5010.89				
	7.62	5014.27	9.30 12 EQ	0.85 1.57	5010.15				
	7.66	5014.30	13.30 11 NR	4.07	5010.15				
	7.02	5013.76	8.97	9.29	5014.87				
		0010.70	14.63	3.63	5009.21				
	6.92	5013.66							
	6.77	5013.51	14	4.26	5009.84				
	6.35	5013.09	14.4	3.86	5009.44				
	6.18	5012.92	15.02	3.24	5008.82				
	7.17	5013.91	14.9	3.36	5008.94				
	7 20	F014.04	15 1	2.17	F000 74				
	7.30	5014.04	10.1 14.59	3.10 2.49	5008.74				
	5.02	5012.56	14.30 14.67	3.00 3.50	5009.26				
	J.17	0012.53	14.07	J.J7	0009.17				

		Home	Office Near	by Wells Wate	er Level M	lonitoring			
LOCATION	ALBE	ERT KOONC	E	DA	VID SLATTEN	1	STEGNER COF	RNFIELD/MN	1 Near KOA
	40	0 37'08.6 N			10 37'18.8 N		40) 36'59.8 N	
DESCRIPTION	2" CASE-BY	NORTH FE	NCELINE	2"CASE-CE	NTER NORT	H FENCE	PVC	BY RV PAR	<
ELEVATION OF		5023.4	-		5028.0	-		5018 5	
BENCHMARK		0020.4			0020.0			0010.0	
SURFACE	5022.4			5027.0			5017.8		
ESTIMATED BEDROCK		5005 4			5010.0			5000 8	
ELEVATION		0000.1			001010			0000.0	
DATE	READING (Measurement from Benchmark to Water Level, ft)	WATER ELEV	SATURATED THICKNESS (ft)	READING (Measurement from Benchmark to Water Level, ft) 7 99	WATER ELEV	SATURATED THICKNESS (ft)	READING (Measurement from Benchmark to Water Level, ft)	WATER ELEV	SATURATED THICKNESS (ft)
05/04/04	8.15	5015 20	9.4	6.29	5020.12	10.1			
07/08/04	5.98	5017.46	9.9	3.45	5024.55	11.7			
08/03/04	5.75	5017.40	12.0	3.55	5024.55	14.0			
09/07/04	5.62	5017.82	12.4	5.91	5022.09	12.1			
10/04/04	5.55	5017.89	12.4	4.74	5023.26	13.3			
11/01/04	5.73	5017.71	12.3	4.77	5023.23	13.2			
12/06/04	6.04	5017.40	12.0	5.18	5022.82	12.8			
01/03/05	7.46	5015.98	10.5	7.36	5020.64	10.6			
02/07/05	7.53	5015.91	10.5	7.42	5020.58	10.6			
03/07/05	7.96	5015.48	10.0	7.77	5020.23	10.2			
04/04/05	8.31	5015.13	9.7	8.16	5019.84	9.8			
05/02/05	8.3	5015.14	9.7	8.22	5019.78	9.8			
06/07/05	7.33	5016.11	10.7	5.7	5022.3	12.3			
07/06/05	6.21	5017.23	11.8	4.62	5023.38	13.4			
08/10/05	6.33	5017.11	11.7	4.42	5023.58	13.6			
01/01/07									
03/01/07									
04/02/07	7.62	5015.82	10.4	7.12	5020.88	10.9	8.6	5009.95	9.1
05/09/07	7.58	5015.86	10.4	7.1	5020.9	10.9	8.71	5009.84	9.0
06/01/07	6.04	5010 50	11.1	4.80	5000.44	10.1	77	5010.05	10.1
07/02/07	6.94 6.87	5016.50	11.1	4.69	5023.11	13.1	8.21	5010.65	9.5
09/05/07	6.72	5016.72	11.3	4.92	5023.08	13.1	8.28	5010.27	9.5
10/08/07	6.84	5016.60	11.2	6.1	5021.9	11.9	8.41	5010.14	9.3
11/05/07	7.04	5016.40	11.0	6.48	5021.52	11.5	8.52	5010.03	9.2
12/03/07	6.92	5016.52	11.1	6.42	5021.58	11.6	8.5	5010.05	9.3
02/01/08									
03/03/08	8.26	5015.18	9.7	8	5020	10.0	8.92	5009.63	8.8
04/07/08	7.85	5015.59	10.1	6.99	5021.01	11.0			
05/05/08	7.71	5015.73	10.3	6.82	5021.18	11.2			
06/01/08	7.23	5016.21	10.8	5.5	5022.5	12.5			
08/11/08	6.98	5016.46	11.0	4.84	5023.16	13.2			
09/08/09	6.82	5016.62	11.2	4.92	5023.08	13.1			
10/01/08									
11/01/08									
01/01/09									
02/03/09	8.1	5015.34	9.9	7.98	5020.02	10.0	8.82	5009.73	8.9
03/03/09	8.13	5015.31	9.9	7.98	5020.02	10.0	8.85	5009.70	8.9
04/07/09	8.62	5014.82	9.4	8.57	5019.43	9.4	9	5009.55	8.8
06/02/09	4,88	5018.51	13.1	6.15	5020.52	11.9	6.10	5012.57	9.0 11.8
07/07/09	4.21	5019.23	13.8	5.94	5022.06	12.1	5.86	5012.69	11.9
08/12/09	5.67	5017.77	12.3	3.53	5024.47	14.5	5.6	5012.95	12.1
09/08/09	6.21	5017.23	11.8	4.58	5023.42	13.4	5.71	5012.84	12.0
10/06/09	0.05 6 91	5016.53	11.9	4.02 5.1	5023.38 5022 9	13.4	0.∠1 7 12	5012.34 5011.43	11.5
12/01/09	6.89	5016.55	11.1	5.11	5022.89	12.9	7.19	5011.36	10.6
01/01/10	6.77	5016.67	11.2	5.18	5022.82	12.8	7.25	5011.30	10.5
2/1/2010	6.74	5016.70	11.3	5.24	5022.76	12.8	7.32	5011.23	10.4
3/1/2010	6.78	5016.66	11.2	5.26	5022.74	12.7	7.28	5011.27	10.5
5/1/2010	6,15	5017.29	11.9	4,59	5022.09	13.4	6,31	5012.24	11.4
6/1/2010	5	5018.44	13.0	4.05	5023.95	13.9	5.42	5013.13	12.3
7/13/2010	3.99	5019.45	14.0	3.56	5024.44	14.4	5.44	5013.11	12.3
8/1/2010	4.12	5019.32	13.9	3.84	5024.16	14.2	5.88	5012.67	11.9
9/1/2010	4	5019.44	14.0	5.14	5021.86	12.9	0.54 7.86	5010.60	11.2
11/19/2010	7.03	5016.34	10.9	7.09	5020.91	10.9	7.93	5010.62	9.8

12/17/2010	7.18	5016.26	10.8	7.14	5020.86	10.9	8.03	5010.52	9.7
1/14/2011	7 21	5016 23	10.8	7 18	5020.82	10.8	81	5010 45	9.6
2/18/2011	7.48	5015.96	10.5	7.21	5020.02	10.8	8.12	5010.43	9.6
2/10/2011	7.40	5015.30	10.0	7.21	5020.73	10.0	0.12	5010.45	0.0
5/16/2011	7.01	5015.65	10.4	1.20	5020.72	10.7	9	5009.55	0.0
5/3/2011	8.76	5014.68	9.2	8.1	5019.9	9.9	9.1	5009.45	8.6
6/6/2011	5.1	5018.34	12.9	5	5023	13.0	5.4	5013.15	12.4
7/16/2011	4.99	5018.45	13.0	4.96	5023.04	13.0	5.42	5013.13	12.3
8/19/2011	5.12	5018.32	12.9	5.04	5022.96	13.0	5.45	5013.10	12.3
9/30/2011									-
11/4/2011	6	5017 //	12.0	5.08	5022.02	12.0	5 58	5012.97	12.2
2/17/2012	6.25	5017.10	11.0	6.14	5021.02	11.0	0.00	0012.01	12.2
2/17/2012	0.25	5017.19	11.0	0.14	5021.60	11.9		5000 75	
4/20/2012	8.17	5015.27	9.8	4.25	5023.75	13.8	8.8	5009.75	8.9
5/25/2012	8	5015.44	10.0	4.14	5023.86	13.9	8.42	5010.13	9.3
7/30/2012	7.21	5016.23	10.8	4	5024	14.0	7.93	5010.62	9.8
1/11/2013	7.25	5016.19	10.8	5.2	5022.8	12.8	8.22	5010.33	9.5
8/13/2013	6 34	5017 10	11.7	4.5	5023 5	13.5	6.55	5012.00	11.2
10/22/2012	5.04	5017.10	10.1	4.0 E 0E	5022.0	10.0	0.00	0012.00	11.2
10/23/2013	5.9	5017.54	12.1	5.65	5022.15	12.1			
4/17/2014	0.5	5016.94	11.5	5.75	5022.25	12.3			
5/23/2014	7	5016.44	11.0	5.62	5022.38	12.4			
6/11/2014	7.5	5015.94	10.5	5.44	5022.56	12.6			
7/16/2014	7.38	5016.06	10.6	5.24	5022.76	12.8			-
8/20/2014	7.00	5016.23	10.8	5	5023	13.0			
0/20/2014	1.21	5010.23	10.0	5	5025	10.0	0	5040.55	0.0
9/8/2014	6.5	5016.94	11.5	5.7	5022.3	12.3	8	5010.55	9.8
10/16/2014	7	5016.44	11.0	6.5	5021.5	11.5	7.1	5011.45	10.6
12/9/2014	8.1	5015.34	9.9	7.6	5020.4	10.4	9.5	5009.05	8.3
7/7/2015	5.26	5018.18	12.7	5.63	5022.37	12.4	7.5	5011.05	10.3
8/18/2015		1						<u> </u>	
11/10/2015	10 5	5012.04	7 5	<u> 9</u> 7	5010.2	0.2	8.0	5010.25	0.6
11/12/2015	10.5	5012.94	1.5	0./	5019.3	9.3	0.2	5010.35	9.0
1/12/2016	12.5	5010.94	5.5	10.1	5017.9	7.9	9.5	5009.05	8.3
2/12/2016	10.7	5012.74	7.3	9.5	5018.5	8.5			
3/12/2016	10	5013.44	8.0	9.1	5018.9	8.9	9.2	5009.35	8.6
4/5/2016	9 97	5013.47	8.0	9	5019	9.0	91	5009.45	8.6
= 10/2010	0.4	5014.04	0.0	0.5	5010 5	0.5	0.1	5000.45	0.0
5/15/2016	9.4	5014.04	0.0	0.0	5019.5	9.5	9	5009.55	0.0
6/16/2016	8	5015.44	10.0	8	5020	10.0	8.9	5009.65	8.9
4/15/2017	6.5	5016.94	11.5	7	5021	11.0	13	5005.55	4.8
5/2/2017	6.68	5016.76	11.3	7.43	5020.57	10.6	13.1	5005.45	4.6
6/12/2017	7 12	5016 32	10.9	7.67	5020 33	10.3	13.08	5005 47	47
7/7/2017	7.12	5010.32	10.0	7.07	5020.00	10.0	10.00	5005.47	4.0
////2017	7.05	5016.39	10.9	7.99	5020.01	10.0	12.99	5005.56	4.0
8/10/2017	7.55	5015.89	10.4	8.12	5019.88	9.9	13	5005.55	4.8
11/1/2017	8.8	5014.64	9.2	5.8	5022.2	12.2	11.2	5007.35	6.6
12/17/2017	8.78	5014.66	9.2	6	5022	12.0	11	5007.55	6.8
1/11/2018	7 21	5016 23	10.8	7 18	5020.82	10.8	81	5010.45	9.6
2/14/2019	7.40	5015.06	10.5	7.10	5020.02	10.0	0.10	5010.40	0.6
2/14/2018	7.40	5015.90	10.5	7.21	5020.79	10.0	0.12	5010.45	9.0
3/28/2018	7.61	5015.83	10.4	7.28	5020.72	10.7	y	5009.55	8.8
5/3/2018	8.76	5014.68	9.2	8.1	5019.9	9.9	9.1	5009.45	8.6
6/4/2018	5.1	5018.34	12.9	5	5023	13.0	5.4	5013.15	12.4
7/13/2018	3 99	5019.45	14.0	3 56	5024 44	14.4	5 44	5013 11	12.3
9/1/2019	4.10	5010.32	12.0	2.04	5024.44	14.9	5.00	5012.67	11.0
8/1/2018	4.12	5019.32	13.9	3.04	5024.10	14.2	0.00	5012.07	11.9
9/1/2018	4	5019.44	14.0	5.14	5022.86	12.9	6.54	5012.01	11.2
10/22/2018	7.03	5016.41	11.0	6.66	5021.34	11.3	7.86	5010.69	9.9
11/19/2018	7.1	5016.34	10.9	7.09	5020.91	10.9	7.93	5010.62	9.8
12/17/2018	7 18	5016.26	10.8	7 14	5020.86	10.9	8.03	5010 52	97
1/1//2010	7 21	5016 22	10.8	7 18	5020.82	10.8	R 1	5010.45	9.0
0/10/0040	7.40	5010.23	10.0	7.10	5020.02	10.0	0.1	5010.40	9.0
2/18/2019	1.48	5015.96	10.5	7.21	5020.79	10.8	8.12	5010.43	9.6
3/18/2019	7.61	5015.83	10.4	7.28	5020.72	10.7	9	5009.55	8.8
7/19/2019	7.05	5016.39	10.9	6.89	5021.11	11.1	8.6	5009.95	9.1
8/23/2020	7.22	5016.22	10.8	7.32	5020.68	10.7	7.87	5010.68	9.9
10/13/2020	7 02	5016 42	11.0	7 12	5020.88	10.9	8 35	5010 20	94
11/10/2020	6.02	5016 51	11 1	7.40	5020.58	10.6	8 56	5000.00	0.7
1//13/2020	0.93	5010.01	10.0	1.42	5020.00	10.0	0.00	5000.05	3.2
1/22/2021	7.13	5016.31	10.9	0.74	5021.26	11.3	10.5	5008.05	1.3
2/17/2021	7.21	5016.23	10.8	6.85	5021.15	11.1	9.4	5009.15	8.4
4/5/2021	7.5	5015.94	10.5	6.86	5021.14	11.1	9.12	5009.43	8.6
5/26/2021	7.34	5016.10	10.7	6.55	5021.45	11.4	8.74	5009.81	9.0
6/30/2021	7 13	5016 31	10.9	6 19	5021.81	11.8	83	5010.25	9.4
7/07/004	7.13	5010.01	10.3	E 00	5021.01	10.4	7 70	5010.20	10.0
112112021	1.34	5010.10	10.7	0.93	5022.07	12.1	1.13	5010.62	10.0
8/27/2021	1.87	5015.57	10.1	6.37	5021.63	11.6	7.23	5011.32	10.5
9/30/2021	8.32	5015.12	9.7	7.4	5020.6	10.6	6.65	5011.90	<u>11</u> .1
10/23/2021	8.6	5014.84	9.4	7.93	5020.07	10.1	7.6	5010.95	10.1
11/30/2021	86	5014 84	9.4	82	5019.8	9.8	10.4	5008 15	7.4
12/17/2021	8.52	5014.01	0.5	7.07	5020.03	10.0	10 11	5008 44	7.6
12/11/2021	0.00	5014.91	5.5	1.91	5020.03	10.0	10.11	5000.44	1.0
1/20/2022	8.61	5014.83	9.4	7.85	5020.15	10.1	9.21	5009.34	8.5
2/11/2022	8.96	5014.48	9.0	7.6	5020.4	10.4	11.65	5006.90	6.1
3/2/2022	9	5014.44	9.0	7.52	5020.48	10.5	11.21	5007.34	6.5
	i	1			1			1	
Data Source Notes:									
Caardinates provided by M	Data Source Notes:								
Coordinates provided by Mart	in Marietta, 2021-0	0-19							
Elevations provided by Martin	Marietta, 2021-08-	-19							
Water level measurements pr	ovided by Martin M	arietta							
Ground Surface for Koonce a	nd Slatten approxim	nated as 1 fool	below BM.						
Bedrock depth estimated as 1	7 feet helow aroun	d surface							
Dearbox doptil cournated as 1		a 3011000							

	Stegner - Monitoring Well Measurements								
			Depth To	Water from	n Surface (Feet)			
Date Measured	MW-01	MW-02	MW-03	MW-04	MW-05	MW-06	MW-07	MW-08	MW-09
July-16	2.62	0.95	1.75	2.28	2.91	2.41	3.15	6.41	2.92
August-16	4.15	0.93	1.78	2.18	3.06	2.71	3.75	7.38	3.56
September-16	6.89	3.00	3.08	2.52	3.70	3.53	5.70	9.28	5.09
October-16	-0.29	3.18	3.40	2.81	3.73	3.43	4.56	9.99	5.27
November-16	7.01	3.39	3.78	3.10	3.95	3.41	5.43	10.23	5.37
December-16	7.21	3.57	3.98	3.22	3.99	3.45	5.66	10.56	5.45
January-17	7.18	3.58	4.05	3.27	4.00	3.42	5.64	10.63	5.42
February-17	7.19	3.70	4.15	4.47	4.07	3.53	6.19	10.73	5.57
March-17	7.16	3.28	3.72	3.18	4.18	3.53	6.41	10.62	5.62
April-17	5.56	2.61	3.38	3.03	4.05	3.55	6.51	8.95	5.53
May-17	1.76	0.97	2.13	2.67	3.24	2.79	5.50	3.11	3.41
June-17	0.44	0.50	1.55	1.50	2.38	2.10	5.57	1.51	2.20
July-17	1.75	0.53	1.96	2.45	3.47	3.11	5.69	2.18	3.64
August-17	2.60	1.66	2.98	2.73	4.00	3.72	6.17	3.07	6.25
September-17	2.31	1.35	2.73	3.43	4.04	3.80		3.64	6.44
October-17	2.62	1.61	3.85	3.76	4.30	4.50	6.67	4.26	7.81
November-17	2.72	2.11	4.37	3.67	4.79	4.24	6.41	5.23	8.42
December-17	5.63	2.88	4.22	3.45	4.97	4.80	7.07	7.18	8.57
April-18	6.69	3.50	4.41	3.57	5.16	4.89	7.09	8.93	8.74
July-18	2.67	0.90	2.03	2.09	3.11	2.65	5.55	4.71	6.49
October-18	6.94	4.24	4.93	3.33	7.02	6.66	8.09	3.87	8.98
January-19	6.14	4.09	5.15	3.63	5.21	4.99	7.28	7.85	8.84
April-19	6.98	4.39	5.37	3.86	5.45	5.01	7.19	9.31	8.94
July-19	5.84	2.81	4.48	3.20	5.13	3.94	7.10	6.63	8.76
September-19	6.32	4.75	5.59	3.64	4.93	4.01	6.89	6.58	8.39
January-20	7.43	5.24	5.59	4.07	5.52	5.17	7.35	9.59	8.97
May-20	7.03	4.53	5.16	3.79	5.39	5.06	7.15	9.24	8.78
August-20	4.59	2.68	3.12	3.46	4.69	3.91	5.79	4.16	7.18
December-20	6.45	3.23	4.41	3.75	4.94	4.50	6.85	5.78	7.73
February-21	6.69	5.02	5.38	4.28	5.46	4.79	7.38	8.07	8.56
May-21	6.94	4.71	5.29	3.90	5.32	4.89	7.25	9.04	8.74
August-21	4.58	2.88	3.31	3.53	4.68	3.82	6.01	4.06	7.28
December-21	6.51	3.77	4.63	3.44	5.11	4.67	7.10	6.86	8.46
March-22	6.96	4.29	5.28	3.78	5.74	5.10	7.49	7.61	8.98



Lege	end
٠	Stegner Monitoring Wells
	Stegner Parcels
0 SCA	
COORDI IAD 83 CO	NATE SYSTEM
STEC	GNER BASEMAP

ATTACHMENT 2 UNDERDRAIN DESIGN



AARTIN MARIETTA\0494.019 HOME OFFICE MINE\CAD\WORKING\UNDERDRAIN\HO UNDERDRAIN_PIPE PROFILE

RECK 11/29/2021 11:32:13 AN

PF	HOME DEFICE MINE		DESIGNED BY:	RAWN BY: CHEC	CKED BY:	60% DESIGN - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION	VK 11-4	-21
roji Dat			SAR	ITR 0	CJH 2	FOR CONSTRUCTION	SR 11-29	9-21
ECT E: 1	UNDERDRAIN CONSTRUCTION	DEEKE & AULI	U I I S	A RAINEV				
: 04 11/2 SHE O		A SCHNABEL ENGINEERING COMPANY						
94.0 9/21 EET		600 S. AIRPORT RD., BLDG. A. SUITE 205						
)19.(9	GENERAL PLAN	LONGMONT, CO 80503 TEI 303 651 1468 FAX 303 651 1469						
00				DATE:				
_								
			STATE PROFESSIO	INAL ENGINEER NO. XX	XXX REV	/ DESCRIPTION	3Y DA1	ТЕ



NOTES:

1. ALL UTILITIES TO BE LOCATED, VERIFIED & POT HOLED AS NECESSARY BY CONTRACTOR.

2. TRAFFIC ON LIMITED SITE ACCESS ROAD TO BE COORDINATED WITH ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS & ONLY ALLOWED DURING STANDARD WORK HOURS.

3. SURVEY CONTROL PROVIDE BY KING SURVEYOR'S. COORDINATE VALUES ARE THAT OF THE COLORADO STATE PLANE COORDINATE SYSTEM, NORTH ZONE, NORTH AMERICAN DATUM 1983/92. TO CONVERT TO GROUND (MODIFIED) SCALE ABOUT POINT 0,0 AT A FACTOR OF 1.00026675 (0.99973332 CF) VERTICAL DATUM: NAVD 88.

	EXISTING	SURVEY P	OINT TABLE
POINT #	NORTHING	EASTING	DESCRIPTION
1	1466019.4650	3110502.4980	S. 1/4 COR, SEC
2	1466033.7797	3109189.4328	W. 1/16 COR, SEC34
3	1466042.3880	3107875.3510	SW. COR, SEC34
4	1467360.3495	3107888.3763	S. 1/16 COR, SEC 34
5	1468678.1520	3107901.4000	W. 1/4 COR, SEC 34
6	1468667.8170	3109210.9885	CENTER W. 1/16 COR, SEC 34
7	1468657.4820	3110520.5770	CENTER 1/4 COR, SEC 34
8	1469985.2060	3110529.0260	N. 1/16 COR, SEC 34
9	1469995.6070	3109218.1910	NW. 1/16 COR, SEC 34

NOTE: POINT # 1,2,3 ARE NOT SHOWN ON THIS PAGE. THEY ARE SOUTH OF THE SITE.

© Schnabel Engineering 2016 All Rights Reserved



- | ~ | \succ RAINE 7 η \triangleleft め Ξ R AIR 303 ΕE s Ш Ω NO WEST DRAIN PLAN AND PROFILE RUC HOME OFFICE MINE 00 UNDERDRAIN PROJECT: 0494.019.00 DATE: 11/29/21 SHEET 6 OF 9



			DESIGNED BY:	DRAWN BY: CI	HECKED BY:	60% DESIGN - NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION	NK 11-4-21
ROJI			SAR	ITR	CJH 2	FOR CONSTRUCTION	SR 11-29-2
	IN CONSTRUCTION	DEERE & AULI		CAN A PAINEY			
: 04 11/2 SHE O		A SCHNABEL ENGINEERING COMPANY	D)				
94.0 9/21 ET		600 S. AIRPORT RD., BLDG. A. SUITE 205					
)19.(9		LONGMONT, CO 80503 TEI 303 651 1468 EAX 303 651 1469					
				DATE:			
			STATE PRC	DFESSIONAL ENGINEER NO.	XXXX RE	V. DESCRIPTION	BY DATE

© Schnabel Engineering 2016 All Rights Reserved



TIIN MARIETTA\0494.019 HOME OFFICE MINE\CAD\WORKING\UNDERDRAIN\HO UNDERDRAIN_PIPE PROFILES

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

то:	Julie Mikulas Britney Guggisberg	DATE:	6/21/2022
COMPANY:	Martin Marietta	SUBJECT:	Underdrain Calculations
ADDRESS:	1800 North Taft Hill Road Fort Collins, CO 80521	PROJECT NAME/NO.:	Home Office DA494019.00
FROM:	Susan A. Rainey, PE	CC:	Pam Hora – Tetra Tech

This document presents the calculations performed as part of the groundwater underdrain design at the Home Office Mine.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Home Office Mine is located in Larimer County, Colorado in the northwest portion of the city of Fort Collins. As mining progressed at the site, Martin Marietta plans to construct a slope liner in stages around the perimeter of the mined area. The slope liner and berm in the center of the site will create two cells. Phase I, or the first cell and dividing berm, was constructed from August to October in 2020. Phase II is scheduled to be constructed in approximately the same time frame this year. Martin Marietta elected to construct a groundwater collection system or underdrain to deal with possible groundwater mounding that could occur due to the liner configuration. The first section of underdrain (the north drain and discharge) was constructed at the beginning of 2022. The remainder of the underdrain (the west drain) will be constructed as part of Phase II.

CALCULATIONS

Seepage analyses were performed using Seep/W, a finite element computer model software program, to estimate the possible groundwater flow into the underdrain. The seepage analyses were performed using two different K values for the native sand and gravel. The first value (2.54×10^{-3} cm/s) was selected using the NAVFAC DM 7.2 Table 1 typical coefficient of permeability for SW (well-graded sand) soil type as a guideline. This table lists a permeability of greater than 1 x 10⁻³ ft/min. We selected 5 x 10⁻³ ft/min or 2.54 x 10⁻³ cm/s for a possible lower end value, which is greater than the minimum (1×10^{-3} ft/min) typical permeability for well graded sand. This value was selected due to the presence of gravel and cobble on the site. A second seepage analysis was performed with a considerably higher permeability (1×10^{-2} cm/s) for a possible higher end value. This value was selected based off the typical permeability on the NAVFAC DM 7.2 Table 1 for GW (well-graded gravel) of 5 x 10⁻² ft/min. Our value of 1.00×10^{-2} cm/s or 1.97×10^{-2} ft/min is less than this maximum permeability.

We performed analyses for each K value with two different groundwater heights for a range of possible flows into the underdrain system. The resulting flows were entered into FlowMaster, a general purpose 1D computational fluid dynamics simulation software, along with other design parameters (pipe size, slope, length, etc.) to calculate how full the pipe would be. An additional flow of 100 gallons per minute or more than double the highest Seep/W flow rate was entered into FlowMaster, as a high-end extreme flow. This was done for the two sections of perforated pipe (north and west drain). A cumulative flow of 200 gallons per minute for the discharge section was

also entered into FlowMaster. The resulting percent of pipe full of flow is shown on the attached calculations summary table.

A final check of water velocity through the slots in the perforated pipe was performed for the anticipated flows to confirm the open area of the perforated pipe was sufficient for the estimated possible, and high-end extreme flows.

U:\0494 MARTIN MARIETTA\0494.019 HOME OFFICE MINE\UNDERDRAIN\UNDERDRAIN CALCULATIONS SUMMARY MEMO 6-21-2022.DOCX

Home Office Underdrain Seep W Analysis Drain pipe sizing.

North Drain

Inputs	
Length:	1370
Slope	0.0047
Pipe Diame	8
Manning's	0.0009
Slots	1.5

				Out	puts						
		Seep \	N Input			Seep W Res	ults			Pipe	
Sand and Gravel (k)	Model Ground Surface	Model Groundwater Elevation	Groundwater depth below ground	Drain Elevation	Drain Depth	q	Total flow	Total flow	Flow height - solved in Flowmaster	% of diameter	Water velocity through slots
cm/sec	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	cfs/ft.	cfs	gpm	in		ft/sec
2.54E-03	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	8.77E-06	1.20E-02	5.392287	0.6	7.1%	8.42E-04
2.54E-03	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	1.85E-05	2.53E-02	11.37484	0.8	10.1%	1.78E-03
1.00E-02	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	3.50E-05	4.80E-02	21.51996	1.1	13.7%	3.36E-03
1.00E-02	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	7.39E-05	1.01E-01	45.43786	1.6	19.6%	7.09E-03
High flow check -	100 gpm, greater	than 200% of mod	del			1.63E-04	2.23E-01	100	2.3	29.3	1.56E-02

West Drain Inputs

Inputs			
Length:	1326	ft from d	drawings
Slope	0.0023	ft./ft.	
Pipe Diame	8	in	
Manning's	0.0009		
Slots	1.5	in2/ft	specified minimum slot area

				Out	puts						
		Seep V	V Input			Seep W Resu	ults			Pipe	
Sand and Gravel (k)	Model Ground Surface	Model Groundwater Elevation	Groundwater depth below ground	Drain Elevation	Drain Depth	q	Total flow	Total flow	Flow height - solved in Flowmaster	% of diameter	Water velocity through slots
cm/sec	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	cfs/ft.	cfs	gpm	in		ft/sec
2.54E-03	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	8.77E-06	1.16E-02	5.219104	0.7	8.2%	8.42E-04
2.54E-03	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	1.85E-05	2.45E-02	11.00951	0.9	11.8%	1.78E-03
1.00E-02	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	3.50E-05	4.64E-02	20.82881	1.3	16.0%	3.36E-03
1.00E-02	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	7.39E-05	9.80E-02	43.97854	1.8	23.1%	7.09E-03
High flow check -	100 gpm, greater f	than 200% of mod	lel			1.68E-04	2.23E-01	100	2.8	35.3%	1.61E-02

Discharge											
Length:	1400	ft from drawing	S								
Slope	0.0012	ft./ft.									
Pipe Diame	8	in									
Manning's	0.0009										
			Seep V	V Input			Seep W Res	ults			Pipe
	Sand and Gravel (k)	Model Ground Surface	Model Groundwater Elevation	Groundwater depth below ground	Drain Elevation	Drain Depth	q	Total flow	Total flow	Flow height - solved in Flowmaster	% of diameter
	cm/sec	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	cfs/ft.	cfs	gpm	in	
	2.54E-03	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7		2.36E-02	10.61139	1.1	13.5%
	2.54E-03	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7		4.99E-02	22.38435	1.6	19.4%
	1.00E-02	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7		9.44E-02	42.34877	2.1	26.7%
	1.00E-02	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7		1.99E-01	89.4164	3.2	39.5%
	High flow check -	200 gpm, greater t	han 200% of moc	lel				4.46E-01	200	5.1	63.9%

Notes:

See USBR DS-15(5) - Filter Drsign. Paragraph 5.5.2 - "Drains sould be sized so that the depth of water in the drain pipe is less than 50% of the inside diameter.

Slot velocity not specified by design standard. Calculated to check, maintin below 0.06 ft/sec, which the maximum orfice velocity at 100 gpm as calculated in Flow Master



CALCULATION COVER SHEET

Project		Project Number
Title		
		Version/Release
Computer Programs Used		No.
Purpose and Objective		1
Summary of Conclusions		
Originator		
	Print Sign	Date
Checked		
	Print Sigr	Date

Base Material

Determine the gradation Design the filter gradati	n curves of the base on based on the bas	soil. Use enough sam se soil that requires the	ples to define the ra smallest D _{15F} size.	inge of grain size for the base soil. If soil has particles larger than the		Project: Home Office Underdrain ASTM #67 Gravel Filter	NamNam	te: W. Kramb 10/5/2021	
#4 sieve, an adjusted g	radation is calculate	d. Input values below f	for the base soil (ori	ginal) gradation (in red):					
Particle size	Sieve	Base soil (origina	al), % passing	Adjusted gradation, % passing	1	G	rain size distribution curves a	nd filter criteria	
(mm)	#	(upper bound)	(lower bound)	upper bound lower bound	100%	* * •	#200		
75	-				1				Oria Dava sail
37.5	-			(No adjustment needed)					(upper bound)
19.0	-			(No aujustitient needed)	90%				(uppor bound)
9.5	-								
4.75	4	100.0%	100.0%						(lower bound)
4.00	5				80% -				(ionor bound)
3.35	6				-				
2.80	7				7.0%/				(upper bound)
2.36	8	46.2%	40.1%		10%				(upper bound)
2.00	10				-				A Adi hasa sail
1.70	12				60%				Adj. base soli (lower bound)
1.40	14				p con				(lower bound)
1.18	16	34.5%	30.9%		SSIL				Constitute Filter
1.00	18				8 50%				Candidate Filter
0.850	20				l les				soli (upper bound)
0.710	25								
0.600	30	22.4%	21.9%		40%	┝┼┼┼╴┠╢┨╴╴┊┼╵╬┼╌╂┼╶╶╇╲╲			Candidate Filter
0.500	35						\mathcal{N}		son (lower bound)
0.425	40						XXIIIIIIIIIIIII		
0.300	50	17.1%	14.6%		30% +				USBR filter criteria
0.250	60								(max. innit)
0.212	70				0.00/				
0.180	80	44 50/	0.000		20%				USBR filter criteria
0.150	100	11.5%	9.6%			┝┼┽╾┝╍┝╍┝╼╋┫┓╌┝┝╅┝┙┥╢╸┝╍┝╍┝╼			(mm. mmu)
0.125	120				10%				
0.106	140				1070				
0.090	170	7.00/	0.00/		-				criteria (max limit)
0.075	200	1.0%	0.0%		0%		╘╹╻╻╻╻		
0.053	270				100	10	1 0.1	0.01	0.001 USACE filter
0.037	-						Grain size (mm)		criteria (min. limit)
0.019	-				L	Proportion of base soil	Lippor bound	Lower bound	
0.009	-								Fixed points on graph:
0.005	-					D _{85B} of original base soil =	3.908 mm	3.987 mm	<5% passing #200
0.002	-					D _{85B} of adjusted base soil =	mm	mm	
0.001	-	0.0%				D _{15B} of original base soil =	0.2313 mm	0.3116 mm	× 50mm max. grain size
0.0001	-	0.0%	0.0%			D _{15B} of adjusted base soil =	mm	mm	(USBR)
Required entry values a	are defined below. *					D _{60B} of original base soil =	2.824 mm	2.977 mm	× 75mm max. grain size
Average % pa	assing #200 after reg	garding (if any) = A =	7.2%]	D _{10B} of original base soil =	0.1149 mm	0.1586 mm	(USACE)
						C _u of original base soil =	24.6	18.8	

Filter Material

Filter criteria required by the USBR as published in Design Standards - Embankment Dams No. 13 (1994):

D _{85B} used in filter design	3.948					
Average Passing #200 sieve of base soil	7.2%					
Base soil category	4					
Base soil description	Sands and gravels					
	Maximum: $D_{15F} \leq 15.79$					
Filter criteria (mm)	To ensure sufficient permeability:					
	Minimum: $D_{15F} \ge 1.36$					
Maximum particle size of filter (mm)	50					
Maximum % passing # 200 sieve	5%					
	0					
PI of material passing #40	when tested in accordace with USBR 5360, <u>Earth Manual</u> , on material passing #40					

Filter criteria required by the US Army Corps of Engineers as published in EM 1110-2-2300 (31 Jul 94):

D _{85B} used in filter design		3.948			
Average Passing #200 sieve of base soil		7.2%			
Base soil category		4**			
	Maximum:	$D_{15F} \leq$	15.79		
		to	19.74		
Filter criteria (mm)	To ensure sufficient permeability:				
	Minimum:	$D_{15F} \ge$	0.69		
		to	1.16		
Maximum particle size of filter (mm)		75			
Maximum % passing # 200 sieve		5%			
		0			
PI of material passing #40	when tested in accordance with EM 1110-2-1906				

**If the base soil is in category 4, use the lower of the two 'max. D_{15F}' values when the filter is beneath riprap subject to wave action or beneath drains which may be subject to violent surging and/or vibration.

				Condidate filte	r coil gradatio	n Values show	a in rod in the
*Doquiroc	l ontru valuas for h	aca cail & aandid	oto		a son gradatio	II. Values showi	
filten anad	entry values for D		ale	ient column, ar	id all values if	i the two right co	iumns, can be
filter grad	ations:			changed.			
1. Particle siz	ze for 100% passing	l.					
2. % Passing	the #4 sieve.			Particle size	Sieve	% Passing	% Passing
3. % Passing	the #200 sieve.	and another m	aint	mm	#	(upper bound)	(lower bound
in the 80%	85% range or the 8	5% point		150.0	<u> </u>		
5 One point	in the 15% - 20% ra	ond and another r	noint	100.0			
in the 10% -	15% range, or the 1	5% point.		100.0	-		
6. No duplica	te entries; if D100<	#4, enter 101% for	• #4	90.0	-		
and 100% fo	r appropriate size.			75.0	-		
				63.0	-		
	USBR filter grada	ition limits:		50.0	-		
				37.5	-		
	Maximu	um limit		25.0	-	100.0%	
	Grain size (mm)	% Passing		19.0	-	90.0%	100.0%
	50.00	100.0%		12.5	-		
	15.79	15.0%		9.5	-	20.0%	55.0%
				4.75	4	0.0%	10.0%
				3.35	6		
	Minimu	m limit		2.36	8	0.0%	5.0%
	Grain size (mm)	% Passing		2.00	10		
	1.36	15.0%		1.70	12		
	0.075	5.0%		1.40	14		(0.0%)
				1 1 2	16		

USACE	filter	gradation	limits:
-------	--------	-----------	---------

Maximu	ım limit
Grain size (mm)	% Passing
75.00	100.0%
19.74	15.0%
15.79	15.0%

Minimu	ım limit
Grain size (mm)	% Passing
0.69	15.0%
1.16	15.0%
0.075	5.0%

langeu.			
article size	Sieve	% Passing	% Passing
mm	#	(upper bound)	(lower bound
150.0	-		
100.0	-		
90.0	-		
75.0	-		
63.0	-		
50.0	-		
37.5	-		
25.0	-	100.0%	
19.0	-	90.0%	100.0%
12.5	-		
9.5	-	20.0%	55.0%
4.75	4	0.0%	10.0%
3.35	6		
2.36	8	0.0%	5.0%
2.00	10		
1.70	12		(0,00())
1.40	14		(0.0%)
1.10	10		
0.600	20		
0.000	40		
0.300	50		
0.250	60		
0.212	70		
0.180	80		
0.150	100		
0.125	120		
0.106	140		
0.090	170	(0.00)	
0.075	200	(0.0%)	(0.0%)
0.053	270		
0.037	-		
0.019	-		
0.009	-	0.0%	0.00/
U.UUU I	-	0.0%	0.0%

Acceptibility of candidate filter (CF) soil: Upper USBR criteria bound Lower bound OK OK Max % passing #200:

Max particle size (mm):	OK	OK							
Maximum D _{15CF} :	OK	OK							
Minimum D _{15CF} :	OK	OK							
To minimize segregation (from Table 2)***									
Max allowable D _{90CF} =	40	OK							
Max D _{90CF} =	19.00	UK							

LISACE criteria	Upper	
	bound	Lower bound
Max % passing #200:	OK	OK
Max particle size (mm):	OK	OK
Maximum D _{15CF} :	OK	OK
Minimum D _{15CF} (3×D _{15B}):	OK	OK
Minimum D _{15CF} (5×D _{15B}):	OK	OK
To minimize segregation (fro	m Table B-3)	***
Max allowable D _{90CF} =	40	OK
Max Donce =	19.00	UK

Filters should be relatively uniform (see the C_{II} value of the candidate filter soil.). Also, filters should not be gapgraded.

*** Generally, this requirement is only necessary for coarse filters and gravel zones that serve as both filters and drains. For sand filters with $D_{90} < \sim 20$ mm, these limitations are usually not necessary.

Required entry values are defined above. *

Properties of candidate filter soil (CF). D sizes are in mm:											
	D _{85CF}	D _{15CF}	D _{60CF}	D _{10CF}	Cu						
upper bound	18.08	7.99	14.12	6.72	2.10						
lower bound	15.08	5.13	10.26	4.75	2.16						

#62 govel - ~ 12mm = 0.42 m

of D15F to D85B over that used for protecting a natural or unprocessed soil. The ratio can be as high as 9, but 5 is generally found to meet the practical requirements of the situation. This increase is sometimes possible because the first-stage filter: (1) is a material processed to stringent gradation requirements and placed and compacted under controlled conditions, (2) is inspected and tested to verify that material properties conform to those that are specified, (3) usually has seepage gradients that are much less than those of a foundation material or impervious zone that needs filter protection, and (4) has D_{85} particles in the first stage filter material that are larger than those in materials that are usually being protected and, therefore, less likely to move. However, this increase should be made with caution.

5.5.2 Drain Pipe Perforation Size

Home office underdrain

10-5-21

The maximum pipe perforation dimension¹⁹ should be no larger than the finer side of the D₅₀E where D₅₀E is taken from the gradation of the envelope (drain) material DSUMADON Astm C33 #57gravel - ~ 15mm = 0.59in that surrounds the drainpipe. That is:

Max Perforation Dimension $\leq D_{50}E$

It is emphasized that inaccessible drainpipes beneath embankment dams should be Use 1" slots may avoided. Drainpipes should be sized and located, and inspection wells should be "more reasonable provided so that access for inspection, maintenance, and repair, if necessary, is easy. It is recommended that each pipe segment be accessible from both ends. In order to provide a margin of safety for the pipe capacity, drains should be sized so that the depth of water in the drainpipe is less than 50 percent of the inside diameter of the drainpipe at the maximum expected discharge. If it is anticipated that the drainpipe will collect a large amount of flow from a pervious foundation or embankment, the maximum depth of water should not exceed 25 percent of the inside pipe diameter due to uncertainties in predicting the amount of flow.

5.6 Laboratory Test Procedures

In the following section, test procedures for laboratory tests are presented. The procedures have been separated into two categories: particle retention and material quality. The particle retention tests evolved from the original test procedures used during research into particle movement. The material quality tests come mainly from industry standard tests, although one stems from research work.

¹⁹ The maximum dimension as used in this standard is the width for a slot and the diameter for a hole.

Home Office Underdrain Seep W Analysis Drain pipe sizing.

North Drain

Inputs			
Length:	1370	ft from	drawings
Slope	0.0047	ft./ft.	
Pipe Diame	8	in	
Manning's	0.0009		
Slots	1.5	in2/ft	specified minimum slot area

				Out	puts						
		Seep \	N Input			Seep W Resu	ults	Pipe			
Sand and Gravel (k)	Model Ground Surface	Model Groundwater Elevation	Groundwater depth below ground	Drain Elevation	Drain Depth	q	Total flow	Total flow	Flow height - solved in Flowmaster	% of diameter	Water velocity through slots
cm/sec	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	cfs/ft.	cfs	gpm	in		ft/sec
2.54E-03	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	8.77E-06	1.20E-02	5.392287	0.6	7.1%	8.42E-04
2.54E-03	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	1.85E-05	2.53E-02	11.37484	0.8	10.1%	1.78E-03
1.00E-02	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	3.50E-05	4.80E-02	21.51996	1.1	13.7%	3.36E-03
1.00E-02	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	7.39E-05	1.01E-01	45.43786	1.6	19.6%	7.09E-03
High flow check -	100 gpm, greater	than 200% of mod	del			1.63E-04	2.23E-01	100	2.3	29.3	1.56E-02

	Outputs												
		Seep V	V Input			Seep W Resu	ılts			Pipe			
Sand and Gravel (k)	Model Ground Surface	Model Groundwater Elevation	Groundwater depth below ground	Drain Elevation	Drain Depth	q	Total flow	Total flow	Flow height - solved in Flowmaster	% of diameter	Water velocity through slots		
cm/sec	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	cfs/ft.	cfs	gpm	in		ft/sec		
2.54E-03	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	8.77E-06	1.16E-02	5.219104	0.7	8.2%	8.42E-04		
2.54E-03	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	1.85E-05	2.45E-02	11.00951	0.9	11.8%	1.78E-03		
1.00E-02	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7	3.50E-05	4.64E-02	20.82881	1.3	16.0%	3.36E-03		
1.00E-02	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7	7.39E-05	9.80E-02	43.97854	1.8	23.1%	7.09E-03		
High flow check - 2	100 gpm, greater t	han 200% of mod	el	1.68E-04	2.23E-01	100	2.8	35.3%	1.61E-02				

Discharge											
Length:	1400	ft from drawing	S								
Slope	0.0012	ft./ft.									
Pipe Diame	8	in									
Manning's	0.0009										
			Seep V	V Input			Seep W Res	ults			Pipe
	Sand and Gravel (k)	Model Ground Surface	Model Groundwater Elevation	Groundwater depth below ground	Drain Elevation	Drain Depth	q	Total flow	Total flow	Flow height - solved in Flowmaster	% of diameter
	cm/sec	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	ft.	cfs/ft.	cfs	gpm	in	
	2.54E-03	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7		2.36E-02	10.61139	1.1	13.5%
	2.54E-03	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7		4.99E-02	22.38435	1.6	19.4%
	1.00E-02	5,024	5,019	5	5017	7		9.44E-02	42.34877	2.1	26.7%
	1.00E-02	5,024	5,021	3	5017	7		1.99E-01	89.4164	3.2	39.5%
	High flow check - 2	200 gpm, greater t	than 200% of mod	lel				4.46E-01	200	5.1	63.9%

Notes:

See USBR DS-15(5) - Filter Drsign. Paragraph 5.5.2 - "Drains sould be sized so that the depth of water in the drain pipe is less than 50% of the inside diameter.

Slot velocity not specified by design standard. Calculated to check, maintin below 0.06 ft/sec, which the maximum orfice velocity at 100 gpm as calculated in Flow Master

TABLE 5.5Coarse Aggregate Grading Requirements for Concrete (Reprinted, with permission, from ASTM C33, Table 2, copyright
ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, PA 19428).

	Amounts Finer Than Each Laboratory Sieve (Square Openings), Weight Percent													
Size No.	Nominal Size	4 in. (100 mm)	3 1/2 in. (90 mm)	3 in. (75 mm)	2 1/2 in. (63 mm)	2 in. (50 mm)	1 1/2 in. (37.5 mm)	1 in. (25.0 mm)	3/4 in. (19.0 mm)	1/2 in. (12.5 mm)	3/8 in. (9.5 mm)	No. 4 (4.75 mm)	No. 8 (2.36 mm)	No. 16 (1.18 mm)
1	3 1/2 to 1 1/2 in. (90 to 37.5 mm)	100	90 to 100		25 to 60		0 to 15		0 to 5					
2	2 1/2 to 1 1/2 in. (63 to 37.5 mm)			100	90 to 100	35 to 70	0 to 15		0 to 5					
3	2 to 1 in. (50 to 25.0 mm)				100	90 to 100	35 to 70	0 to 15		0 to 5				
357	2 in. to No. 4 (50 to 4.75 mm)				100	95 to 100		35 to 70		10 to 30		0 to 5		
4	1 1/2 to 3/4 in. (37.5 to 19 mm)					100	90 to 100	20 to 55	0 to 15		0 to 5			
467	1 1/2 in. to No. 4 (37.5 to 4.75 mm)					100	95 to 100		35 to 70		10 to 30	0 to 5		
5	1 to 1/2 in. (25.0 to 12.5 mm)						100	90 to 100	20 to 55	0 to 10	0 to 5			
56	1 to 3/8 in. (25.0 to 9.5 mm)						100	90 to 100	40 to 85	10 to 40	0 to 15	0 to 5		
57	1 in. to No. 4 (25.0 to 4.75 mm)						100	95 to 100		25 to 60		0 to 10	0 to 5	
6	3/4 in. to 3/8 in. (19.0 to 9.5 mm)							100	90 to 100	20 to 55	0 to 15	0 to 5		
67	3/4 in. to No. 4 (19.0 to 4.75 mm)							100	90 to 100		20 to 55	0 to 10	0 to 5	
7	1/2 in. to No. 4 (12.5 to 4.75 mm)								100	90 to 100	40 to 70	0 to 15	0 to 5	
8	3/8 in. to No. 8 (9.5 to 2.36 mm)									100	85 to 100	10 to 30	0 to 10	0 to 5