

## FLORENCE SAND & GRAVEL FILE NO. M-1992-051 BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

A PARCEL OF LAND LYING IN PORTIONS OF THE NE1/4 SECTION 20 AND PORTIONS OF THE SW1/4NW1/4, AND THE NW1/4NW1/4 SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 19 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6 TH P.M., CITY OF FLORENCE, COUNTY OF FREMONT, STATE OF COLORADO, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS: BEGINNING AT THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF SAID SECTION 21; THENCE S 89°45'12" E A DISTANCE OF 1327.84 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 21 TO THE W1/16 CORNER COMMON TO SECTIONS 16 AND 21; THENCE S 0'2'2" W A DISTANCE OF 1320.77 FEET ALONG THE EAST LINE OF SAID NW1/4NW1/4 SECTION 21 POINT BEING ON THE SOUTH RIGHT OF WAY

LINE OF AN UNNAMED STREET; THENCE S 89°15'13" W A DISTANCE OF 57.12 FEET LEAVING SAID LINE; THENCE ALONG A NON-TANGENT CURVE TO THE RIGHT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 1544.58 FEET, A DELTA ANGLE OF 21° 07' 41", AND WHOSE LONG CHORD BEARS S 59°6'29" W A DISTANCE OF 566.35 FEET;

THENCE S 69°40'17" W A DISTANCE OF 397.90 FEET; THENCE ALONG A TANGENT CURVE TO THE LEFT, HAVING A RADIUS OF 991.74 FEET, A DELTA ANGLE OF 28° 11' 33", AND WHOSE LONG CHORD

BEARS S 55°34'30" W A DISTANCE OF 483.08 FEET; THENCE N 0°0'0" E A DISTANCE OF 24.76 FEET; THENCE S 44°50'14" W A DISTANCE OF 450.45 FEET TO THE NORTHEAST

CORNER LOT 1 TWO CREEKS SUBDIVISION; THENCE S 89°29'49" W A DISTANCE OF 1252.66 FEET ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF SAID TWO CREEKS SUBDIVISION TO INTERSECT THE EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE OF KELSEY COURT;

THENCE N 0°42'39? W A DISTANCE OF 989.86 FEET ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT OF WAY LINE TO INTERSECT THE NORTH LINE OF THE S1/2 NE1/4 SECTION 20;

THENCE N 89°07'35" E A DISTANCE OF 254.54 FEET ALONG SAID NORTH LINE TO THE NE1/16 CORNER OF SAID SECTION 20; THENCE N 89°07'35"? E A DISTANCE OF 1332.13 FEET ALONG SAID NORTH LINE TO THE N1/16 CORNER OF SAID SECTION 20 AND 21; THENCE N 0°42'27" W A DISTANCE OF 321.13 FEET ALONG THE COMMON SECTION LINE BETWEEN SAID SECTIONS 20 AND 21;

THENCE S 89°17'33" W A DISTANCE OF 217.80 FEET LEAVING SAID LINE; THENCE N 0°42'27" W A DISTANCE OF 1000.00 FEET TO INTERSECT THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 20; THENCE N 89°17'33" E A DISTANCE OF 217.80 FEET ALONG SAID NORTH

LINE TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING. CONTAINING 89.85 ACRES MORE OR LESS.

TOGETHER WITH A WATER LINE EASEMENT A FIFTEEN (15) FEET WIDE WATER LINE EASEMENT OVER AND ACROSS A PORTION OF THE SW1/4SW1/4 SECTION 16, TOWNSHIP 19 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., CITY OF FLORENCE, COUNTY OF FREMONT, STATE OF COLORADO, BEING 7.5 FEET EITHER SIDE OF THE FOLLOWING

DESCRIBED CENTERLINE BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF SAID SW1/4SW1/4 FROM WHICH THE SE CORNER OF SAID SW1/4SW1/4 BEARS S 89°45'12" E A DISTANCE OF 77.59 FEET;

THENCE N 12°33'20" E A DISTANCE OF 151.70 FEET MORE OR LESS TO THE TERMINUS OF SAID WATER LINE EASEMENT.

Client:

drawn by: GRH

FILENAME: 2025111LANGSTON\_FSGPIT DATE: 03/26/2025 04/28/2025

LANGSTON CONCRETE INC. P.O. BOX 279 FLORENCE, CO 81226 ZLANGSTON@NEWLCI.COM

According to Colorado law you must commence any legal action based on any defect in this survey within three years after you first discover such defect. In no event may any legal action based upon any defect in this survey be commenced more than ten years from the date of certification shown hereon. Any person who knowingly removes, alters or defaces any Public Land Survey Monument or Land Boundary Monument or Accessory commits a closs two (2) misdemeanor pursuant to Colorado State Statute 18–4–508, of the Colorado Revised Statutes LINEAL UNITS Lineal units = U.S. Survey foot = 1.00' = 12 inche

# FLORENCE SAND & GRAVEL PIT FILE No. M-1992-051

IN PORTIONS OF THE NE1/4 SECTION 20, THE SW1/4NW1/4, and THE NW1/4NW1/4 SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 19 SOUTH, RANGE 69 WEST OF THE 6th P.M., CITY OF FLORENCE, COUNTY OF FREMONT, STATE OF COLORADO

crown Point Land Services	NOLES
719-275-5005 Office 391 Arrowhead Drive	This survey does not constitute a title search by Crown Point Land Services to determine
P.O. Box 749 Florissant, CO 80816 Canon City, CO 81215-0749 crown.land@outlook.com	ownership. No Title Commitment was provided by the client. Easements are as shown, no other easements were requested to be researched for this survey.

# EXHIBIT B-1

Bearings are based on G.P.S. observation on the NORTH line of NW1/4NW1/4 SECTION 21 as being S 89°45'12'' E AS SHOWN HEREON.

# LAND SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I, George R. Hall, a licensed Land Surveyor in the State of Colorado do hereby certify to

that this plat has been prepared under my responsible charge in accordance with current Colorado Revised Statutes, as amended, and that said plat does accurately show and describe the tract of land to the best of my knowledge and belief.



George R. Hall, C.P.L.S. 38118





DATE: 03/26/2025 04/28/2025



# **Exhibit C: Adjoining Surface Owners:**

Please also see Exhibit B-3, Exhibit C-1

-MURPHY OJ & FAYE J – Assessor # 61010280 201 NE  $21^{ST}$  ST

FORTH WORTH, TX. 761648527

-COLORADO FUEL AND IRON CORP- Assessor # 99922063, 99922067, 99922066, 99922065 P O BOX 316 PUEBLO, CO, 810020316

-LT INCOME LLC- Assessor # 61009660 690 MAIN ST #774 SAFETY HARBOR , FL, 346953551

-MARINAC DONNA MARIE- Assessor # 61000160 326 JOHNSON STREET FLORENCE, CO, 812261700

-SHIPMAN JOSHUA JAY- Assessor # 61001580, 61080025 320 JOHNSON ST FLORENCE, CO, 81226

-SAUNDERS TONI D- Assessor # 61011060 400 JOHNSON ST FLORENCE, CO, 812261702

-PLOUVIER GREGORY R & JANIE M- Assessor # 61009030 426 JOHNSON ST FLORENCE, CO, 812261702

-BANTA CONSTANTINE A- Assessor # 61001970 428 JOHNSON ST FLORENCE, CO, 812261702

-HJELM DONOVAN M- Assessor # 99922128 428 1/2 JOHNSON STREET FLORENCE, CO, 812261702

-PADILLA CYMON J- Assessor # 61010670 430 JOHNSON ST FLORENCE, CO, 812261702

-MEIGS STEPHEN- Assessor # 99923271 234 MOFFATT AVE FLORENCE, CO, 812261359

-ROSS DAWN- Assessor # 99704005, 99704009



301 FRAZIER AVE FLORENCE, CO, 812261347

-BRADLEY KEVIN- Assessor # 67000240 601 E MAIN ST FLORENCE, CO, 812261347

-GOODALL MARGARET A- Assessor # 98504426 225 QUARTZ ST FLORENCE, CO, 812261315

-WRG LLC DBA HELTON CONSTRUCTION- Assessor # 39392010033015, 3939201003007 1920 N 7TH ST CANON CITY, CO, 812122021

-HAYDEN HIDEOUT LLC- Assessor # 3939201003006, 3939201003005, 3939201003004, 3939201003003, 3939201003002 PO BOX 7 CANON CITY, CO, 812150007

-KILLOUGH KAYLA- Assessor # 3939201003001 341 KELSEY CT FLORENCE, CO, 81226

-BELLINO DOMINIC P & DEANNA S- Assessor # 67001150, 99924470, 73000120 1241 COUNTY ROAD 13A FLORENCE, CO, 812269531

-MOLINAR ALBERTO- Assessor # 99924180 378 KELSEY CT FLORENCE, CO, 812267509

-MC DUFFEE PEGGY A- Assessor # 99924189 417 KELSEY CT FLORENCE, CO, 812267510

-STRINGER MERCEDZ L- Assessor # 73002240 502 S UNION ST FLORENCE, CO, 81226

-CITY OF FLORENCE- Johnson Street = No assessor # 600 W 3<sup>RD</sup> ST FLORENCE, CO, 81226

-INDUSTRIAL HOTEL LLC- Assessor # 99504033 803 S 4THST CANON CITY, CO, 812124106









Crown Point Land Se	rvices Notes	BASIS 0
719-275-5005 Office 391 Arrowhead Drive	This survey does not constitute a title search by Crown Point Land Services to determine	Bearings
P.O. Box 749 Florissant, CO 80816 Canon City, CO 81215-0749 crown.land@outlook.co	other easements were requested to be researched for this survey	SECTION

ngs are based on G.P.S. observation on the NORTH line of NW1/4NW1/4 ON 21 as being S 89°45'12" E AS SHOWN HEREON.

	H	FLOF			SA	
	M	2	FILE		v © ₀	
Compos and		5		INI DAT		

T		IN THE SW1 TOWNSHIP CITY OF FLOP	19 SOU
150 0 Sco	150 300 45 ale 1" = 150'	50	
	LEGEND WASH PLANT AREA EXISTING SCALE AND SALE OFFICE FOUND ALEQUOTE CORNER AS SHOWN AN FOUND SECTION CORNER AS SHOWN AND FOUND REBAR AND CAP LS 3553		
	SUBJECT PROPERTY LINE SUBJECT PERMIT BOUNDARY EXISTING WATER LINE RECLAIMED AREA DISTURBED AREA		
	ADJACENT PROPERTIES INDEX CONTOUR LINE INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR LINE FINISHED MINE CONTOUR/RECLAMATION	UNDERGROUND	
POLE	PÕLE TOP PIT SLOPE ELEVATION VARIES 2:1 SLOPE TOE PIT FLOOR 5220± ELEVATION FINISHED EAST AND WEST SLOPES	ELECT BOX TOP PIT SLOPE ELEVATION VARI 3:1 SLOPE TOE PIT 5220± FINISHED NORTH SLO	FLOOR ELE VATION
DEPOS CLAY	BURDEN 10' TO 15' IT 5' TO 10' 10' TO 15' ROCK 10' TO 15' ROCK 10' TO 15' TOP PIT SLOPE 2:1 SLOPE TOE PIT FLOOF 5220± ELEVA	r Tion	



Crown Point	Land Services	NOTES	BASIS O
719-275-5005 Office	391 Arrowhead Drive	This survey does not constitute a title search by Crown Point Land Services to determine	Bearings
P.O. Box 749	Florissant, CO 80816	ownership. No Title Commitment was provided by the client. Easements are as shown, no	SECTION
Canon City, CO 81215-0749	crown.land@outlook.com	other easements were requested to be researched for this survey.	



# S OF BEARINGS:

ings are based on G.P.S. observation on the NORTH line of NW1/4NW1/4 10N 21 as being S 89°45'12'' E AS SHOWN HEREON.



# **Exhibit D: Mining Plan**

Langston Concrete Inc. does not intend to change the existing approved mining plan already in place with the DRMS. Piling overburden off the permitted property has not changed our focus on the mining plan. The overburden on site is still to be used for reclamation activities once screening operations have subsided at the pit.

No explosives are or will be used in conjunction with the mining or reclamation operation at all. Our deposit is an alluvial deposit. There is no need to use explosives for mining operations.

There are no defined roads within the permitted area. Nor are there any plans for developed roads within the permitted area. The stockpile area of the permitted area has piles of marketable material stored on it for sales. Our equipment and customer trucks simply traverse around the piles as needed for access.

In regard to the land in question of which Langston Concrete Inc. has affected area beyond the approved permit boundaries, Langston Concrete Inc. intends to treat this land the same as the rest of the permitted area. No new mining techniques will occur. There is no desire to reinvent the wheel when it comes to harvesting material out of the pit.

Technically speaking, no "mining" will occur in the area. "Mining Activity" has occurred given that we have stockpiled overburden material there. But no actual mining. We intend on utilizing the area as a mining activity area rather than an actual mining area.

The attached "Exhibit B-3, Exhibit C-1 map" reflects the location of the stockpile area on the North-Western quadrant of the property. Harvestable rock/sand will be pulled out of the pit on the Eastern side of the stockpile up to the toe of the Eastern most side. Once all the harvestable material is removed/mined, the pile will be pushed into the pit area and utilized to reclaim the property perimeter (generated from mining) at a 2:1 slope.

As mentioned in the previous exhibits and in the cover letter to this amendment, we plan on adding a wash plant to the property. The expansion of a sand wash plant is an added step in the material separation process already occurring at the site, not a change. Mining will continue to occur as it has since Langston Concrete Inc. has owned the property. At any one point in time we plan on having no more than 2000' of open face highwall exposed.

The adequacy review calls for clarification on the depth of the deposits at that pit. A conversation was had during one of the site visits about the material and deposit thickness. The conversation was not meant to conflict the existing information on file or confuse the division. During the conversation, loosely spoken depth numbers were discussed. But nothing was intended to be formal or binding on our part. The deposit depth of the materials varies GREATLY within the deposit layers. The soils are Cascajo and Kim Cascajo complex, are alluvial in nature and are known to vary in depth. The isolated components located within our



deposit are what we are trying to harvest. Rather than high-grade various layers with the complex, we are trying to get all we can out of every layer we can. It just so happens that there is a moderately thin layer of "reddish" colored rock deposit that lays at a depth of about 15' deep. And then the main deposit is at a depth of about 35'.

Please see the associated table to help try to clarify the depths of our deposits. We would like to further state that these are approximate numbers given the natural topography of the land and unknown variations of the deposit thicknesses.

Material:	Depth:	Layer Thickness +/-
Overburden/Clay	0'-15'	10'-15'
Red Deposit	15'-25'	5'-10'
Clay	25'-35'	10'-15'
River Rock Deposit	35'-50'	10'-15'

Our plans will not change the way we have worked the pit since we have owned it. We will continue to harvest the workings as we have. We will continue to bench the sections of material back as necessary for safety and will work the harvested products as benches in a "longwall" fashion.

We are asking the Division for an increase to 70acres within the permitted area for disturbance within this application. At the moment, approximately 55 of those acres are disturbed. The previous limit was 50acres. We currently have approximately **30.74acres** (not on the map) within the gravel pit that we internally refer to as our "stockpile area." This area is all but reclaimed given the reclamation plan and the post mining land use listed as being "industrial." Of this area, 14.7acres is only used for material storage and customer load out. The reclamation plan states "(T)the pit floor will be leveled and a 6"-12" plate of pit run material will be left." This entire area is such. We are simply still using it for stockpiling our products for retail sales. The entire area is technically still in the disturbed area, but there is no mining activity occurring. A large portion of the area is still used to transport mined material through. Meaning, we run trucks and loaders back and forth from the mined face to the screening operation for separating.

The entire pit floor is technically reclaimed. This occurs out of necessity for operation. When we harvest the cobble rock from the area, the earth underneath the deposit is too loose/soft to run equipment on. Therefore, part of our mining operation is to place pit run material in the quarry floor so we can continue to run equipment on it. Inadvertently, this activity creates our reclamation in the pit floor.

Therefore, on paper it looks like there is 70acres of property being mined all at one time. But there is not. This is a slight conundrum in the pit. All the stockpile area in the pit floor is already mined out. There is no material left to harvest.

If the division would grant it, we would leave the area alone and not increase the acreage given that most of the disturbed area is not actively being mined.



Rule 6.4.4(d) requires a statement clarifying the size and the area to be worked at one time; and there is an *assumed* relation to permitted acreage. We are asking to have 70 acres of disturbed area. We currently have 55 acres disturbed according to the Division. Of the current 55 acres that are disturbed, 30.74 acres are in the pit floor. Leaving approximately 24.26 acres. 24.26 acres better represents the acreage being worked at any one time. This area is in the Northern quadrant of the pit, on the Western side. We anticipate working this area for the next 5-10 years.

The adequacy review also asks for clarification on the "stages" or "phases" of the mining operation. It was not our intention to label phases or stages within the pit. The existing approved mining plan from 1997 indicates that the operation shall be ran in a "floating bond operation" and "will not be a definitely phased operation." We are simply working the current face we have to the West. When that area is mined out, we will simply start removing material from the other area. The "future deposit" area is in the South West quadrant and is currently un-touched. The area encompasses approximately 21acres (+/-). We anticipate working this area in approximately 10 years. And we anticipate the workings to take 15-20 years to harvest once started.

Washed sand will be harvested from the reject products generated from the existing screening plant operation. No "new" mining will occur. The direction of the mining sequence will not change. Nor will the extraction process. There will also not be a shift in the focus of materials harvested from the existing deposit. We are not planning on halting, altering, or modifying any of the existing mining plan. The wash plant operation will be set up further down the line in the material separation sequence. We will be modifying the 'mining operation' by adding the wash plant.

Adding to the existing operation will change the way the reject material is handled. Currently, all 3/4" minus product is removed from the existing screening operation and placed in locations around the mine for reclamation purposes. It is currently considered reject. We will be adding to the separation operative by pulling more marketable products from this reject material. Instead of going straight to the stockpiles for reclamation locations in the pit, we will run it through the wash plant and harvest C33 spec sand out of the reject while also creating  $\frac{1}{4}$ " x  $\frac{1}{2}$ " and a  $\frac{1}{2}$ " x  $\frac{3}{4}$ " clean rock. The material separated out from this additional processing (reject) will then go to the locations around the pit for reclamation purposes.

The C33 cement sand will be placed in a stockpile via a conveyor belt stacker to the North of a settling pond. The plated area where the sand is to be stockpiled will be graded in a Southern fashion to slope back towards the settling pond. Here we will attempt to capture the excess water in the sand and let it drain back into the settling pond for recirculation though the wash facility.

The clean rock products will be stacked out on a conveyor belt stacker and shuttled via a haul truck to a location within the disturbed "stockpile" area to store for future retail sales.

We have an employee on staff that use to work for two different organizations as a wash plant operator. We have leaned on his experience to develop operational processes for everything involved with washing sand. It will be our intention to place the reject material in a fashion to let



it dry out for approximately one to two weeks. After it is dry enough it will be pushed up into a pile and/or moved to a location on the property for reclamation efforts.

Please refer to the attached, exhibit B-3 exhibit C-1 map, for the proposed location of the wash plant and associated elements within the disturbance area at the pit.

An added feature of the wash plant will be a new impoundment for settling reject solids out of the washing facility. The existing mine plan narrative states that "no water diversions or impoundments will exist on site." We are going to need to change this narrative to include the impoundment as a settling pond. As well as add the portable wash plant facility.

Water for washing procedures will be purchased from Evraz and come from the Minnequa Canal on the North East side of the permitted boundary. (Please see the attached water lease agreement from Evraz Inc.) We plan on adding a pump at the canal location capable of pulling water from the canal and also pushing it to the wash plant location. The water line will run into the permitted property on the North East corner and across the pit floor in a South West direction. We plan on installing everything we can underground to assist in vandalism/theft prevention as well as freezing problems. The pump will be an all-inclusive set up and be mounted on a skid. The suction line will plumb into it on the canal side and the push line will hook up and run underground to the South from there.

Please refer to the attached, exhibit B-1 exhibit C-1 map, for the proposed location of the process-water ponds. As well as the location of the water line entry into the permitted property and location of the pump at the canal.

In addition to the impoundment, we have added three concrete structures for the wash plant. One is a set of walls to be used as a loading ramp to load the surge bin that will feed the wash plant. (This wall set is very similar to the set of walls we added for our screening plant a few years ago.) One is a concrete slab the wash plant will sit on to cut down on mud & excessive settling of the wash plant structure. We want to be able to keep the plant clean and tidy on a daily basis, so having a concrete slab underneath the chassis of the portable wash plant was the best solution we could come up with to allow personnel to access the area on foot and with a skid loader to clean the area around the facility. We feel this will also cut down on safety related issues that may arise from the facility being under constant water intrusion. This area is also conveniently located just to the South West of the settling pond. We have graded the area to drain all water to the North East for capture of excess water coming off the plant and into the pond to be recirculated through the wash facility. This will cut down waste and the potential for run-off. And the last structure is a concrete slab for the wash plant control house to sit on. This was done for ease of leveling the control house since it is a van trailer and overall cleanliness of the plant.

We plan on leaving these structures in place once the mine is reclaimed in full. We feel that once the process of extracting the C33 sand has subsided, the concrete structures we built for the wash plant can be purposeful for either storing rock on, possibly setting some kind of sales store front on, a customer load out station, or something of the nature. There is some future value in leaving them there.







# **Exhibit E: Reclamation Plan**

The post mining land use in the existing reclamation plan that was approved in 1997 is allotted for "industrial usage." We do not intend to change the post mining land use nor change any of the approved reclamation plan. All guidelines created within the approved plan from 1997 shall continue to be adhered to.

Leftover material generated from processing operations within the property will continue to be utilized for reclamation. As well as the vast amount of overburden the pit produces. The existing reclamation plan is working and has worked well since it was approved and it is not our intention to rewrite the plan.

Throughout the process of applying for this amendment to the mining operation, we have become overwhelmingly compelled to revisit the existing reclamation plan and attempt to explain how we are currently working the process in our best efforts to comply with the existing approved plan from 1997.

For starters, the majority of the reclamation we have to accomplish at the site is occurring naturally as a part of the mining process. The pit floor is to "be leveled and a 6"-12" plate of pit run material will be left" as stated in the 97' documents. We have discovered that our equipment cannot run on the material left in the floor of the pit as we are mining. It is too soft/loose. The equipment struggles to navigate back and forth from the harvested face to the processing facility. As a result of this, we are forced to remove the unsuitable material and replace it with pit run as we proceed with mining operations to bridge anything underneath in an effort to create a stable running platform. Thereby, "reclaiming" the pit floor. So, in compliance with Rule 6.4.5(2)(e), 6.4.5(2)(e)(i), 6.4.5(2)(e)(ii), & 6.4.5(2)(e)(iii), "reclamation" is occurring continuously as we harvest. The size & location of the area depends on the day and how much we are able to harvest and where we are at the face at the current time. It is continuously occurring in a running bond fashion; similar to the mining operation.

In regards to the backslopes on the North & West boundaries of the permitted area, we were under the impression when we purchased the property that the North East section of the property had been mined out and reclaimed. Meaning the backslopes that existed were basically completed. Upon taking over the operation of the pit, we soon discovered that the previous operator had high-graded select materials and left and abundant amount of harvestable material in the backslopes they told us were reclaimed. We chose to re-screen the material in the area in an effort to remove any harvestable products from it. We elect to run our operation as efficient/effective as possible and still do not understand why the previous operation left certain products within the material.

We are going on our 10<sup>th</sup> year of operating the pit and are still working on re-screening all the material left behind by the previous operator. It has proven to be a slow and difficult process. The material is terribly contaminated with previously spoiled products and doesn't screen very



well. However, we still feel it is the best stewardship of the land to get everything out of the material while we have the property permitted. Unfortunately, this has delayed our original timeline for completing the backslope reclamation in the North & North East quadrant of the pit. However, we are still diligently working on it and hope to have the harvestable material in the North Eastern quadrant removed in the next 2-5years and will backslope the permit boundary as soon as the material is removed for reclamation compliance.

In regard to reclamation of the wash plant, we intend to set the plant up as a "portable operation." We do not plan on taking the plant elsewhere at any point in time, however we will set it up on blocks; similar to the way a portable operation would be. This would allow it to be brought back down and pulled away with a semi-tractor if need be.

The other added components will be stackers/conveyors for material discharge handling and a surge bin. These will be a-typical; nothing out of the ordinary. We plan on installing a belt to feed the wash plant from the surge bin. Another set of belt systems for the sand, one for the  $\frac{1}{4}$ " x  $\frac{1}{2}$ " rock, as well as the  $\frac{1}{2}$ " x  $\frac{3}{4}$ " clean rock. There will be nine conveyor belts total within the entire wash plant set up. All of which will be positioned on either legs or concrete cribbing blocks.

We will be adding a pond to create a location to discharge the reject material generated from the washing procedure. The process-water pond will be one pond linked together with a series of earthen dikes to allow reject material the opportunity to settle out of the water. We will pull clean water back off the furthest away location in the pond and recycle it back through the wash plant for processing. Allowing us the privilege to recycle & re-use as much of the water as possible. Thereby creating a closed loop recycling system. The pond will be located to the North of the wash plant and lay on the property in a South-West to North-East fashion.

The pond is approximately 200' long, 250' wide, and roughly 10' deep. However, the full depth is achieved by berm height. We excavated a hole approximately 5' deep from the grade of the quarry floor. The material we pulled out of the hole was used to create a berm around the perimeter of the pond on the North side thereby adding height to the overall depth of the pond. The berm height is approximately 5' above the grade of the quarry floor. The South side depth is naturally created due to the existing contours of the land. It is sort of dug into the bank.

When the time comes to fill the pond in, the way we have created the berm around the perimeter allows us the privilege of simply pushing the berm in. The material around the perimeter is the same material that was pulled from the excavated hole to create the pond, so simply shoving it back into the open hole will be a quick and easy process. No material will need to be hauled in from other locations for fill. A dozer should be able to support itself and have the pond filled in approximately two days or less.

To calculate the cost of this operation, we referred to data provided to us from 2016 in our Technical Revision #1. In 2016, the operating cost of a D-8 dozer was \$169.91/hr. We do not know what the current operating costs is today, but used a 10% inflation increase and came up with \$186.90/hr. The average push distance is approximately 100'. And the material consistency



is the same as well as the unit weight. Therefore- 16hrs. x \$186.90 = \$2,990.40 to complete the operation. A mobilization fee can be assessed at \$1,000.00. For a total of \$3,990.40 as a reclamation cost.

In the closest location to the wash plant, we will create the initial discharge into the pond off the wash plant. This area will generate all of the reject off the wash plant and will be where we "clean" out the pond on a regular basis. The earthen material will be pulled from the pond with an excavator and hauled to the existing reclamation areas within the property via haul truck. Here the material will have the opportunity to fully dry out. We are not planning on using any flocculants of any kind.

Taking the existing reclamation plan into consideration, we intend to keep all the reject material within the confinements of the existing disturbed area. At the moment, there is a hole in the North East corner of the gravel pit we intend to begin discarding waste material from the wash plant. The material will be discarded here for a short period of time. We are currently mining from the East to the West. At our face, we have met our Northern border and are working on getting the material harvested at the time of this document. We intend to have the marketable rock out of the area in the next couple of months. Once we have the area cleared out, we intend to start discarding the waste material from the wash plant here. The space is larger and will give us the opportunity to have plenty of room to store the material as it dries out. As soon as it is manageable, we will use it as backfill in the areas needing reclamation around the pit. The primary areas are in the slopes surrounding the pit floor.

In regard to the amount of material previously allocated for reclamation purposes, we are going to be cutting into the amount set aside, but still have more than enough to completely reclaim the property; and then some. There are a couple different ways to calculate the amount of reclamation material we are going to need for the property. And a couple of different ways to calculate what we have left. The simplest way, in our opinion, is to look at it as a whole. Using rough numbers, we have approximately 48 acres left to mine. Of that 48 acres, our total max excavation depth is 40 feet down. When you calculate the cubic yard volume on that area, we get 3,097,600cy of material. If you break down the same 40 feet we have approximately 25 feet of overburden or "waste material." Which leaves approximately 15 feet of marketable product. From a simple perspective, we have 1,936,000cy of overburden/waste material and 1,161,600cy of marketable material. Which leaves 774,400cy of excess overburden material.

To further investigate what is needed for reclamation, we calculated the bare minimum needed for following the existing reclamation plan. If we calculate just enough to backfill the highwalls along the perimeter with a 2:1 slope and the 12 inches of pit run in the quarry floor, we come up with approximately 500,000cy +/- of material needed over the 48acre area we have at our pit. So, it goes without saying, we have more than enough material to adequately reclaim the site. In some places we are going to have to "fatten" our slopes and or grow space to get rid of the rest.

Attached in Exhibit F is the Reclamation Plan Map. We took the liberty of coming up with an idea to use more overburden on the property to get rid of some of it. As you will note, we sketched a "flat" spot at the top of the reclaimed slope. (highlighted in blue on the map) This



idea came to us after we calculated all the material quantities in the paragraphs above. The thought derived here was that we could "fatten" these areas as needed to gobble up material to help balance out some of the excess of material we are planning on having left at the end of the life of the mine. We did not calculate the quantities of material we plan on using up in this situation, but rather use it as a solution to disperse excess overburden as needed throughout the remainder of the life of the mine.

We feel this idea is a solution to a potential problem. We are of the opinion that we are not changing the reclamation plan by executing this idea. We still plan on back sloping all the necessary places as well as plating the floor for future industrial use. We simply want to have the ability to take privilege out of this idea for the slope areas if we feel it is necessary in the future given we believe we will have excess overburden. To reiterate, we believe we will be looking for places to put overburden and waste materials generated from processing.

In addition to this, we also have the material we have already pulled from the pit in "bank." To correlate, the 5-acre parcel on the West side of the property we are asking to annex to the existing permitted area has approximately 250,000cy of material on it as of now.

As stated in the mining plan, we are going to add a few concrete structures to the wash plant operation for various reasons to make the operation more successful. There will be a slab for the wash plant to sit on. This slab is 25' x 75' x 12". The control van slab is 18'6" x 38' x 12". And the ramp walls to feed the surge bin are 18'3" x 45'3" x 13' tall. The walls are 3 sided with backfill up the center to create a ramp for access to the surge bin. We intend to keep these structures for post mining land use. We believe we can utilize them for future operations once mining has ceased. The ramp will be useful for loading out trucks and the concrete pads can double for material storage and/or for structures to sit on.

The water feed for the wash plant will come in from the North-East corner of the property. We intend on running a water line underground from the property corner to the wash plant. This line will be a 6" line. We are still working on figuring out the details in a pump size and demand on the plant for the amount of water we are going to need. It will be skid mounted and will be a one-unit all-inclusive kind of set up. Meaning that the entire thing can be picked up as one.

Regardless of the size, we believe the best solution for the reclamation of the line is to abandon it in place once washing activities have subsided. In the field of utility work, our organization is familiar with abandoning City water main lines in place. A common practice is to drain the lines, dig the ends up, terminate the pipe, and cap the ends with concrete and/or flow fill. In order to do this, an excavator and some concrete will be needed. We believe it should take an excavator approximately one hour to dig up one end. And about a half an hour to backfill it. For a total of three hours. We do not have an estimated cost per hour to operate an excavator, but we try to get 220.00/ hour for our excavators on projects we bid.  $220.00 \times 3$  hours = 660.00. An estimated 1/2cy of flow fill should be all that is needed for each end to cap. For a total of 1cy of flow fill to cap the ends. We currently sell flow fill for 190.00/cy. A mobilization fee of 1,000.00 can be assessed as well. For a total of 1,850.00. (660.00 + 190.00 + 1,000.00).



This practice will allow the backfill material to be buried underground and will not interfere with post mining land use. It will also allow the privilege of guaranteeing the land will not settle or create a void as the flow fill will flow into any and all cavities in and around the end of the pipe.

There is 1,7001.f. of 6" water line installed at the mine for the purposes of conveying water to the wash plant. We calculate there to be 17cy of volume quantity within the pipe. We hereby certify that the waterline material is clean and inert. Please see attached affidavit.

Please see "Exhibit C Pre Mining Map, Exhibit C-2, and Exhibit B-3, Exhibit C-1" for wash plant location, processing water pond location, and proposed water line location. As well as for the location of where the water line will come into the property on the North East corner from the Evraz ditch.

In regards to the 5 acres of land on the West side of the property that we stored overburden on and unintentionally went outside the permitted area; we intend to treat this land as the rest of the land under the existing reclamation plan. If the Division grants us the permission to add the affected area outside the permitted area into the permitted area, we will assume the land to be dealt with in the same manner as the rest of the gravel pit. Post mining land use will remain as "industrial." We do not intend to change or modify any portion of the existing operation currently occurring at the gravel pit.

The 5 acres area is currently being used as a storage area for the potential of using the material in the future for backfill/reclamation purposes. At the moment, our calculations determine that the pit has an abundant amount of excess material for reclamation purposes. We are of the view that at the current time, we are not going to need the material for reclamation of the property, but that could change in the future. We intend to leave the material where it is but will also use it to push back into the excavated area for reclamation purposes if need be. We are of the opinion that the material is a "reserve" at the moment. It is in reserve for the potential to possibly be used for reclamation/ backfill anywhere needed on the property. Or it could be left where it is and simply become a "knoll, small hill, or beauty berm" to be left as is. Slopes will be maintained at a 2:1 slope as stated in the original reclamation plan.

The most common weed in the permitted area is the tumble weed. (a.k.a Russian Thistle, Salsola Kali) Weeds shall be managed in a manner to the best of our ability. We will adherer to the following 3 programs for control: Eradicate, Contain, Suppress. The initial attempt is to detect & eradicate any and all weeds that may be present. The goal is to keep them from reproducing. So, every attempt will be made to eradicate them before they mature and seed out. Chemically spraying of the infant weed has been the best control measure for our application.

Should the weed mature and begin to reproduce, every attempt to contain the growth area will be made. If possible, the weed growth area will be burned. Thereby reducing the likelihood of seed spread. When burning is not an option and something different is needed, the weeds shall be pulled and removed. They will be transported to a designated safe area within the pit and burned there.



Suppression is the maintenance aspect of our program. We spray a local chemical agent on what we think may be areas where weeds may sprout in an attempt to keep them from coming up to begin with. Should we need to burn an area, we will then spray it with a local agent weed spray to suppress any future sprouting. Should an instance arise where weeds have overcome an area and we cannot burn it, or pull & contain them, we will then again spray the area to suppress it from growing larger and spreading.







WASH PLANT AREA
EXISTING SCALE AND SALE OFFICE
FOUND ALEQUOTE CORNER AS SHOWN AND DESCRIBED
FOUND SECTION CORNER AS SHOWN AND DESCRIBED
▲ FOUND REBAR AND CAP LS 3553 SUBJECT PROPERTY LINE
SUBJECT PERMIT BOUNDARY
EXISTING WATER LINE
RECLAIMED AREA
DISTURBED AREA
ADJACENT PROPERTIES
INDEX CONTOUR LINE
INTERMEDIATE CONTOUR LINE
FINISHED MINE CONTOUR/RECLAMATION SLOPE CONTOUR
POLE EXISTING OVERHEAD POWERUNDERGROUND
POLE POLE ELECT BO
OVER BURDEN 10' TO 15' DEPOSIT 5' TO 10' CLAY 10' TO 15' RIVER ROCK 10' TO 15' DEPOSIT LAYERS



DRAWN BY: GRH FILENAME: 2025111RECLAIM\_EXF DATE: 03/26/2025 04/28/2025

P.O. BOX 279 FLORENCE, CO 81226 ZLANGSTON@NEWLCI.COM

Any person who knowingly removes, alters or defaces any Public Land Survey Monument or Land Boundary Monument or Accessory commits a class two (2) misdemeanor pursuant to Colorado State Statute 18—4—508, of the Colorado Révised Statutes LINEAL UNITS Lineal units = U.S. Survey foot = 1.00' = 12 inche

Crown	Point	Land Services	NOTES	BASIS
19-275-5005	Office	391 Arrowhead Drive	This survey does not constitute a title search by Crown Point Land Services to determine	Bearing
.O. Box 749 anon City, CO	81215-0749	Florissant, CO 80816 crown.land@outlook.com	ownership. No Title Commitment was provided by the client. Easements are as shown, no other easements were requested to be researched for this survey.	SECTIO

ings are based on G.P.S. observation on the NORTH line of NW1/4NW1/4 10N 21 as being S 89°45'12'' E AS SHOWN HEREON.

George R. Hall, C.P.L.S. 38118



# **Exhibit G: Water Information**

We plan on purchasing water from the Minnequa Canal.

This Canal is on record as being owned by CF&I (Colorado Fuel & Iron Company). To our knowledge, CF&I sold to Rocky Mountain Steel, and then they sold to Evraz North America. This is a privately owned water feature. The canal will not be jeopardized in any form from the extraction activities. The canal right-of-way borders the gravel pit on the North/ North-East side. We plan on running a water line from there to the wash plant location.

We have been in communication with the managing engineer (Brad Zerfas) in charge of the Minnequa Canal and they are receptive to our water needs. We learned there is a similar water take-up located down river from us for similar gravel pit operations. It is our intention to "borrow" the ideas at this location to do the same thing at our take-up location. It will be our burden to install all take-up features in the ditch. Evraz is only going to sell the water. They are not responsible for any ownership and/or maintenance of the materials once installed.

Dealing with Mr. Zerfas at Evraz has proven to be difficult in the past. He is receptive to what we are proposing but appears to be extremely pre-occupied with his duties at Evraz and only provides communications at his discretions. While we do not criticize how the Ezraz Canal is managed, we have found it difficult to get anything done in a timely manner. Prior dealings have taught us that patience is a virtue and those virtues are strained when attempting to contact the management division of the Canal.

In light of this, we have arranged to purchase water from the Florence Municipal water district in Florence, Co. Please see the attached Exhibit G Florence Water Agreement. The City of Florence has multiple avenues available for obtaining water. We were planning on pulling water from their bulk water station and transporting it via water truck to the gravel pit. The station where the water is obtained keeps count on gallons and generates a fee via the system the City uses for water billing. We tried this for a while, (while filling the pond) but have since determined that it is more of a burden to handle than what we are willing to deal with.

If need be, we could have also pulled water from a fire hydrant through a hydrant meter. In this instance, we obtain a meter from the City Water District and place a deposit down for the meter until it is returned. The meter is then used and must be checked in once a month for a meter reading. The reading tracks the water usage and is then transferred to the billing system the City uses for water billing. We also tried this as a solution. It also turned out to be a wasted effort as the meter was stolen off the hydrant during the day while we were using it. We had to replace it and give it back to the City. Managing the meter's location proved to be too difficult for our personnel to handle.

It was also discovered after a couple billing cycles from the City that they were having a terribly difficult time billing us correctly for some reason. Meter readings were inconsistent and vague at



best. At one point they determined that the meter had stopped reading only to redact that statement the following month when they discovered they had made an accounting error. We did, however, discover a large difference in water cost pulled from the fire hydrant vs. water pulled from the bulk station. Once we made this discovery, we internally decided to abandon the idea of trying to get water from the City. It is still an option in the event a problem arises out of the Minnequa Canal, but we determined it is not going to be a stable long term solution for what we are attempting to do at the wash plant facility.

We do not anticipate needing any water for processing sand from the City Water District. Utilizing them is simply a viable back-up.

We have been working on this wash plant system for over a year. Our biggest hurdle thus far has been coming up with a consistent and reliable water source. We recently learned that Mr. Zerfas was relieved of his duties with Evraz. A new canal manager has been hired. His name is Chad Ones and has thus far proven to be a much better human being than the person that held the position previously. Attached you will find our water lease agreement with Evraz as well as a legal right to enter letter. All of which was made possible by the cooperation and coordination of Mr. Ones. We will be obtaining all our water for wash plant processing from Evraz through the lease agreement and it will come from water they own out of the Minnequa Canal. We are going to meter the water and report to Evraz weekly. Please see the attached Exhibit G Evraz Water Lease for reference.

In regards to our stormwater permit with the CDPHE, we determined we are permitted for processing sand after reviewing the permit. Attached to this exhibit you will find our COG500000 discharge permit. Our certification # is COG501737.

Part IA.1 lists activities covered on page 5. If you note page 5 of the permit; about half way down the page under Part I.A.1.a. Eligible Process water discharges it lists everything allowed to discharge water from. Including dimension stone, crushed stone, construction sand & gravel, & industrial sand. It is our understanding that the COG500000 permit is a generalized permit that lists out basic requirements for discharges. Obtaining a certification # gives us authorization to discharge and outlines specific requirements.

If you refer to the 2<sup>nd</sup> attachment to exhibit G, you will find our certification # (GOG501737) and the requirements to comply with. Including Visual Monitoring, WQBEL/Water Quality Standards, & Reporting.

Further communication with the CDPHE WQCD has yielded that as long as we are not discharging any of our process water to the discharge location on the property and thereby to State owned water, we are clear to do as we wish. We were asked if we were creating a closed loop system, which we are. We were told that as long as we are keeping the process water contained within the wash plant system there is no need to modify the existing stormwater permit.



There are no known aquifers within the vicinity of the gravel pit. Please see attached Exh. G. Aquifer information pulled from the Colorado State University.

Please also see attached Exh. G. e-mail communication with the Army Core of Engineers regarding the potential impact to water resources. It is our understanding that as long as we are not discharging dredged or fill material into waters of the United States that no additional action is required. Since we are setting up the wash plant as a closed loop system- where we will be recycling/reclaiming used water- there will be no dredged or fill material discharged into the waters of the United States.

It is anticipated that the wash plant we are planning on installing is going to use approximately 1 million gallons of water a month. We are planning on operating the wash plant 5-6 months out of the year given the cold weather temperatures.

It is also estimated that the pump we plan on installing to convey water to the wash plant is rated at 1200 gallons per minute.

None of the water we plan on utilizing for the wash plant has anything to do with the development or reclamation phases of the permitted property. It is being purchased for the sole purposes of washing sand.





# Southern Colorado Engineering

Professional Engineering Services

1109 Elkhorn Road \* Cotopaxi, Colorado \* 719-792-9771

Engineering Evaluation Potential Damage to Man-Made Structures

> Langston Concrete DRMS Permit M-1992-051 Florence, CO.

> > 6/15/2025



## Table of Contents

1.	Purpose of report Page 2
2.	General topography of the area Page 2
3.	General description of property Page 2
4.	Soils Investigation Page 3
5.	Analysis and criteria Page 3
6.	Conclusions and recommendations Page 4
7.	Attachments;
	Attachment A – General Pit Layout (aerial view taken from the Fremont County GIS) Page 5
	Attachment B – General Pit Layout including residences located at the North end Page 6
	Attachment C – Pre-Mining Site Plan Page 7 (including HYRCAN slope analysis)
	Attachment D – Section View with reclaimed slopes Page 8 (including HYRCAN slope analysis)
	Attachment E – Proposed Reclamation Plan View Page 9

### 1. <u>Purpose of report;</u>

Langston Concrete Inc. presently owns and operates a sand and gravel extraction operation South of Florence Colorado as noted on Division of Reclamation and Mine Safety (DRMS) permit M-1992-051 and as shown on the attachments. The mine owner has requested Southern Colorado Engineering to perform an investigation with respect to possible damage to private residences or structures located adjacent to the mining operation at the North end of the pit. This report is being submitted to meet permitting requirements where structures agreements cannot be reached and is being submitted in lieu of signed structures agreements with the residents located along Johnson Street at the North end of the present operation. Although the mine I presently operated by Langston Concrete, there has been mining activities on the property by previous owners and only recently has it become a concern that completed structures agreements are not in place.

## 2. General topography of the area;

The subject property is located immediately South of the city of Florence and is bounded on the North side by Johnson Street where there are several residences within 200 ft of the sand/gravel extraction. Those properties are noted on the plan view taken from the Fremont County GIS System (attachments A & B).

The general area in the immediate vicinity of the property is an undeveloped rural area with only the Northern boundary between the existing pit and Johnson Street having any residences within 200 ft pr proposed mining.

The engineer of record has inspected the site and noted that the pit owner has placed berms and a substantial buffer between the face of the pit and the local residences. Reference also attachments B, C, and D.

## 3. General description of property:

The subject property is a 90.33 acre irregularly shaped property that has an address 480 South Union Street, Florence, CO. It is located immediately South of Florence Colorado 81226, and specific location details are shown on the attachments. The Fremont County GIS System Parcel Viewer shows the following information for the subject property;

Account Number N012335 Assessors Map No. 3939212000017 Assessors Schedule No. 99927123 Site Address (none) Owner Name Langston Concrete Inc. Subdivision (none) Legal Description Y 475.11 FT TO THE POB. TOG WITH AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS & EGRESS AS DESC IN B785-P209 TOTAL OF90.02 AC M/L P156622 Zone Jurisdiction FLORENCE GIS Acres 90.33

Please reference the attachments for specific location and orientation of the property.

Page 2

## 4. Soils Investigation:

Onsite observations noted the surface soil to be a sandy clay loam typical for the area, however there are several stratifications with different soils types. These are noted on attachment C "Pre-Mining site Plan" and as follows;



A review of the USDA Website for soils found that the portion of the pit adjacent to the residences along Johnson Street is made up of "Kimera-Cascajo" complex which is a mixture of loam, clay loam, gravelly sandy loam, and a gravelly sand at various depths. Density of the soil is estimated at 62.5 to 87.5 pounds/cubic ft.

As noted on the diagram above, the existing pit at the North end adjacent to the residences is presently only 15' deep. It is the owners intention to remove additional material to pursue an alluvial deposit located approximately 40 ft below the original grade. Although the depth of the alluvial layer varies, the owner does not plan to exceed a depth of 50 ft. Below the alluvial layer is a layer of shale that will remain in place.

## 5. Analysis and Criteria;

Presently the owner intends to continue to mine to the North end at the existing elevation of the bottom of the existing mining operation (approximately 5218 ft elevation) which will provide for maximum yield of the pits resources. The final configuration of the pit wall at the North end (adjacent to Johnson Street) is shown on appendix D. The purpose of this analysis is to review any possible hazards to the existing residences located along Johnson Street, which includes a slope stability analysis of the pit wall in the area adjacent to the existing residents.

Mining activities have been ongoing at this site by the current owner using mechanical extraction methods. The existing berms, fences, and setbacks are adequate to provide a sufficient buffer between the mining operation and the residences and subsequently prevent any damage to the existing residences from mining operations.

It is the owners intention to reclaim the area after mineral extraction to a 3;1 slope (3H; 1V) using surplus materials (clay/loam, etc.) that are not conducive to concrete batch operations and/or landscape materials.

A review of the slope stability using HYRCAN 2.0 software has found that in its final configuration (3;1 slope) the stability of the slope would have a factor of safety of approximately 1.35 indicating that it would be a stable slope and not subject to collapse.

It should be noted that in the unlikely event that the slope were to collapse it would only damage the face of the pit wall but enough material would not be displaced to damage the adjacent roadway (Johnson Street) or the adjacent residences.

It should also be noted that the 3:1 slope is only specified/required along the East-West property line adjacent to Johnson Street at the North end of the property. The final slope of the remainder of the pit walls is to be per agreement between the CDRMS and Langston Concrete.

## 6. Conclusions and Recommendations;

Mining activities have been ongoing at this site by the current owner and also by the previous owner, and there has been no damage to the existing structures located on the North side of Johnson Street. Based on the history of the site, the existing berms and setbacks are adequate to prevent any damage to the existing residences.

The owner intends to continue mining by excavation with scrapers, loaders, and excavators and no blasting is required.

A slope stability analysis based on the final reclaimed condition and a 3;1 slope has found that the final slope is stable (factor of safety of 1.35) and subsequently does not exhibit a threat of damage to the existing structures or any proposed new structures.

The final use of the property is intended to be industrial, however at this time the future use or proposed structures to be constructed on the property have not been defined and no projections of possible hazards associated with industrial operations on the site can be provided. If the final slope as defined in this report is not altered there should be no impact on future structures or uses of the pit.

Please note that this report only addresses the North end of the pit that is adjacent to Johnson Street, and all other areas are to be graded as agreed upon by the Colorado Department of Mine Reclamation & Safety (CDRMS) and Langston Concrete.

Any questions or concerns with respect to this report may be sent to me at the address below.

Cary "Joe" Lovett, PE Southern Colorado Engineering LLC 719-792-9771 1109 Elkhorn Road Cotopaxi, Colorado 81223 joe.lovett@forgedunderthemountain.com



Page 4









