"**G**"

Wastewater Feasibility Study

A. S. Vineyards Use Permit Modification – P19-00273 Zoning Administrator Hearing Date (January 27, 2021)

ONSITE WASTEWATER DISPOSAL FEASIBILITY STUDY

FOR THE

SODHANI WINERY USE PERMIT MODIFICATION

LOCATED AT: 3283 St. Helena Highway North St. Helena, CA 94574 NAPA COUNTY APN 022-080-028

> PREPARED FOR: Arvind Sodhani 85 21st Avenue San Francisco, CA 94121

Telephone: (415) 608-1565

PREPARED BY:



2074 West Lincoln Avenue Napa, California 94558 Telephone: (707) 320-4968 www.appliedcivil.com

Job Number: 14-102

Revision #I



Michael R. Muelrath

Michael R. Muelrath R.C.E. 67435

<u>5/8/2020</u> Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICESii	i
INTRODUCTIONI	
SOILS INFORMATION)
PREDICTED WASTEWATER FLOW2)
Winery Process Wastewater2)
Winery Sanitary Wastewater	}
Employees	}
Daily Tastings3	}
Total Peak Winery Sanitary Wastewater Flow	;
Combined Peak Wastewater Flow4	ŀ
RECOMMENDATIONS4	ŀ
Option #1 – Sanitary Wastewater Subsurface Drip Disposal Field and Process Wastewater Hold and Haul4	ł
Required Disposal Field Area4	ŀ
Available Disposal Field Area4	ŀ
Pretreatment and Septic Tank Capacity	;
Reserve Area	,
Winery Process Wastewater Disposal	;
Option #2 – Sanitary Wastewater Subsurface Drip Disposal Field and Process Wastewater Treatment for Irrigation6	ò
Required Disposal Field and Reserve Area	5
Pretreatment and Septic Tank Capacity6	
Process Wastewater Treatment & Disposal	, ,
Process Wastewater Disposal7	,
Required Disposal Field Area7	,
Available Disposal Field Area8	3
Pretreatment and Septic Tank Capacity8	}
Reserve Area	}
CONCLUSION	}

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Site Topography Map	9
APPENDIX 2: Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans	12
Reduced to 8.5" x 11"	12
APPENDIX 3: Water Storage Tank Water Balance Calculations	20
APPENDIX 4: Site Evaluation Reports	24

INTRODUCTION

Arvind Sodhani is applying for a Use Permit Modification to adjust the operational characteristics for a new winery at his property located at 3283 St. Helena Highway North in Napa County, California. The subject property, known as Napa County Assessor's Parcel Number 022-080-028 is accessed directly off of State Route 29, approximately 0.5 miles north of the intersection of State Route 29 and Ehlers Lane. The winery has been issued a Use Permit (P14-00402) but the facility has not yet been constructed.

The Use Permit Modification application under consideration proposes the following operational characteristics:

- Wine Production:
 - o 20,000 gallons of wine per year
 - Crushing, fermenting, aging and bottling
- Employees:
 - o 2 full time employees
 - o 2 part time employees
- Marketing Plan:
 - Daily Tours and Tastings by Appointment
 - I l visitors per day maximum
 - Private Food and Wine Pairings
 - 30 guests maximum
 - I0 events per year
 - Food prepared offsite by caterers
 - Private Wine Club and Release Events
 - 100 guests maximum
 - I event per year
 - Food prepared by offsite catering company
 - Portable toilets brought in for guests

Existing improvements on the property include a single family residence, accessory structures, approximately 6.3 acres of vineyard and the related access and utility infrastructure. Domestic wastewater from the existing residence is collected in a septic tank and disposed of in a leach field located just northeast of the residence, above the vineyard. Please refer to the Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans for approximate locations of existing and proposed features.

Arvind Sodhani has requested that Applied Civil Engineering Incorporated (ACE) evaluate the feasibility of disposing of the winery process wastewater as well as the domestic sanitary wastewater that will be generated by the proposed winery via a new onsite wastewater disposal system as part of the proposed Use Permit Modification. The remainder of this report describes the onsite soil conditions, the predicted process and sanitary wastewater flows and outlines the conceptual design of an onsite wastewater disposal system to serve the new winery facility as proposed under this Use Permit Modification. The systems outlined in this report

are similar to those of the original use permit with adjustments made to accommodate the proposed changed in use permit parameters.

SOILS INFORMATION

The United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service Soils Map for Napa County shows the entire property mapped as Boomer gravelly loam, 15 to 30 percent slopes.

A site specific soils analysis was conducted during site evaluations performed by Napa County on April 10, 2003 and April 23, 2003. The site evaluation consisted of the excavation and observation of eight test pits in vineyard portion of the property. The test pits generally revealed uniform soil conditions consisting of approximately 72 inches of acceptable clay loam soil.

Two additional site evaluations were performed by Napa County and Applied Civil Engineering Incorporated on December 6, 2016 to evaluate additional onsite areas and an area on a neighboring property that was subsequently added to the subject property via a lot line adjustment.

Please refer to the Site Evaluation Reports in Appendix 4 for additional details.

PREDICTED WASTEWATER FLOW

The onsite wastewater disposal system will be designed for the peak winery process wastewater flow and the peak sanitary wastewater flow from the proposed winery. The existing residence septic system will continue to serve the existing residence and reserve area for the two bedroom residence will also be included in the design of the new septic system reserve area.

Winery Process Wastewater

We have used the generally accepted standard that six gallons of winery process wastewater are generated for each gallon of wine that is produced each year and that 1.5 gallons of wastewater are generated during the crush period for each gallon of wine that is produced. Based on the size of the winery and our understanding that both red and white wines will be produced we have assumed a 30 day crush period. Using these assumptions, the average and peak winery process wastewater flows are calculated as follows:

Annual Winery Process Wastewater Flow =
$$\frac{20,000 \text{ gallons wine}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{6 \text{ gallons wastewater}}{1 \text{ gallon wine}}$$

Annual Winery Process Wastewater Flow = 120,000 gallons per year

Average Daily Winery Process Wastewater Flow = $\frac{120,000 \text{ gallons}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{1 \text{ year}}{365 \text{ days}}$

Average Daily Winery Process Wastewater Flow = 329 gallons per day (gpd)

Peak Winery Process Wastewater Flow = $\frac{20,000 \text{ gallons wine}}{\text{year}} \times \frac{1.5 \text{ gallons wastewater}}{\text{I gallon wine}} \times \frac{1 \text{ year}}{30 \text{ crush days}}$

Peak Winery Process Wastewater Flow = 1,000 gpd

Winery Sanitary Wastewater

The peak sanitary wastewater flow from the winery facility is calculated based on the number of winery employees, the number of daily visitors for tastings and the number of guests attending scheduled marketing events. In accordance with Table 4 of the Napa County "Regulations for Design, Construction, and Installation of Alternative Sewage Treatment Systems" we have used a design flow rate of 15 gallons per day per employee and 3 gallons per day per visitor for tastings. Table 4 does not specifically address design wastewater flows for guests at marketing events. Since all events will be catered we have conservatively assumed 5 gallons of wastewater per guest at marketing events.

Based on these assumptions, the peak winery sanitary wastewater flows are calculated as follows:

Employees

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 4 employees X 15 gpd per employee

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 60 gpd

Daily Tastings

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 11 visitors per day X 3 gallons per visitor

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 33 gpd

Marketing Event with Catered Meal (10 per year)

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 30 guests X 5 gallons per guest

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 150 gpd

Marketing Event with Catered Meal (I per year)

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 100 guests X 5 gallons per guest

Peak Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 500 gpd

Total Peak Winery Sanitary Wastewater Flow

In order to manage the peak sanitary wastewater flows a maximum of one event will be scheduled each day. Furthermore, for any events with more than 30 guests in attendance portable toilets will be used. Therefore, the worst case peak winery sanitary wastewater flow is calculated based on 4 employees, 11 visitors for tastings and a marketing event with 30 guests and a meal prepared by a caterer offsite. The peak flow for this scenario is calculated as follows:

Total Peak Winery Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 60 gpd + 33 gpd + 150 gpd

Total Peak Winery Sanitary Wastewater Flow = 243 gpd

Combined Peak Wastewater Flow

Combined Peak Wastewater Flow = Peak Winery Process Wastewater Flow + Total Peak Winery Sanitary Wastewater Flow

Combined Peak Flow = 1,000 gpd + 243 gpd

Combined Peak Flow = 1,243 gpd

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the proposed site configuration, onsite soil conditions and estimated wastewater flows we have determined that there are at least three options for properly disposing of the process and sanitary wastewater generated at the proposed winery. A summary of each option is presented in the following sections of this report.

Option #1 – Sanitary Wastewater Subsurface Drip Disposal Field and Process Wastewater Hold and Haul

In this scenario the sanitary wastewater would be disposed of in a subsurface drip type septic system and the winery process wastewater would be collected separately, temporarily stored and then would be hauled offsite for treatment and disposal by the Napa Sanitation District, East Bay Municipal Utility District or a similar municipal wastewater treatment plant.

Required Disposal Field Area

The disposal field area is calculated based upon the design hydraulic loading rate for the soil conditions and the proposed design flow. Since the slope of the natural ground surface in the area of the proposed disposal field is more than 20% a 150% adjustment factor is required to accommodate for the steep slopes. Based on these design parameters, the required disposal field area is calculated as follows:

Required Disposal Field Area = $\frac{\text{Peak Flow}}{\text{Soil Application Rate}} \times 150\%$ Required Disposal Field Area = $\frac{243 \text{ gpd}}{0.6 \text{ gpd per square foot}} \times 150\%$

Required Disposal Field Area = 608 square feet

Available Disposal Field Area

Based on the proposed site layout and topographic data prepared by Albion Surveys, we have determined that there is enough area to install at least 610 square feet of subsurface drip disposal

field in the vicinity of Test Pits #3B, #4B, #6B & #7B. The conceptual layout of the disposal field is shown on the Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans in Appendix 2.

Pretreatment and Septic Tank Capacity

Pretreatment must be provided to treat the wastewater to meet Napa County pretreated effluent standards (BOD<30 mg/l, TSS < 30 mg/l). There are several options for pretreatment systems that are available to meet this requirement. The Applicant and the Engineer will review options and select a suitable pretreatment system designed to meet this requirement prior to application for a sewage permit for the winery. Septic tanks will be sized in accordance with the requirements of the selected pretreatment system.

Reserve Area

Napa County code requires that an area be set aside to accommodate a future onsite wastewater disposal system in the event that the primary system fails or the soil in the primary area is otherwise rendered unsuitable for wastewater disposal. For subsurface drip type septic systems the reserve area must be 200% of the size of the disposal field area. The required reserve area must include capacity for the existing two bedroom residence (240 gpd) and is calculated as follows:

Required Reserve Area = $200\% \times \frac{\text{Peak Flow}}{\text{Soil Application Rate}} \times 150\%$

Require Reserve Field Area = $200\% \times \frac{483 \text{ gpd}}{0.6 \text{ gpd per square foot}} \times 150\%$

Required Reserve Area =2,415 square feet

Based on the proposed site plan we have determined that there is enough area to set aside for at least an additional 2,415 square feet of subsurface drip disposal field in the vicinity of Test Pits #6 and #7 as shown on the Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans in Appendix 2.

Winery Process Wastewater Disposal

The winery process wastewater hold and haul system must be designed to hold at least seven days of peak flow (7 days \times 1,000 gallons per day = 7,000 gallons), have a water level alarm and be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements for hold and haul systems as outlined in Napa County Code Section 13.52.035.

Winery Process Wastewater Disposal Reserve Area

Napa County Code requires that an onsite "reserve area" be designated for process wastewater hold and haul systems. The reserve area will be onsite pre-treatment and irrigation as described in Option #2 below.

Option #2 – Sanitary Wastewater Subsurface Drip Disposal Field and Process Wastewater Treatment for Irrigation

In this scenario the sanitary wastewater would be disposed of in a subsurface drip type septic system and the winery process wastewater would be collected separately, pretreated, stored and disposed of via surface irrigation in the vineyard, landscaping or on natural vegetation outside of the required well setbacks.

Required Disposal Field and Reserve Area

Sanitary wastewater disposal field and reserve areas are the same as described in Option #I above.

Pretreatment and Septic Tank Capacity

Sanitary wastewater pretreatment and septic tank requirements in this scenario are the same as previously described in Option #1 above.

Process Wastewater Treatment & Disposal

We recommend that treatment be achieved through the use of a package plant type system or other treatment system designed to accept winery process wastewater that is capable of meeting the following treatment requirements:

Parameter	Pre-treatment*	Post Treatment**			
pН	3 to 10	6 to 9			
BOD₅	500 to 12,000 mg/l	<160 mg/l			
TSS	40 to 800 mg/l	<80 mg/l			
SS	25 to 100 mg/l	<1 mg/l			

* Reference California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region General Waste Discharge Requirements Order No. R3-2008-0018 for winery process wastewater characteristics

** Required for discharge to land via surface irrigation by Napa County for samples taken at the discharge of the treatment unit.

Process Wastewater Disposal

To simplify this analysis we have assumed that final disposal of the treated effluent will be via surface drip irrigation in the vineyard. There are approximately 5.9 acres of vineyard area available outside of the required well setbacks. The treated process wastewater may also be able to be used for landscape irrigation outside of all required setbacks which would provide additional flexibility in operation of the disposal system. All application of treated winery process wastewater must comply with the requirements of the Napa County Winery Process Wastewater Guidelines for Surface Drip Irrigation and general wastewater setback requirements.

In order to accommodate differences in the timing of wastewater generation, irrigation demand and prohibitions on applying water to the land during rainy periods a storage tank will be required. We have prepared a water balance calculation to size a tank that will temporarily store wastewater generated at the winery before it is applied to the vineyard. The water balance calculation assumes a monthly wastewater generation rate and a monthly vineyard irrigation schedule based on our past experience with projects of this type. The water balance calculations show that the water generated by winery production operations each month can be effectively managed after treatment by applying it to the identified vineyard area. We recommend a minimum storage tank capacity of 10,000 gallons to provide operational flexibility in timing of land applications (see Appendix 4).

Option #3 Sanitary and Process Wastewater Subsurface Drip Disposal Field

In this scenario the sanitary and process wastewater streams from the winery would be combined, pretreated and disposed of via a subsurface drip disposal field similar to the disposal field described in Option #1 and Option #2.

Required Disposal Field Area

The disposal field area is calculated based upon the design hydraulic loading rate for the soil conditions and the proposed design flow. Since the slope of the natural ground surface in the area of the proposed disposal field is more than 20% a 150% adjustment factor is required to accommodate for the steep slopes. The system must accommodate the peak flow from the winery sanitary wastewater (243 gpd), and the winery process wastewater flow (1,000 gpd) for a total of 1,243 gpd. Based on these design parameters, the required disposal field area is calculated as follows:

Required Disposal Field Area = $\frac{\text{Peak Flow}}{\text{Soil Application Rate}} \times 150\%$

Required Disposal Field Area = $\frac{1,243 \text{ gpd}}{0.6 \text{ gpd per square foot}} \times 150\%$

Required Disposal Field Area = 3,108 square feet

Available Disposal Field Area

Based on the proposed site layout and topographic data prepared by Albion Surveys, we have determined that there is enough area to install at least 3,500 square feet of subsurface drip disposal field in the vicinity of Test Pits #3B, #4B, #6B & #7B. The conceptual layout of the disposal field is shown on the Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans in Appendix 2.

Pretreatment and Septic Tank Capacity

Pretreatment must be provided to treat the sanitary and process wastewater to meet Napa County pretreated effluent standards (BOD<30 mg/l, TSS < 30 mg/l). There are several options for pretreatment systems that are available to meet this requirement. The Applicant and the Engineer will review options and select a suitable pretreatment system designed to meet this requirement prior to application for a sewage permit for the winery. Septic tanks will be sized in accordance with the requirements of the selected pretreatment system.

<u>Reserve Area</u>

Napa County code requires that an area be set aside to accommodate a future onsite wastewater disposal system in the event that the primary system fails or the soil in the primary area is otherwise rendered unsuitable for wastewater disposal. For subsurface drip type septic systems, the reserve area must be 200% of the size of the disposal field area. The required reserve area must include capacity for the existing two bedroom residence (240 gpd) and is calculated as follows:

Required Reserve Area =
$$200\% \times \frac{\text{Peak Flow}}{\text{Soil Application Rate}} \times 150\%$$

Require Reserve Field Area = $200\% \times \frac{1,483 \text{ gpd}}{0.6 \text{ gpd per square foot}} \times 150\%$

Required Reserve Area =7,415 square feet

Based on the proposed site plan we have determined that there is enough area to set aside for at least an additional 8,200 square feet of subsurface drip disposal field in the vicinity of Test Pits #6 and #7 as shown on the Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans in Appendix 2.

CONCLUSION

It is our opinion that the wastewater from the proposed winery can be accommodated in either of the three options previously described. Full design calculations and construction plans for the wastewater system(s) must be prepared in accordance with Napa County standards at the time of building permit application.

APPENDIX I: Site Topography Map





2074 West Lincoln Avenue Napa, CA 94558 (707) 320-4968 (707) 320-2395 Fax www.appliedcivil.com

SODHANI WINERY

3283 ST. HELENA HIGHWAY NORTH ST. HELENA, CA 94574 APN 022-080-004

JOB NO. 14-102

PAGE I OF I

MAY 2020

APPENDIX 2: Sodhani Winery Use Permit Modification Conceptual Site Plans

Reduced to 8.5" x 11"



3030 VINTED CAF EREINERING INCONORVIED





© 3039 Year ED CWF ENGINEERING INCOMONY 4000

APPENDIX 3: Water Storage Tank Water Balance Calculations

			Land	
	Beginning	Process	Application	
Month	Balance	Wastewater	Capacity	Ending Balance
January	0	6,000	128,159	0
February	0	6,000	128,159	0
March	0	6,000	128,159	0
April	0	4,800	128,159	0
May	0	4,800	71,104	0
June	0	6,000	177,761	0
July	0	12,000	177,761	0
August	0	15,600	234,816	0
September	0	30,000	234,816	0
October	0	15,600	199,264	0
November	0	7,200	128,159	0
December	0	6,000	128,159	0
	-	120,000	I,864,478	-

Notes:

1. All values shown above for beginning balance, inflow, outflow and ending balance are in units of gallons.

2. See attached tables for detailed explanation of process wastewater and irrigation data presented in this table.

3. This water balance is based on the assumption that the tank is empy in August, just prior to crush.

4. Where irrigation demand exceeds available treated wastewater availability additional irrigation water will be provided by another source.

Annual Wine Production Wastewater Generation Rate Annual Wasewater Generation

Crush Season Length

Wastewater Generated During Crush

Peak Wastewater Generation Rate

20,000 gallons

6 gallons per gallon of wine

120,000 gallons

30 days

1.5 gallons per gallon of wine

1,000 gallons per day

Winery Process Wastewater Generation Table						
	Percentage of	Monthy Flow	Average Flow			
Month	Annual Total	(gallons)	(gpd)			
January	5.0%	6,000	194			
February	5.0%	6,000	214			
March	5.0%	6,000	194			
April	4.0%	4,800	I 60			
May	4.0%	4,800	155			
June	5.0%	6,000	200			
July	10.0%	12,000	387			
August	13.0%	15,600	503			
September	25.0%	30,000	1,000			
October	13.0%	15,600	503			
November	6.0%	7,200	240			
December	5.0%	6,000	194			
Total	100.0%	120,000				

Notes:

I. Wastewater generation rates and monthly proportioning are based on our past experience with similar projects.

vineyaru information.	
Total acres of vines	5.9 acres
Vine Row Spacing	5 feet
Vine Spacing	3 feet
Vine density	2,904 vines per acre (average)
Total Vine Count	17,134 vines

Irrigation Information:

Vinovard Information:

Seasonal Irrigation¹

Non-Irrigation Application

0.8 inches

October through April

41.5 gallons per vine (May through October)

Irrigation Schedule							
				Non-Seasonal			
		Irrigation		Irrigation			
	Monthly	per Vine	Irrigation	Application	Total		
Month	Percentage ²	(gallons)	(gallons)	(gallons)	(gallons)		
January		0.0	0	128,159	128,159		
February		0.0	0	128,159	128,159		
March		0.0	0	128,159	128,159		
April		0.0	0	128,159	128,159		
May	10%	4.2	71,104	0	71,104		
June	25%	10.4	177,761	0	177,761		
July	25%	10.4	177,761	0	177,761		
August	١5%	6.2	106,657	128,159	234,816		
September	١5%	6.2	106,657	128,159	234,816		
October	10%	4.2	71,104	128,159	199,264		
November		0.0	0	128,159	128,159		
December		0.0	0	128,159	128,159		
Total	100%	41.5	711,044	1,153,434	I,864,478		

Notes:

I. Irrigation per vine is based on 0.37 acre-feet per acre of vines per Vineyard Manager.

2. Monthly vineyard irrigation percentages are based on our past experience with projects of this type.

3. Non-Irrigation Application is for managing tank levels and assumes a maximum of 5 operational

days per month based on historic weather data (Summit Engineering NBRID Capacity Study, 1996)

and a saturated soil infiltration rate of 0.1 gallons per square foot per day uniformly over the entire area.

APPENDIX 4: Site Evaluation Reports

62 - 14448 EXOLUST FOR SITE WALLATION TASPECTION SUPERIMENTAL HEALTH DEFT. USE ONLY FEE: $5/4/9.00$ PARCEL NUMBER: $22 - 080 - 04$ DATE: $10/2.9/02$ DATE: $10/2.9/02$ DATE: $10/2.9/02$ DATE: $10/2.9/02$ DATE: $10/2.9/02$ DATE: 2.4857 DOMEST: $91000000000000000000000000000000000000$	02-39
ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEFT. USE ONLY FEE: $3/4/9$. OO DATE: $10/2.9/02$ RECEIT: 2.4857 BY: CQ TYPE OF TEST: FIELD ANALYSIS TEST CONDUCTED BY: $AOT+C/f$ TYPE OF TEST: FIELD ANALYSIS To be run on $\frac{11}{12/02}$ at $10:\infty$ @ pra To be run on $\frac{11}{12/02}$ at $10:\infty$ @ pra To be run on $\frac{11}{12/02}$ at $10:\infty$ @ pra To be run on $\frac{11}{10/02}$ at $10:\infty$ @ pra To be run on $\frac{11}{10/02}$ at $10:\infty$ @ pra To be run on $\frac{11}{10/02}$ gpd ************************************	$\frac{\text{NAPA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT}}{\text{REQUEST FOR SITE EVALUATION INSPECTION}} S2 - 14448$
PROMANDA PARCEL NUMBER: $22 - 080 - 04$ JOB ADDRESS: 3283 54464 4424 JOB ADDRESS: 3283 54464 4424 RECEIPT: 24857 95064 9506764 BY: CQ TEST CONDUCTED BY: $D074614$ TO be run on 1412402 at 10:00 mpr To be run on $_{16706}$ em/pm to $_{pm}$ PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: 4 4 PROJECTED WASTERATER FLOWS: $MMybc$ 0020 gpd Pre-soak checked? yes no Length of pre-soak: 0020 gpd Pre-soak checked? yes no Length of pre-soak: 0020 gpd Statilized perc rate: $MMybc$ 0020 gpd Checked by: Date: $8tabilized$ perc rate: 16000 fpre-soak: Statilized perc rate: $x \cdot 6$	ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPT. USE ONLY
PARE:	# # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #
DATE:	PLE: $\sqrt{3700}$ PARCEL NUMBER: $\frac{720500}{1000}$
RECEIPT: 24857 BY: GQ TEST CONDUCTED BY: DG(4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4c/4	DATE: 10129102 JOB ADDRESS: 3203 0110, 11000
BY:	RECEIPT: 24857 OWNER: JOODO JOOD JOOD
TYPE OF TEST: FIELD ANALYSIS PERCOLATION TEST To be run on II/r2/02 at 10:00 mpn To be run onfroman/pm topm PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: Y VINERT: Y OTEER: PROJECTED WASTEWATER FLOWS:	BY: Conducted By: Martelt
TYPE OF TEST: FIELD ANALYSIS FERCOLATION TEST To be run on 11/12/02 at 10:00 mpn To be run on from am/pm to pm PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: // (U) (D) mpn PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: // (U) (D) mpn PROJECTED WASTEWATER FLOWS:	
To be run on [1][12[02] at 10:00 m] pn To be run onfromam/pn topn FURFOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: // HUINERY: // OTHER: PROJECTED WASTEWATER FLOWS:	TYPE OF TEST: FIELD ANALYSIS PERCOLATION TEST
PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: Y (WINERY: OTHER:	To be run on 11/12/02 at 10:00 am pm To be run on from am/pm topm
PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: Y Y INERY: Y PROJECTED WASTEWATER FLOWS: Muybe 1050 gpd ************************************	<u>Ular</u>
PROJECTED WASTENATER FLOWS: Mulphe 1020 gpd ************************************	PURPOSE OF TEST: HOUSE: X Q WINERY: X OTHER:
************************************	PROJECTED WASTEWATER FLOWS: gpd
Pre-soak checked? yes no Length of pre-soak:	**************************************
The soak checker yes Ino Date: Checked by:	Pro-cosk shocked? reg reg length of pro-cosk:
Checked by:	Pre-soar checked: yes ho Length of pre-soar
Rate at time of inspection:	Checked by: Date:
Gravel and Pipe Used? yes no If so, take the perc rate x .6 = in/hr ************************************	Rate at time of inspection: Stabilized perc rate:
STANDARD SYSTEM Acceptable soil to: _72" / Assigned perc range: 1-3 / 2-6 / 6-12 Depth of trenches:/ Rock under pipe:/ Cover over rock: Lineal feet of leachline required: Depends work / Plot plan received: STANDARD SYSTEM Acceptable soil to: _72" / Assigned perc range: 1-3 / 2-6 / 6-12 Depth of trenches:/ Rock under pipe:/ Cover over rock: Lineal feet of leachline required: Depends work / Plot plan received: Slope: ~10% / Surface drainage problems: SPECIAL DESIGN SYSTEM DUE TO THE FOLLOWING - Size constraints: Perc rate too slow: /Perc rate too fast: /Steep slope: Insufficient soil depth: /High seasonal groundwater:	Gravel and Pipe Used? yes no If so, take the perc rate x .6 *in/hr
STANDARD SYSTEM Acceptable soil to:/ Assigned perc range: 1-3 / 1-6 / 6-12 Depth of trenches:/ Rock under pipe:/ Cover over rock: Lineal feet of leachline required: Depends upon / Plot plan received: Market filter Slope: ~10% / 10% <	**************************************
Acceptable soil to:	STANDARD SYSTEM
Depth of trenches: / Rock under pipe: / Cover over rock: Lineal feet of leachline required: Depends upon / Plot plan received: Slope: ^^10% / Surface drainage problems: NONL NOKC Additional information:	Acceptable soil to: $72''$ / Assigned perc range: 1-3 / $3-6$ / 6-12
Lineal feet of leachline required: Depends upon / Plot plan received:	Depth of trenches:/ Rock under pipe:/ Cover over rock:
Slope: ~10% / Surface drainage problems: NON MOKE Additional information:	Lineal feet of leachline required: Depends upon / Plot plan received:
Additional information:	Slope: ~10% / Surface drainage problems: NONE NOVE
SPECIAL DESIGN SYSTEM DUE TO THE FOLLOWING - Size constraints: Perc rate too slow: /Perc rate too fast: /Steep slope: Insufficient soil depth: /High seasonal groundwater: Acceptable soil for special design: /Other problems: E-H. Specialist KMM WUMAN Date 4-10-03	Additional information:
SPECIAL DESIGN SYSTEM DUE TO THE FOLLOWING - Size constraints: Perc rate too slow: /Perc rate too fast: /Steep slope: Insufficient soil depth: /High seasonal groundwater: Acceptable soil for special design: /Other problems: E-H. Specialist KMM WUMMW Date 4-10-0.3	·
Perc rate too slow: /Perc rate too fast: /Steep slope: Insufficient soil depth: /High seasonal groundwater: Acceptable soil for special design: /Other problems: E-H. Specialist KM WWMW Date 4-10-03	SPECIAL DESIGN SYSTEM DUE TO THE FOLLOWING - Size constraints:
Insufficient soil depth:/High seasonal groundwater: Acceptable soil for special design:/Other problems: E.H. Specialist KMM WUMMW Date 4-10-03	Perc rate too slow: /Perc rate too fast: /Steep slope:
Acceptable soil for special design: /Other problems: E-H. Specialist Kim WUHMW Date 4-10-0.3	Insufficient soil depth: /High seasonal groundwater:
E.H. Specialist Kim WYMM Date 4-10-03	Acceptable soil for special design: /Other problems:
E.H. Specialist Kim Withme Date 4-10-03	Contraction for the contraction and the second
E.H. Specialist KM WHMW Date 4-10-03	
	E.H. Specialist KM WHMW Date 4-10-03

.7

FIELD ANALYSIS

TEXTURE (In the proposed trench zone)

<u> </u>	LAY	CONTE	NT		5	SAND CO	ONTENT		GRAVEL, COB	BLE S	TONT	ະ ແມນ	יזא עידיני	г
Core Hole 1	2	3 4	5.6	Core Hol	.e Ī	2 3	4 5	- 6	Core Hole	<u>,</u>	21	3 2		A T
Low (<12)				High (>S	<u>io)</u> —				Very High (>60)	┝╧┼	<u>-</u>	+-	≁
Mod (12-27)	436	LVL	·	_ Mod (20-	-50) 🐺	\mathbf{Y}			High(35-60)		┝─┼╸	-+		+-
High (27-40) /		11 7	<u>^</u> .	Low (<20) 75				Mod (15-35)	~	<u>├</u>	-+-		+
High (>40)	_		•	·····		t	1 - 1 - 1		Low (<15)	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$		নাম		
			1 1 -							بكنهم	~~-	<u>x v</u>		
* * * * * * *	* *	* * *	* * *	* * * * *	* *	* * *	* * * *	* * *	* * * * * *	* * *	* *	. * *	* *	. *
STRUCTURE				,										
COTT EDucard						Unic	Ê	' ~					/	,
SULL DENSIT	Y WH	EN PIC	CKED (Circle whe	ther ·	we War	dry)		CONSIST	ENCE (Circ	le ^{VVI} #	10 <u>5</u> 7	<u>a</u>)
core noie				5.95 S. 5	1 2	3	4 5	6	Core Hole	1	23	4	5	6
pick sturis or	cav	es sou	ll in		¥ ¥	11/	V V		Easy	N.	11 1		10	<u> </u>
pick bites and	so1.	⊥.slui	IS.						Moderate	777			*†	
prev pres/ 11	ccie	orno	soil	sluffs					Hard		1			-
	נמידים	ממווייייו	- Caro	4				•						
				<u>IO</u> .			MODI	FIER	CHARACTERIST	ICS				•
Granular	1-1	-3 4	1 2 1 0	- 12 0.11										
Blocky	1 74	210	+ -		L Surv	zey Nai	ne:		·	<u> </u>	• •			
Prismenses _A		<u>≯†x</u>									<i>i</i>			
Platy	┿┈┼			2) nori	zon f	soundai	ries: D	itfuse	≜ Gradu	al <u>X</u>	(Ab	rupt		_ ·
Massive	+			3) Ton	a de la comb									
Cemented	ff-		┝──╉╌━━	. 57 1090	grap	iy: Coi	icave		Convex	/ A	spec	;t:	<u> </u>	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	╃╼╍╌╀			4) Veze	tatio	n: Tvr	in VIA	il.	id c			am	1	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·								- Jor		000101	on:	200	<u> </u>	<u>-</u> .
* * * * * * * *	* *	* *	* * *	* * * * *	* * *	* * * *	• * * *	* * *	* * * * * * *	* * *	* ×	* *	÷ ±	
د. مربعات معمد مربع					ORE	OLE RE	CORD		· , ,					-
HOL	E #1		EST.	1 -	,	HOLE #	12	EST.		- HO1	# ج	2	FCT	,
E.S. N.S. 2.	**	#	PERC		s		7	PERC				2	000	- -
0 to (20"/0a/	n	day	346	o to	304	Dam-	1 Lan	241	to				LEV	0
2-11 100	4 44 43, WH	- loan	1. 14 L + K 14			oam	0	. <u></u>		e .	,	<u> </u>	, •	
20 to 38 d	an	loam	<u> </u>	20" to	U2r	Clan	loam	⊴=3	to	CO	m	C		
3210"	<u> </u>		, . , .			5			-		- عمر			.
20 to 18 11	<u>hte</u>	<u>clay!</u>	aur te	$\frac{4}{2} \frac{4}{2}$ to	72	tight	erclan	-1-3	to	a/-	21	······································		
Peerer tould	······		r``		k	ram_	- 0-	· · · · · ·			•			- .
Color: total	<u>nz +</u>	000	·	Roots:	·				Roots:		5			
Water Tables	1 . C	aul		Color:	br	ight	/ dul	1	Color:	brigh	<u>ال</u>	/ 8	lul1	 n
Diginary / hard	1 4	IDECP		Water La	ble:	NOL-	ndea	<u> </u>	Water Tabl	e: <u>/</u>	<u>101</u>	no	<u>ted</u>	<u>/</u>
Acceptable Soil		1.5.5 / 1.Cii	smear	Dugleasy		rd / d	usty /	spear	Dug easy /	hard /	dust	:y _/e	meat	C
	10.	<u>-40</u>		Acceptab.	le 201	LL TOI	10	<u>.</u>	Acceptable	Soil	To:	10	<u>ди</u>	_
44.91 m f F &					WE H	N.R 97	תפראי	•						•
HOLE	. #4		EST.	, <u>∽</u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	TOLE #	5	EST	11/12/02	. 101	₩ #¢		200	
			PERC	\$	-		<u> </u>	PERC	4,000	HOL	E VO) *	591 - 597 -	, 4
0 to 52 0	an	→ .	3-6	to					1 n to	26"			1.1	ź
class.	la	100					0			1 11	(m 1	·		3
20 to 72-Al	an	loam	<u> </u>	to	. 4	Sar	· / · · ·	· · · · ·	36 to	$\frac{1}{1}$	6-1-10	<u> 2 2 m</u>	1-5	>
	<u> </u>	<u>.</u>				Ċ.a	9] ē	lan 1		······································	حرب	".
		<u> </u>		to		ω			to					
Roots:			· . ·	· • · · · · ·										•
Color: Aright		2 7 7	}	KOOTS:					Roots:					
Water Tables 10	nt.		C	Color:	ori	ght	/ dull	L	Color:	bright	E,	/ đ	111	
Dug: exer / hard	<u> </u>	et v		water lab	те:]	<u>vot r</u>	wa		Water Table	: 		<u> </u>		
Acceptable Sofl	r ua To:	7-2"	TB:SHO	Accentral	/ nar	α / đu 1 π	ISTY / 8 ·ブール	Teear	Dug:easy /1	hard /	iusty	7 /si	ear	
· · ·		10	I	acceptabl	e 301	* TO:	10		Acceptable	Soil 3	·o: _	<u> </u>		
• *				ي م ل ر	° C)-tjær	Cin	Joan	/ hugen br	3				
TS/NJP/JP/ts SP-	1 -	11-26-	-89		4	o	- 1 0-13-0	م ماد.	ما به معدا ا	Ja 2	(_			
					-	. –			n a senerar é é distriction		-M-1			

Napa County Division of Environmental Health

SITE EVALUATION REPORT

Permit #: OE16-0002

APN: 022-080-004

(County Use Only)

Reviewed by:

Date:

Please attach an 8.5" x 11" plot map showing the locations of all test pits triangulated from permanent landmarks or known property corners. The map must be drawn to scale and include a North arrow, surrounding geographic and topographic features, direction and % slope, distance to drainages, water bodies, potential areas for flooding, unstable landforms, existing or proposed roads, structures, utilities, domestic water supplies, wells, ponds, existing wastewater treatment systems and facilities.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL INFORMATION

Property Owner AS Vineyards LLC	X New Construction Addition Remodel Relocation Other:
Property Owner Mailing Address	
85 21 st Avenue	X Residential - # of Bedrooms: 2 Design Flow : 240 gpd
City State Zip	
San Francisco CA 94121	X Commercial – Type: Winery
Site Address/Location 3283 St. Helena Highway North	Sanitary Waste: 60 gpd Process Waste: 600 gpd
St. Helena, CA 94574	□ Other:
	Sanitary Waste: gpd Process Waste: gpd

Evaluation Conducted By:

Evaluator's Name	Signature (Civil Engineer, R.E.H.S., Geologist, Soil Scientist)
Michael R. Muelrath, R.C.E. 67435	Míchael R. Muelrath
	Telephone Number (707) 320-4968
State Zip CA 94558	Date Evaluation Conducted December 6, 2016
-	Evaluator's Name Michael R. Muelrath, R.C.E. 67435 State Zip CA 94558

Primary Area	<u>E</u> >	Expansion Area				
Acceptable Soil Depth: 72" to 80" TP#1A – TP#5A		P#5A Ac	Acceptable Soil Depth: 72" to 80"			°P#1A - TP#5A
Soil Application Rate (gal. /sq. ft. /da	y): 0.6	So	oil Application Rate (gal. /sq.	ft. /day): 0.6		
System Type(s) Recommended: Pre	System Type(s) Recommended: Pretreatment and Subsurface Drip System Type(s) Recommended: Pretreatment and Subsurface				ubsurface Drip	
Slope: 15% to 30% Distan	ce to nearest water source	e: 100'+ Slo	lope: 15% to 30%	Distance to ne	arest wat	ter source: 100'+
Hydrometer test performed?	No □ Yes X (attach re	esults) Hy	lydrometer test performed?	No 🗆	Yes X	(attach results)
Bulk Density test performed?	No X Yes □ (attach re	esults) Bu	ulk Density test performed?	No X	Yes 🗆	(attach results)
Percolation test performed?	No X Yes □ (attach re	esults) Pe	ercolation test performed?	No X	Yes 🗆	(attach results)
Groundwater Monitoring Performed?	No X Yes 🛛 (attach re	esults) Gr	Froundwater Monitoring Perfo	rmed? No X	Yes 🗆	(attach results)

Site constraints/Recommendations:

This site evaluation was performed to find an area suitable to install a new septic system to serve a recently permitted winery and the existing residence. The feasibility study for the winery identified an area within the vineyard to accommodate the septic system and this evaluation was performed to locate soil outside of the vineyard for the new septic system. Final layout to be verified after winery site design is completed.

The main constraints are the property line setbacks, well setbacks and limited space available between the proposed site improvements and the existing vineyard. The existing well will have to be destroyed if the area of Test Pits #1A and #2A is utilized.

Page <u>2</u> of <u>3</u>

Test Pit #1A

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL INFORMATION

Horizon					C	onsistenc	е	Boroo	Deate	
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores	Roots	Mottling
0-36	G	0-15	CL	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/FM	FF	NONE
36-80		0-15	CL	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	FF/FM	FF	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 80"

Test Pit #2A

Horizon	Boundary				C	onsistenc	e	_		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores	Roots	Mottling
0-72		0-15	CL	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/FM	FF	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #3A

Horizon		%Rock	Deale Terter		C	consistenc	e	Boroo	Deate	M a tillin av
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	ucture Side Ped Wet Pores Roots Wall		Mottling			
0-72	G	0-15	CL	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/FM	FF	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #4A

Horizon		% Book			C	onsistenc	e	Damaa		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped Wet Pores Roots		Mottling		
0-72		0-15	CL	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #5A

Horizon		% Book	_		C	consistenc	e	Deree		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores Roots		Mottling
0-72		0-15	CL	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

				LEGEND				
Boundary	Texture	Structure		Consistence		Pores	Roots	Mottling
A=Abrupt <1"	S =Sand LS =Loamy	W=Weak M=Moderate	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Quantity:	Quantity:	Quantity:
C=Clear 1"- 2.5" G=Gradual 2.5"-5" D=Difuse >5"	Sand SL=Sandy Loam SCL=Sandy Clay Loam SC=Sandy Clay CL=Clay Loam C=Clay SiC=Silty Clay SiCL=Silty Clay Loam SiL=Silt Loam Si=Silt	S=Strong G=Granular PI=Platy Pr=Prismatic C=Columnar B=Blocky AB=Angular Blocky SB=Subangular Blocky M=Massive SG=Single Grain CEM=Cemented	L=Loose S=Soft SH=Slightly Hard H=Hard VH=Very Hard ExH=Extremely Hard	L=Loose VFRB=Very Friable FRB=Friable F=Firm VF=Very Firm ExF=Extremely Firm	NS=NonSticky SS=Slightly Sticky S=Sticky VS=Very Sticky NP=NonPlastic SP=Slightly Plastic P=Plastic VP=Very Plastic	F=Few C=Common M=Many Size: VF=Very Fine F=Fine M=Medium C=Coarse VC=Very Coarse	F=Few C=Common M=Many Size: F=Fine M=Medium C=Coarse VC=Very Coarse ExC=Extremely Coarse	F=Few C=Common M=Many Size: F=Fine M=Medium C=Coarse Contrast: Ft=Faint D=Distinct P=Prominent

Notes:

Structure is recorded as Modifier then Structure - for example, Moderate (M) Subangular Blocky (SB) is recorded as MSB Pores and Roots are recorded as Quantity then Size – for example Few (F) Coarse (C) is recorded as FC Mottling is recorded as Quantity then Size then Contrast – for example Few (F) Coarse (C) Distinct (D) is recorded as FCD

SCALE: |" = 2.000'

- I. TEST PITS IA THROUGH 5A (TP #IA TP #5A) WERE EXCAVATED BY McCOLLUM GENERAL ENGINEERING AND WERE WITNESSED BY MIKE MUELRATH OF APPLIED CIVIL ENGINEERING INCORPORATED AND DARELL CHOATE OF THE NAPA COUNTY PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT - ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION ON DECEMBER 6, 2016.
- 2. FADED BACKGROUND REPRESENTS EXISTING TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES. TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED FROM THE "MAP OF TOPOGRAPHY OF A PORTION OF THE LANDS OF 3283 ST. HELENA HIGHWAY" PREPARED BY ALBION SURVEYS, INC., DATED JUNE 30, 2014. APPLIED CIVIL ENGINEERING INCORPORATED ASSUMES NO LIABILITY REGARDING THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THE TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.
- 3. CONTOUR INTERVAL: ONE (1) FOOT, HIGHLIGHTED EVERY FIVE (5) FEET
- 4. BENCHMARK: NAPA COUNTY BENCHMARK NO. 505-U, ELEVATION = 349.19'
- 5. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS WERE OBTAINED FROM THE NAPA COUNTY GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) DATABASE AND ARE DATED APRIL 9, 2011.
- 6. ACCORDING TO THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA) FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP (FIRM) MAP NUMBER 06055C0245E, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 26, 2008, THE PROJECT SITE IS NOT LOCATED IN A SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA.

NOTES:

2074 West Lincoln Avenue Napa, CA 94558 (707) 320-4968 (707) 320-2395 Fax www.appliedcivil.com

AS VINEYARDS LLC

3283 ST. HELENA HIGHWAY NORTH ST. HELENA, CA 94574 APN 022-080-004

JOB NO. 14-102

PAGE I OF 3

DECEMBER 2016

JOB NO. 14-102

PAGE 3 OF 3

DECEMBER 2016

SOIL PERCOLATION SUITABILITY CHART

Instructions:

- 1. Plot texture on triangle based on percent sand, silt, and clay as determined by hydrometer analysis.
- 2. Adjust for coarse fragments by moving the plotted point in the sand direction an additional 2% for each 10% (by volume) of fragments greater than 2mm in diameter.
- 3. Adjust for compactness of soil by moving the plotted point in the clay direction an additional 15% for soils having a bulk-density greater than 1.7 gm/cc.

Note:

For soils falling in sand, loamy sand or sandy loam classification bulk density analysis will generally not affect suitability and analysis not neccesary.

Napa County Division of Environmental Health

SITE EVALUATION REPORT

Permit #: OE16-00003

APN: 022-080-016

(County Use Only)

Reviewed by:

Date:

Please attach an 8.5" x 11" plot map showing the locations of all test pits triangulated from permanent landmarks or known property corners. The map must be drawn to scale and include a North arrow, surrounding geographic and topographic features, direction and % slope, distance to drainages, water bodies, potential areas for flooding, unstable landforms, existing or proposed roads, structures, utilities, domestic water supplies, wells, ponds, existing wastewater treatment systems and facilities.

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL INFORMATION

Property Owner Dorothea Lyman		х	New Construction	n 🗆	Addition	□ Remodel		Relocation
			Other:					
Property Owner Mailing Address 1088 Candlewood Avenue		ХІ	Residential - # of I	Bedroor	ms: 2	Design Flow :	240	gpd
City State Sunnyvale CA	Zip 94089	х	Commercial – Ty	vpe: Wi	nery			
Site Address/Location No Site Address			Sanitary Waste:	60	gpd	Process Was	te: 60	0 gpd
St. Helena Highway North St. Helena, CA 94574			Other:					
			Sanitary Waste:		gpd	PFOCESS Was	e:	gpd
Evaluation Conducted By:						R. MUE	S	
Company Name	Evaluator's Name			Signa	ty e ovil Engin	eer, R.E.H.S., Geol	igist So	Scientist)
Applied Civil Engineering Incorporated	Michael R. Muelrath, R.C.E. 67	435		Μί	anel R	Muelra	the	
Mailing Address: 2074 West Lincoln Avenue				Telep (707)	one Number 820-4968	5. 12/31/2020)×	
City Napa	State Zip CA 94558	3		Date I Decer	Eveluation Co mbe 6, 2016	onducted	Ŋ	/

Primary Area			Expansion Area						
Acceptable Soil Depth: 60" to 72"		TP#1 – TP#7	Acceptable Soil Depth: 60" to	72"		TP#1 – TP#7			
Soil Application Rate (gal. /sq. ft.	/day): 0.8		Soil Application Rate (gal. /sq. ft. /day): 0.8						
System Type(s) Recommended:	Pretreatment and S	Subsurface Drip	System Type(s) Recommende	d: Pretreatme	ent and S	ubsurface Drip			
Slope: 15% to 30% Dis	tance to nearest wa	ater source: 100'+	Slope: 15% to 30%	Distance to ne	arest wat	er source: 100'+			
Hydrometer test performed?	No 🗆 Yes X	(attach results)	Hydrometer test performed?	No 🗆	Yes X	(attach results)			
Bulk Density test performed?	No X Yes 🗆	(attach results)	Bulk Density test performed?	No X	Yes 🗆	(attach results)			
Percolation test performed?	No X Yes 🗆	(attach results)	Percolation test performed?	No X	Yes 🗆	(attach results)			
Groundwater Monitoring Performe	ed? No X Yes 🗆	(attach results)	Groundwater Monitoring Perfo	rmed? No X	Yes 🛛	(attach results)			

Site constraints/Recommendations:

This site evaluation was performed to determine if it is feasible to install a new septic system to serve a recently permitted winery and the existing residence on the adjacent property (APN 022-080-004). This area would be acquired by the adjacent property owner either via a lot line adjustment or easement. Final layout to be verified after ground topographic mapping is obtained.

A sample was taken for laboratory analysis from Test Pit #2. The results for texture are sandy loam. Since it is very close to the border we recommend a more conservative texture of Loam for the determination of application rate and thus have indicated loam in the report below.

The main constraints are the property line setbacks and numerous trees.

Other types of systems could be suitable depending on actual design flows and topographic mapping.

Test Pit #1

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE ALL INFORMATION

Horizon					C	onsistenc	e	_		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores	Roots	Mottling
0-72		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #2

Horizon		%Pock			C	onsistenc	e	Deree		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores Roots		Mottling
0-72		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #3

Horizon	Boundary	%Pock			C	consistenc	е	Boroc	Dente	Mattlina
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Ucture Side Ped Wall		Wet	Pores	Roots	Mottling
0-72		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #4

Horizon		% Pock	-		C	onsistenc	е	Boros		Mattling
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Side Ped Wet Pores Roo Wall		Roots	Mottling	
0-72		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #5

Horizon				Structure	Consistence			_		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture		Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores	Roots	Mottling
0-72		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

Test Pit #6

Harizon				_	C	onsistenc	e	_	Roots	Mottling
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture	Structure	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores		
0-60		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 60"

Test Pit #7

Horizon			_	Structure	Consistence			_		
Depth (Inches)	Boundary	%Rock	Texture		Side Wall	Ped	Wet	Pores	Roots	Mottling
0-72		30-<50	L	MSB	S	VFRB	SS	CF/CM	CF/CM/ FC	NONE

Acceptable soil depth = 72"

				LEGEND				
Boundary	Texture	Structure		Consistence		Pores	Roots	Mottling
A=Abrupt <1"	S =Sand LS =Loamy	W=Weak M=Moderate	Side Wall	Ped	Wet	<u>Quantity:</u>	<u>Quantity:</u>	Quantity:
<pre> C = Clear 1"- 2.5" G = Gradual 2.5"-5" D = Difuse >5" </pre>	Sand SL=Sandy Loam SCL=Sandy Clay Loam SC=Sandy Clay CL=Clay Loam C=Clay SiC=Silty Clay SiCL=Silty Clay Loam SiL=Silt Loam Si=Silt	G=Granular PI=Platy Pr=Prismatic C=Columnar B=Blocky AB=Angular Blocky SB=Subangular Blocky M=Massive SG=Single Grain CEM=Cemented	Wall L=Loose S=Soft SH=Slightly Hard H=Hard VH=Very Hard ExH=Extremely Hard	L=Loose VFRB=Very Friable FRB=Friable F=Firm VF=Very Firm ExF=Extremely Firm	NS=NonSticky SS=Slightly Sticky S=Sticky VS=Very Sticky NP=NonPlastic SP=Slightly Plastic P=Plastic VP=Very Plastic	F=Few C=Common M=Many Size: VF=Very Fine F=Fine M=Medium C=Coarse VC=Very Coarse	F=Few C=Common M=Many Size: F=Fine M=Medium C=Coarse VC=Very Coarse ExC=Extremely Coarse	F=Few C=Common M=Many Size: F=Fine M=Medium C=Coarse Contrast: Ft=Faint D=Distinct P=Prominent

Notes:

Structure is recorded as Modifier then Structure - for example, Moderate (M) Subangular Blocky (SB) is recorded as MSB Pores and Roots are recorded as Quantity then Size – for example Few (F) Coarse (C) is recorded as FC Mottling is recorded as Quantity then Size then Contrast – for example Few (F) Coarse (C) Distinct (D) is recorded as FCD

NOTES:

- I. TEST PITS ONE THROUGH SEVEN (TP #I TP #7) WERE EXCAVATED BY McCOLLUM GENERAL ENGINEERING AND WERE WITNESSED BY MIKE MUELRATH OF APPLIED CIVIL ENGINEERING INCORPORATED AND DARELL CHOATE OF THE NAPA COUNTY PLANNING, BUILDING AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DIVISION ON DECEMBER 6, 2016.
- 2. FADED BACKGROUND REPRESENTS EXISTING TOPOGRAPHIC FEATURES. TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION WAS TAKEN FROM THE NAPA COUNTY GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM DATABASE. APPLIED CIVIL ENGINEERING INCORPORATED ASSUMES NO LIABILITY REGARDING THE ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS OF THE TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.
- 3. CONTOUR INTERVAL: FIVE (5) FOOT, HIGHLIGHTED EVERY TWENTY FIVE (25) FEET.
- 4. BENCHMARK: NAVD 29
- 5. AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS WERE OBTAINED FROM THE NAPA COUNTY GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) DATABASE AND ARE DATED APRIL 9, 2011.
- 6. ACCORDING TO THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA) FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP (FIRM) MAP NUMBER 06055C0245E, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 26, 2008, THE PROJECT SITE IS NOT LOCATED IN A SPECIAL FLOOD HAZARD AREA.

2074 West Lincoln Avenue Napa, CA 94558 (707) 320-4968 (707) 320-2395 Fax www.appliedcivil.com APN 022-080-016 ST. HELENA, CA 94574

JOB NO. 14-102

PAGE I OF 3

DECEMBER 2016

Experience is the difference

January 8, 2019 File: 9260.25

Mr. Mike Muelrath Applied Civil Engineering 2074 West Lincoln Ave. Napa, CA 94558

Subject: Laboratory Test Results Soil Texture Analysis by Bouyoucos Hydrometer Method # 14-102

Dear Mr. Muelrath:

This letter transmits the results of our laboratory testing performed for the subject project. We performed a Soil Texture Analysis by the Bouyoucos Hydrometery Method with the following results:

Size/Density	TP-2 Lyman
+ #10 Sieve	48.9 %
Sand	46.0 %
Clay	4.6 %
Silt	49.4 %
Db g/cc	

We trust this provides the information required at this time. Should you have further questions, please call.

Yours very truly,

RGH GEOTECHNICAL

George Fotou Laboratory Manager

SOIL PERCOLATION SUITABILITY CHART

Instructions:

- 1. Plot texture on triangle based on percent sand, silt, and clay as determined by hydrometer analysis.
- 2. Adjust for coarse fragments by moving the plotted point in the sand direction an additional 2% for each 10% (by volume) of fragments greater than 2mm in diameter.
- 3. Adjust for compactness of soil by moving the plotted point in the clay direction an additional 15% for soils having a bulk-density greater than 1.7 gm/cc.

Note:

For soils falling in sand, loamy sand or sandy loam classification bulk density analysis will generally not affect suitability and analysis not neccesary.