



Minnesota Pollution Control Agency

520 Lafayette Road North
St. Paul, MN 55155-4194

Compliance Inspection Form
Existing Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS)

Doc Type: Compliance and Enforcement

Inspection results based on Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) requirements and attached forms - additional local requirements may also apply.

Submit completed form to Local Unit of Government (LUG) and system owner within 15 days

For local tracking purposes:

System Status

System status on date (mm/dd/yyyy): 4/10/2018

[X] Compliant - Certificate of Compliance
(Valid for 3 years from report date, unless shorter time frame outlined in Local Ordinance.)

[] Noncompliant - Notice of Noncompliance
(See Upgrade Requirements on page 3.)

Reason(s) for noncompliance (check all applicable)

- [] Impact on Public Health (Compliance Component #1) - Imminent threat to public health and safety
[] Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance Component #3) - Imminent threat to public health and safety
[] Tank Integrity (Compliance Component #2) - Failing to protect groundwater
[] Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance Component #3) - Failing to protect groundwater
[] Soil Separation (Compliance Component #4) - Failing to protect groundwater
[] Operating permit/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance Component #5) - Noncompliant

Property Information

Parcel ID# or Sec/Twp/Range:

Property address: 9514 122nd St N Hugo, MN 55038

Reason for inspection: Sale

Property owner: Robert and Sherrylee Maccornack

Owner's phone: 651-208-5854

or

Owner's representative:

Representative phone:

Local regulatory authority: Washington County

Regulatory authority phone: 651-430-6655

Brief system description: (2) 1,000 gallon septic tanks, (1) 1,000 gallon lift station, 10'x60' mound dispersal system

Comments or recommendations:

Certification

I hereby certify that all the necessary information has been gathered to determine the compliance status of this system. No determination of future system performance has been nor can be made due to unknown conditions during system construction, possible abuse of the system, inadequate maintenance, or future water usage.

Inspector name: Benjamin Zierke

Certification number: C9594

Business name: Zierke Soil Testing

License number: L119

Inspector signature: [Signature]

Phone number: 651-249-1346

Necessary or Locally Required Attachments

- [X] Soil boring logs
[X] System/As-built drawing
[] Forms per local ordinance
[] Other information (list):

1. Impact on Public Health – Compliance component #1 of 5

Compliance criteria:

System discharges sewage to the ground surface.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
System discharges sewage to drain tile or surface waters.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
System causes sewage backup into dwelling or establishment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Any "yes" answer above indicates the system is an imminent threat to public health and safety.

Comments/Explanation:

Sherrylee reported having no past issues with the system.

Verification method(s):

- Searched for surface outlet
- Searched for seeping in yard/backup in home
- Excessive ponding in soil system/D-boxes
- Homeowner testimony (See Comments/Explanation)
- "Black soil" above soil dispersal system
- System requires "emergency" pumping
- Performed dye test
- Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation)
- Other methods not listed (See Comments/Explanation)

2. Tank Integrity – Compliance component #2 of 5

Compliance criteria:

System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, or leaching pit. <i>Seepage pits meeting 7080.2550 may be compliant if allowed in local ordinance.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth. If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Any "yes" answer above indicates the system is failing to protect groundwater.

Comments/Explanation:

Tanks pumped 4/10/2018 by Smilies.

Verification method(s):

- Probed tank(s) bottom
- Examined construction records
- Examined Tank Integrity Form (Attach)
- Observed liquid level below operating depth
- Examined empty (pumped) tanks(s)
- Probed outside tank(s) for "black soil"
- Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation)
- Other methods not listed (See Comments/Explanation)

3. Other Compliance Conditions – Compliance component #3 of 5

- a. Maintenance hole covers are damaged, cracked, unsecured, or appear to be structurally unsound. Yes* No Unknown
- b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety. Yes* No Unknown
***System is an imminent threat to public health and safety.**

Explain:

- c. System is non-protective of ground water for other conditions as determined by inspector. Yes* No
***System is failing to protect groundwater.**

Explain:

4. Soil Separation – Compliance component #4 of 5

Date of installation: 5/11/2004 Unknown
(mm/dd/yyyy)

Shoreland/Wellhead protection/Food beverage lodging? Yes No

Compliance criteria:

For systems built prior to April 1, 1996, and not located in Shoreland or Wellhead Protection Area or not serving a food, beverage or lodging establishment: Yes No

Drainfield has at least a two-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.

Non-performance systems built April 1, 1996, or later or for non-performance systems located in Shoreland or Wellhead Protection Areas or serving a food, beverage, or lodging establishment: Yes No

Drainfield has a three-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.*

"Experimental", "Other", or "Performance" systems built under pre-2008 Rules; Type IV or V systems built under 2008 Rules (7080.2350 or 7080.2400 (Advanced Inspector License required) Yes No

Drainfield meets the designed vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.

Verification method(s):

Soil observation does not expire. Previous soil observations by two independent parties are sufficient, unless site conditions have been altered or local requirements differ.

Conducted soil observation(s) (Attach boring logs)

Two previous verifications (Attach boring logs)

Not applicable (Holding tank(s), no drainfield)

Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation)

Other (See Comments/Explanation)

Comments/Explanation:

Indicate depths or elevations

A. Bottom of distribution media	101.2'
B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock	97.0'
C. System separation	4.2'
D. Required compliance separation*	3.0'

*May be reduced up to 15 percent if allowed by Local Ordinance.

Any "no" answer above indicates the system is failing to protect groundwater.

5. Operating Permit and Nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #5 of 5 Not applicable

Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? Yes No If "yes", A below is required

Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP? Yes No If "yes", B below is required

BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system design

If the answer to both questions is "no", this section does not need to be completed.

Compliance criteria

- a. Operating Permit number: _____
Have the Operating Permit requirements been met? Yes No
- b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning? Yes No

Any "no" answer indicates Noncompliance.

Upgrade Requirements (Minn. Stat. § 115.55) An imminent threat to public health and safety (ITPHS) must be upgraded, replaced, or its use discontinued within ten months of receipt of this notice or within a shorter period if required by local ordinance. If the system is failing to protect ground water, the system must be upgraded, replaced, or its use discontinued within the time required by local ordinance. If an existing system is not failing as defined in law, and has at least two feet of design soil separation, then the system need not be upgraded, repaired, replaced, or its use discontinued, notwithstanding any local ordinance that is more strict. This provision does not apply to systems in shoreland areas, Wellhead Protection Areas, or those used in connection with food, beverage, and lodging establishments as defined in law.

Logs of Soil Borings

Location of Project: 9514 122nd St N Hugo, MN 55038

Borings Made by Ben Zierke

Date: 4/10/2018

Hand bucket auger used for borings; USDA - SCS Soil Classification used.

Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 1	Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 2
0-----	-----	0-----	-----
0-12"	10YR 3/3 loamy fine sand	0-12"	Mixed topsoil and mound sand fill
12-60"	10YR 4/4 loamy fine sand, faint redox around fine banding below 36", 36". Fine bands were 10YR 4/6 in color.	12-20"	10YR 3/3 loamy fine sand
		20-32"	10YR 4/4 loamy fine sand, redox present below 26"
		32-36"	7.5YR 4/4 massive sandy loam, redox present throughout profile

End of boring at 5 feet
Standing water table:
 Present at _____ feet of depth _____ Hours after boring
 Standing water not present in hole
Mottled Soil:
 Observed at 3 feet of depth
 Mottled soil not present in bore hole
 Comments:

End of boring at 3 feet
Standing water table:
 Present at _____ feet of depth _____ Hours after boring
 Standing water not present in hole
Mottled Soil:
 Observed at 2.2 feet of depth
 Mottled soil not present in bore hole
 Comments:

Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 3	Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 4
0-----	-----	0-----	-----

End of boring at _____ feet
Standing water table:
 Present at _____ feet of depth _____ Hours after boring
 Standing water not present in hole
Mottled Soil:
 Observed at _____ feet of depth
 Mottled soil not present in bore hole
 Comments:

End of boring at _____ feet
Standing water table:
 Present at _____ feet of depth _____ Hours after boring
 Standing water not present in hole
Mottled Soil:
 Observed at _____ feet of depth
 Mottled soil not present in bore hole
 Comments:

Relative Elevations and Site Notes

B1: 100.0, redox 97.0

B2: 98.1, redox 95.9

Top of rock: 102.2

Bottom of rock: 101.2

B1 Separation: 4.2

B2 Separation: 5.3

Benchmark: 95.6 (cover on lift tank)

Height of instrument: 105.8

***It was difficult to obtain a second representative sample along the east side of the contour that the mound was installed on. Despite setting up further downslope from the mound than B1, I still encountered mound sand and other fill soils. The system was constructed right on the edge of a dropoff - I would consider B1 to the most representative boring of the soil conditions where the system was installed.**

