Midwest Sewer Services

P.O. Box 10853 White Bear Lake, MN 55110 651-492-7550/Brian@Midwestsoiltesting.com

Brian Humpal

MPCA Licensed Advanced Inspector

SUBSURFACE SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (SSTS) COMPLIANCE REPORT

Date: March 1, 2021 **Time:** 10:30 AM **Owner:** Natalie Johnston **Inspection Address:** 10925 33rd St. Ln N, Lake Elmo ,MN **Site Conditions:** 6" Snow 12" Frost

REPORT SUMMARY

I have performed an "MPCA Compliance Inspection" on this system and have reviewed the original design/permit records on file at the City of Lake Elmo. This older system (installed in 1993) consists of a pre-cast septic tank and a rock trench drainfield. Meyer Sewer Service pumped the septic tank on March 1, 2021.

Although not a compliance criteria, it should be noted that the septic tank manhole cover is buried. I recommend extending this cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper maintenance.

Predicated on my inspection of the system and my review of the original design/permit records, it is my opinion that this system <u>presently meets</u> MPCA minimum compliance inspection requirements.

Midwest Sewer Services have been hired to perform a compliance inspection of this SSTS for compliance with local ordinances pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 115.55 (2013). This compliance inspection covers only the criteria required by Minn. Stat. § 115.55 Subd. 5a (2013) and Minn. R. 7080.1500 (2011). A compliance inspection is an indication of the current compliance status of the system and does not guarantee the performance or longevity of this system beyond the date of inspection, as it is impossible to determine the future performance of any system. Midwest Sewer Services disclaim any use of this compliance inspection beyond determining SSTS compliance pursuant to Minn. Stat. § 115.55 Subd. 5a (2013) and Minn. R. 7080.1500 (2011).

Please contact me should you have any questions.

Christopher Uebe

Brian Humpal



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

Compliance inspection report form

Existing Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS)

Doc Type: Compliance and Enforcement

Instructions: Inspection results based on Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) requirements and attached supporting documentation – additional local requirements may also apply. Further information can be found here: https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-wwists4-31a.pdf.

Inspector must submit completed form to Local Governmental Unit (LGU) and system owner within 15 days of final determination of compliance or noncompliance.

Property information	Local tracking number:
Parcel ID# or Sec/Twp/Range: Loca	I regulatory authority: Washington County
Property address: 10925 33 rd Street Ln N, Lake Elmo, MN 55042	
Owner/representative: Natalie Johnston	Owner's phone: 651-747-7228
Brief system description: A pre-cast septic tank and rock trench dra	ainfield.
System status	
System status on date (mm/dd/yyyy):3/1/2021	
☐ Compliant – Certificate of compliance*	☐ Noncompliant – Notice of noncompliance
(Valid for 3 years from report date unless evidence of an imminent threat to public health or safety requiring removal and abatement under section 145A.04, subdivision 8 is discovered or a shorter time frame exists	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 or under section 145A.04 subdivision 8.
in Local Ordinance.) *Note: Compliance indicates conformance with Minn. R. 7080.1500 as of system status date above and does not guarantee future performance.	Systems failing to protect ground water must be upgraded, replaced, or use discontinued within the time required by local ordinance.
Reason(s) for noncompliance (check all applicable)
☐ Impact on public health (Compliance component #1) – Imminer	nt threat to public health and safety
☐ Tank integrity (Compliance component #2) – Failing to protect	groundwater
☐ Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) – In	
Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) – Fa	
☐ System not abandoned according to Minn. R. 7080.2500 (Com	
Soil separation (Compliance component #5) – Failing to protect	
Operating permit/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance co	mponent #4) – Noncompliant - local ordinance applies
Comments or recommendations	
Although not a compliance criteria, it should be noted that the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper in the sept cover to the sept cover t	
Certification	
I hereby certify that all the necessary information has been gathered determination of future system performance has been nor can be mabuse of the system, inadequate maintenance, or future water usag	ade due to unknown conditions during system construction, possible
By typing my name below, I certify the above statements to be true can be used for the purpose of processing this form.	e and correct, to the best of my knowledge, and that this information
Business name: Midwest Sewer Services	Certification number: C5342/C9852
Inspector signature: Brian Humpal After the	License number: L2896
(This document has been electronically signed)	Phone: 651-492-7550
Necessary or locally required supporting docu	mentation (must be attached)
☑ Soil observation logs☑ Locally required forms☑ Other information (list):	☐ Tank Integrity Assessment ☐ Operating Permit
Report Summary, Property Information, Disclaimer, License	

1. Impact on public health – Compliance component #1 of 5

Compliance criteria:		Attached supporting documentation:
System discharges sewage to the	☐ Yes* ☒ No	Other:
ground surface		☐ Not applicable
System discharges sewage to drain tile or surface waters.	☐ Yes* ☒ No	
System causes sewage backup into dwelling or establishment.	☐ Yes* ☒ No	
Any "yes" answer above indicates imminent threat to public health and	•	
Describe verification methods and	results:	
None of the above found.		

2. Tank integrity – Compliance component #2 of 5

Compliance criteria:		Attached	supporting d	ocumentation:	
System consists of a seepage pit,	☐ Yes* ☒ No	☑ Pumped at time of inspection			
cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?		Name of maintenance business:		Meyer Sewer Service	
Sewage tank(s) leak below their	☐ Yes* ☒ No	License number of maintenance busines		ntenance business	: <u>L915</u>
designed operating depth?		Date of maintenance:			3/1/2021
		☐ Existing	tank integrity a	ssessment (Attach)
			maintenance		
If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:		(mm/dd/y	yyy):	(must be within t	three years)
Any "yes" answer above indicates the system is failing to protect groundwater.			n instructions to 7082.0700 sub	o ensure assessmo pp. 4 B (1))	ent complies with
		☐ Tank is I	ا) Noncompliant (oumping not necessa	ry – explain below)
		☐ Other:			
Describe verification methods and	results:				

Although not a compliance criteria, it should be noted that the septic tank manhole cover is buried. I recommend extending this cover to the ground surface to facilitate easier access and proper maintenance.

3. Other compliance conditions – Compliance component #3 of 5

	I	Maintenance hole covers appear to be structurally unsound (da ☐ Yes* ☐ No ☐ Unknown	amaged, cracked, ctc.), or unse	our ou :
	3b. (Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adverse	ely impact public health or safety	/? ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Unknown
		*Yes to 3a or 3b - System is an imminent threat to public h	ealth and safety.	
	3c. \$	System is non-protective of ground water for other conditions a	as determined by inspector?	☐ Yes* ⊠ No
	3d. \$	System not abandoned in accordance with Minn. R. 7080.2500)?	☐ Yes* ⊠ No
	,	*Yes to 3c or 3d - System is failing to protect groundwater		
	ı	Describe verification methods and results:		
		Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □		
	•	Attached supporting documentation. Not applicable		
4.	Оре	erating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compli	ance component #4 o	f 5 🛭 Not applicable
	ls the	ne system operated under an Operating Permit?	☐ Yes ☐ No I	f "yes", A below is required
	Is the	ne system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the sy	/stem design? ☐ Yes ☐ No I	f "yes", B below is required
		ne system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the sy BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system	·	f "yes", B below is required
		BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system	design	
	If the	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system he answer to both questions is "no", this section does	design	
	<i>If the</i> Com	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system he answer to both questions is "no", this section does mpliance criteria:	design s not need to be completed	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met?	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning the Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance.	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	
	<i>If the</i> Com a.	BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specified in the system the answer to both questions is "no", this section does impliance criteria: a. Have the operating permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning Any "no" answer indicates noncompliance. Describe verification methods and results:	design s not need to be completed ☐ Yes ☐ No	

5. Soil separation – Compliance component #5 of 5

Date of installation 1993 (mm/dd/yyyy)	Unknown		
Shoreland/Wellhead protection/F	ood 🛚 Yes 🗀 No	Attached supporting documentation:	
beverage lodging?		oxtimes Soil observation logs completed for th	e report (Attach)
Compliance criteria (select on	e):	☐ Two previous verifications of required	vertical
5a. For systems built prior to April 1,		separation (Attach)	
and not located in Shoreland or Protection Area or not serving a		☐ Not applicable (No soil treatment area	1)
beverage or lodging establishme		Reviewed design and permit records.	
Drainfield has at least a two-foot separation distance from periodi saturated soil or bedrock.			
5b. Non-performance systems built .		Indicate depths or elevations	
1996, or later or for non-perform systems located in Shoreland or Protection Areas or serving a foo	Wellhead	A. Bottom of distribution media	See Attached Boring Log(s)
beverage, or lodging establishm	ent:	B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock	
Drainfield has a three-foot vertic separation distance from periodi	-	C. System separation	
saturated soil or bedrock.*	Cally	D. Required compliance separation*	
		*May be reduced up to 15 percent if allo Ordinance.	owed by Local
5c. "Experimental", "Other", or "Per systems built under pre-2008 Ru Type IV or V systems built unde Rules 7080. 2350 or 7080.2400 (Advanced Inspector License red	r 2008		
Drainfield meets the designed ve separation distance from periodi saturated soil or bedrock.			
*Any "no" answer above indic failing to protect groundwater	-		

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.


Describe verification methods and results:

<u>Midwest Sewer Testing</u> Subsurface Sewage Treatment System Owner/Property Information

This inf	ormation will be used for th	ne purpose of conducting an MP	CA Compliance Inspection.	
Date of Inspection:	March 1, 2021		Time: 10:30 AM	
Property Address:	10925 33 rd Street L ₁	n N, Lake Elmo, MN	Zip: 55042	
Property Owner:	Natalie Johnston		Phone: 651-747-7228	
Tank(s) Septic 1 Aerobic Lift Holding Other:	Tank(s)Material ☐ Fiberglass ☐ Plastic ☐ Metal ☐ Concrete ☐ Block ☐ Other	Soil Treatment System Rock trench Gravelless trench Chamber trench Seepage bed Mound At-grade	n Other □ Alternative system □ Experimental system □ Cesspool system □ Other system	
performed through	the maintenance hole		If no, proper maintenance must be overs should be made accessible to of the system.	
Year house built: 1	993 Year sep	tic installed: 1993	Tank size (gals.): 1500	
How long has selle	er owned the property		f residents in home?	
Number of bedroom		Are all floors drained by	y gravity? Y	
Garbage disposal?		Whirlpool ba	th?	
More than one syst	tem (laundry, etc.)?			
Does this property	Does this property have any footing drain tiles connected to the septic system?			
, C		as garages or out-build	ings connected to this system?	
Are there any addition	ional systems on this	s property serving other	bundings?	
	system on lot? South			
	well on lot? City Wat		the well a deep well? N/A	
			as: tree roots, sewage back-ups, etc.; or have any repairs been made	
When was the syst	em last pumped? 2/1/	/2021 Name of p	umper: Meyer Sewer Service	
	l in previous years?		tem on a monitoring plan?	
Have you received	notices from any gov	vernment agency concer	rning this system?	
		management area? Y		
Do you have any a	dditional information	that should be given to	the new owner?	
I hereby certify that the above information is correct to the best of my knowledge. I also understand that if the system is considered "non-compliant/failing" per MPCA rules, that the inspector must by law submit a copy of this report to the local government unit within 15 days of the date of inspection completion. I also agree that unless otherwise noted in this report, that I/we are ultimately responsible for payment of all fees for all work performed relative to this inspection by Inspect Minnesota and Midwest Soil Testing				

Date:

Owner/Occupant:



Soil Observations Log

Observations Made By: Midwest Sewer Services Date: 3/1/2021 Classification System: USDA Soil Observation: ST-1 Surface Elevation of Observation Of Observ	Locat	ion of Project:	10925 33rd Street	Ln N. L	ake Elm	no. MN 5504	2
Classification System: Soil So							
Surface Elevation of Observation Depth In Inches O-10 10YR 2/2 Loam 10YR 3/4 Clay Loam 10YR 3/4 Fine Sandy Loam 10YR 4/4 Fine Sand 10YR 4/4 Fine Sand 10YR 4/4 Fine Sand Depth To End Of Soil Observation Or Redox Elevation of Observation Depth To End Of Soil Observation Or Redox Elevation of Observation Relative To System Belevation of Observation Or Redox Elevation of Observation Or Redox Depth To End Of Soil Observation Or Redox Depth To Bottom Of Distribution Media ≥36" Of Separation Same Same Selevation Of Observation Or Redox Of Separation End Of Soil Observation At: Redox Present At: None Soils Encountered Soils Encountered Depth To End Of Soil Observation Or Redox Depth To End Of Soil Observation Or Redox Depth To End Of Soil Observation Relative To System Elevation Of Observation Relative To System Of Separation Depth To Bottom Of Distribution Media Depth To Bottom Of Distribution Media Redox Present At: None Redox Present At:					•		
Elevation of Observation Same ground surface as last drainfield trench Cobservation Cob	Soi	il Observation:	ST-1		Soil O	bservation:	
Inches	Elevation of	_		Elevat	Surface Elevation of		
10-30 30-42 42-66 10YR 3/4 Fine Sandy Loam 10YR 4/4 Fine Sandy Loam 10YR 4/4 Fine Sand 1		Soils E	ncountered		Rock %	Soils	Encountered
SameElevation Of Observation Relative To SystemElevation Of Observation Relative To System-30"Depth To Bottom Of Distribution MediaDepth To Bottom Of Distribution Media≥36"Of SeparationOf SeparationEnd Of Soil Observation At:66"End Of Soil Observation At:Redox Present At:NoneRedox Present At:	10-30 30-42	10YR 3 10YR 3/4 I	/4 Clay Loam Fine Sandy Loam				
-30" Depth To Bottom Of Distribution Media ≥36" Of Separation End Of Soil Observation At: Redox Present At: None Redox Present At:	66" Depth	To End Of Soil O	bservation Or Redox		Depth T	o End Of Soil	Observation Or Redox
≥36" Of Separation End Of Soil Observation At: 66" End Of Soil Observation At: Redox Present At: None Redox Present At:		on Of Observatio	on Relative To System		Elevatio	n Of Observat	tion Relative To System
End Of Soil Observation At: 66" End Of Soil Observation At: Redox Present At: None Redox Present At:			stribution Media				Distribution Media
Redox Present At: None Redox Present At:	≥36" Ur Sep	aration			or Sepa	iration	
Redox Present At: None Redox Present At:	End Of Soil	Observation At:	66"	End Of	Soil Ob	servation At:	
Standing Water Present At: None Standing Water Present At:				,			
				Standi			

Bottom Of Distribution Medium At: 30 Inches		
Signature:	Offer the	


-SOIL BORINGS-

Soil borings are made in order to determine the type and structure of soils at various depths as vell as the location of the water table, impervious strata or bedrock.

Borings are most easily made with a hand auger, however other expedients may be utilized - back hoe, post hole auger, etc.

Soils encountered at various depths should be listed as to appearance, texture and composition.

Depth at which water, bedrock or heavy clay layer is encountered should be recorded.



LOG OF SOIL BORING

BORI	NG NO. <u>4</u>
Depth in Feet	Soil Description
_1	DARK BROWN Silt loAm
2 /	2 - BROWN C/AM
_ 2	BROWN LINE SANDY CLAY + GRAVEL
<u>_3</u>	Brown fine - menium SANDY loam + GRAVER
<u></u>	- BROWN Silty - Fine SANDY LOAM
	- BROWN Silty SANDY loam.
<u>_7</u>	mottles Brown Silty SANDY loam
 8 <i>i</i>	3.0

DISCLAIMER

Brian L. Humpal, Inc. dba. Midwest Sewer Services, Inspect Minnesota, Midwest Soil Testing Relative to Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS) Compliance Inspections

- 1. This inspection/report is being performed for only the seller/owner of the property on which the SSTS is located. In such case that another party is paying for the inspection, the contract is between only said party and Brian L. Humpal, Inc.; there is no contract between Brian L. Humpal, Inc. and any other party unless otherwise noted.
- 3. Brian L. Humpal, Inc. has not been retained to warranty, guarantee, or certify the proper functioning of the SSTS for any period of time beyond the date of inspection or into the future. Because of the numerous factors (usage, maintenance, soil characteristics, previous failures, etc.) which may affect the proper operation of an SSTS, as well as the inability of Brian L. Humpal, Inc. to supervise or monitor the use or maintenance of the SSTS, the report shall not be construed as a warranty by Brian L. Humpal, Inc. that the SSTS will function properly for any particular party for any period of time.
- 4. Brian L. Humpal, Inc. is unable to verify the frequency and/or, quality of prior or future maintenance of the SSTS. Maintenance of the tank(s) must be performed through the tanks maintenance hole. The removal of solids from any location other than the maintenance hole is not a compliant method of maintenance. It is strongly recommended that maintenance covers be made accessible to the ground surface to facilitate proper maintenance.
- 5. Minimum Compliance Inspection requirements relative to this inspection and this report include <u>only</u> verification that the SSTS has tank(s) (septic tanks, lift tanks, dosing tanks, stilling tanks, etc.) which are watertight below the designed operating depth, the required separation between the bottom of the subsurface soil distribution medium and seasonally saturated soils, no back-ups of sewage into the dwelling, no discharge of sewage/effluent to the ground surface or surface waters, and no imminent safety hazards. Brian L. Humpal, Inc. does not inspect plumbing or pumps prior to the first SSTS component as these are plumbing components. The performance of exterior pumps and associated components are not inspected as they are considered to be maintenance items. Additionally, no indications relative to compliance with electrical code requirements have been made. It is recommended that any other applicable plumbing, electrical, housing, etc. inspections be performed by a qualified inspection business. Sewage back-up verification is limited to observing the floor drain area and/or the information supplied by the last occupants of the building prior to inspection. Brian L. Humpal, Inc. cannot guarantee that the information given to them by the last occupants of the building prior to inspection relative to back-ups is accurate.
- 4. Certification of this SSTS does not warranty future use beyond the date of the inspection. Any SSTS, old or new, can become hydraulically overloaded or discharge sewage/effluent to the ground surface as a result of more people moving into the house than were previously occupying the house, improper maintenance, heavy usage, leaking plumbing fixtures, groundwater infiltration, tree roots, freezing conditions, surface drainage problems, poor initial design, poor construction practices, or unsuitable materials used in constructing the system; the system can also simply stop working because of its age. An SSTS that has been properly designed and installed, properly maintained, and used in the manner for which the system was designed can be expected to provide service for twenty to twenty-five years on average. Some parts of the SSTS such as alarms, switches, pumps, filters, etc. will most likely have to be repaired or replaced over the lifetime of the system.
- 5. A Compliance Inspection is not meant to be a test or inspection for longevity of the system; a Compliance Inspection is strictly for the purpose of determining if the SSTS is protective of public health and safety, as well as the groundwater at the date and time the inspection was performed. This inspection is not intended to determine if the SSTS was originally designed or installed to past or present MPCA or other Local Government Unit code requirements. This inspection is not intended to determine if the SSTS was designed and/or installed to support the anticipated flow from the building as the use of the building may have changed since the design and construction of the SSTS due to the addition of bedrooms, occupants, etc. In addition, this inspection is not intended to determine the quality of the original SSTS design, the quality of the construction practices used while installing the SSTS, or the quality of the materials used in constructing the SSTS.
- 6. Brian L. Humpal, Inc. cannot guarantee the performance of SSTS products/components such as: gravelless pipe, chamber trenches, effluent filters, tanks, sewage pre-treatment components, piping, etc. Products such as gravelless pipe are no longer approved for installation in the State of Minnesota and may have a significantly reduced performance and/or life expectancy.
- 7. WINTER WORK: By accepting this report, it is understood that inspections conducted during winter months (approximately November 1st through April 1st) are more difficult to perform because of possible snow cover and/or ground frost. SSTS components such as tanks, maintenance covers, tank inspection pipes, subsurface distribution medium inspection pipes, and soil treatment areas are more difficult or impossible to locate due to snow cover and/or ground frost. In addition, soil borings are more difficult to perform due to snow cover and/or ground frost. Brian L. Humpal, Inc. will attempt to use the same level of standards when performing work during winter periods as when performing work during non-winter periods. However, the recipient of this report understands that because of the aforementioned considerations, the same level of standards may not be possible.
- 8. By accepting this report, the client understands that Brian L. Humpal, Inc. will not be responsible for any monetary damages exceeding the fee for the services provided.

Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems

Non-transferable

Business License

Midwest Sewer Services

License # L2896

License Expires: 12/22/2021

Issued: 11/06/2020

Specialty Area(s):

Installer

Maintainer

Service Provider

Advanced Designer

Advanced Inspector

Designated Certified Individual(s):

Cert #

Name

Certification Expires:

C5342

Brian L'Humpal

10/15/2023

Installer, Maintainer, Serv Prov, Adv Designer, Adv Inspector

C9852

Christopher R Uebe

3/4/2024

Designer, Inspector



520 Lafayette Road North St. Paul, Minnesota 55155-4194 Nich Haig

Nick Haig, Supervisor Certification and Training Unit