Midwest Sewer Services

P.O. Box 10853 White Bear Lake, MN 55110

Brian Humpal

651-492-7550/Brian@Midwestsoiltesting.com MPCA Licensed Advanced Inspector

SUBSURFACE SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEM (SSTS) COMPLIANCE REPORT

Date: March 4, 2021 **Time:** 12:30 PM **Owner:** Jackie Wishon **Inspection Address:** 18240 Forest Rd N, Forest Lake, MN **Site Conditions:** 4" Snow 4" Frost

REPORT SUMMARY

I have performed an "MPCA Compliance Inspection" on this system and have reviewed the original design/permit records on file at Washington County. This very old system (installed in 1989) consists of a pre-cast septic tank, a pre-cast lift tank, and a mound. It should be noted that the average life expectancy of a septic system is approximately 30 years. Olson's Sewer Service pumped the septic tank and lift tank on March 3, 2021.

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

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	al regulatory authority: Washington County	
Property address: 18240 Forest Rd N, Forest Lake, MN 55025		
Owner/representative: <u>Jackie Wishon</u>	Owner's phone: 612-819-3941	
Brief system description: A pre-cast septic tank, a pre-cast lift tank	s, and a mound.	
System status		
System status on date (mm/dd/yyyy): 3/4/2021		
☐ 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 o 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.	
 Impact on public health (Compliance component #1) − Immine Tank integrity (Compliance component #2) − Failing to protect Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) − In Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) − F System not abandoned according to Minn. R. 7080.2500 (Com Soil separation (Compliance component #5) − Failing to protect Operating permit/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance components or recommendations 	groundwater mminent threat to public health and safety failing to protect groundwater apliance component #3) – Failing to protect groundwater at groundwater	
abuse of the system, inadequate maintenance, or future water usage By typing my name below , I certify the above statements to be true can be used for the purpose of processing this form.	nade due to unknown conditions during system construction, possible ge. ue and correct, to the best of my knowledge, and that this information	
Business name: Midwest Sewer Services	Certification number: C5342/C9852	
Inspector signature: Bean Thempal (After Man	License number: L2896	
(This document has been electronically signed)	Phone: 651-492-7550	
Necessary or locally required supporting docu	umentation (must be attached)	
 ☑ Soil observation logs ☑ Locally required forms ☑ Other information (list): Report Summary, Property Information, Disclaimer, License 	☑ Tank Integrity Assessment ☐ Operating Permit	

1. Ir

und surface □ Not applicable stem discharges sewage to drain or surface waters. stem causes sewage backup into □ Yes* ☑ No elling or establishment. y "yes" answer above indicates the system is an minent threat to public health and safety. scribe verification methods and results:	ompliance criteria:		Attached supporting documentation:
stem discharges sewage to drain or surface waters. Stem causes sewage backup into elling or establishment. Yes* No Yes* No Yes* No Yes* No I Yes* No Stem causes sewage backup into elling or establishment. Yes* No Stem causes sewage backup into and yes* No Stem causes sewage backup into an extention into an extention in	vstem discharges sewage to the	☐ Yes* ☒ No	Other:
or surface waters. stem causes sewage backup into elling or establishment. y "yes" answer above indicates the system is an minent threat to public health and safety. scribe verification methods and results:	ound surface		_ Not applicable
elling or establishment. y "yes" answer above indicates the system is an minent threat to public health and safety. scribe verification methods and results:	vstem discharges sewage to drain e or surface waters.	☐ Yes* ☒ No	_
ninent threat to public health and safety. scribe verification methods and results:	stem causes sewage backup into velling or establishment.	☐ Yes* ☒ No	_
		•	_
one of the above found.	escribe verification methods and	l results:	
	lone of the above found.		

2. Tank integrity – Compliance component #2 of 5

Compliance criteria:		Attached supporting d	ocumentation:			
System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?	☐ Yes* ⊠ No	☐ Pumped at time of insport				
Sewage tank(s) leak below their	☐ Yes* ☒ No	License number of maintenance business:				
designed operating depth?		Date of maintenance:				
			ssessment (Attach)			
If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:		Date of maintenance (mm/dd/yyyy):	3/3/2021 (must be within three years)			
Any "yes" answer above indic is failing to protect groundwat	_	(See form instructions to Minn. R. 7082.0700 sub	o ensure assessment complies with op. 4 B (1))			
		☐ Tank is Noncompliant (pumping not necessary – explain below)			
		Other:				
Describe verification methods and	d results:					

https://www.pca.state.mn.us wq-wwists4-31b • 1/11/21

651-296-6300

800-657-3864

Use your preferred relay service

Available in alternative formats

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

	3a.	Maintenance hole covers appear to be struct ☐ Yes* ☐ No ☐ Unknown	urally unsound (dam	iaged, cra	acked, etc.	<i>)</i> , or arrow	ourcu.		
	3b.	Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immed	iately and adversely	impact p	ublic healt	n or safet	v? □ Yes*	⊠ No □ Unknow	/n
		*Yes to 3a or 3b - System is an imminent t					, _		
	3c.	System is non-protective of ground water for	-		-	ector?	☐ Yes*	⊠ No	
		System not abandoned in accordance with M			, ,		_ □ Yes*	_	
		*Yes to 3c or 3d - System is failing to prot					_	_	
		Describe verification methods and results	_						
		Attached supporting documentation: ☐ N	lot applicable.						
		Attached supporting documentation.	iot applicable						
							_		
1.	Ор	erating permit and nitrogen BN	1P* – Compliai	nce co	mponei	nt #4 c	of 5 ⊠ N	lot applicable	_
1.		erating permit and nitrogen BN e system operated under an Operating Permi	<u> </u>	nce co	<u> </u>			lot applicable below is require	– •d
1.	ls th	<u> </u>	t?		☐ Yes	□No	If "yes", A	below is require	
1.	ls th	e system operated under an Operating Permi	t? specified in the syst	em desig	☐ Yes	□No	If "yes", A	below is require	
1.	Is th	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP	t? specified in the syste iied in the system de	em desig sign	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
<u>1.</u>	Is th	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi	t? specified in the syste iied in the system de	em desig sign	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specific e answer to both questions is "no", th	t? specified in the syst ied in the system de nis section does n	em desig sign not need	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
<u>1.</u>	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifie e answer to both questions is "no", the appliance criteria:	t? specified in the system declined in the system declined in the system declines section does received met?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permire system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifice answer to both questions is "no", the impliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements been as the required nitrogen BMP in place and processing in the requirement in the implication of the impl	t? specified in the system desired in the system desired in the system desired in the system does reference in met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permire system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifice answer to both questions is "no", the impliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements been	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permi e system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifi e answer to both questions is "no", the npliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements bee Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and p Any "no" answer indicates nonce	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need □ Yes	☐ Yes In? ☐ Yes If to be co	□ No	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	
1.	Is th Is th Cor	e system operated under an Operating Permire system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP BMP = Best Management Practice(s) specifice answer to both questions is "no", the impliance criteria: Have the operating permit requirements been as the required nitrogen BMP in place and purpose and purpos	t? specified in the system details section does not met? roperly functioning?	em desig sign not need Yes	□ Yes In? □ Yes If to be co	□ No □ No mpleted	If "yes", A If "yes", B	below is require	

5. Soil separation – Compliance component #5 of 5

Date of installation 1989 (mm/dd/yyyy)	Unknown			
Shoreland/Wellhead protection/Food	☐ Yes ☐ No	Attached supporting documentation:		
beverage lodging?		⊠ Soil observation logs completed for the report (Attach)		
Compliance criteria (select one):		☐ Two previous verifications of required	vertical	
5a. For systems built prior to April 1, 1996,		separation (Attach)		
and not located in Shoreland or Wellhea Protection Area or not serving a food,	ad	☐ Not applicable (No soil treatment area)		
beverage or lodging establishment:		$oxed{\boxtimes}$ Reviewed design and permit records.		
Drainfield has at least a two-foot vertica separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.				
5b. Non-performance systems built April 1,	☐ Yes ☐ No*	Indicate depths or elevations		
1996, or later or for non-performance systems located in Shoreland or Wellhe Protection Areas or serving a food,	ad	A. Bottom of distribution media	See Attached Boring Log(s)	
beverage, or lodging establishment:		B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock		
Drainfield has a three-foot vertical separation distance from periodically		C. System separation		
saturated soil or bedrock.*		D. Required compliance separation*		
		*May be reduced up to 15 percent if allo Ordinance.	wed by Local	
5c. "Experimental", "Other", or "Performand systems built under pre-2008 Rules; Type IV or V systems built under 2008 Rules 7080. 2350 or 7080.2400 (Advanced Inspector License required)	re" Yes No*			
Drainfield meets the designed vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.				
*Any "no" answer above indicates the failing to protect groundwater.	he system is			

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:


5	
Property address: 18240 Forest Road 6	of 12 Parcel ID:
City: Forest Lake	State: Mw Zip code:
Optional section: Sewage Tank Compliance	Certification
This form does not represent a complete system inspection	report and only certifies sewage tank compliance status.
	igned by a Designated Certified Individual (DCI) of a licensed SSTS procedures to assess the compliance status of each sewage tank in
	ofessional, it becomes <i>necessary supporting documentation</i> to an pection form - Existing system (wq-wwists4-31b). This form can be er/ssts-and-msts-technical-and-compliance-criteria.
individual other than the SSTS Inspector that submits the inspec	00, subp. 4 Item (B) subitem (1). This form is valid for a period of vevaluation is requested by the owner or owner's agent or is
Certificate of sewage tank compliance	☐ Notice of sewage tank non-compliance
Affirm all three statements:	Select all that apply:
The SSTS does not contain a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit. It does not contain a sewage tank that was designed to be watertight, but subsequently leaks below the designed operating depth. It does not represent an imminent safety threat by reason of unsecured, damaged, or weak maintenance hole cover(s) or other unsafe condition.	 ☐ The SSTS has a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit – "Failure to Protect Groundwater." ☐ It has a sewage tank that was designed to be watertight, but subsequently leaks below the designed operating depth – "Failure to Protect Groundwater." ☐ It presents a threat to public safety by reason of unsecured, damaged, or weak maintenance hole cover(s) or other unsafe condition – "Imminent Threat to Public Health or Safety."
Company information	Designated Certified Individual (DCI) information
Company name: Olson's Sewer service	Print name: Mark Stackler
Business license number: 2/6	Certification number: C1937
I personally conducted the work described above as a Designate Business. I personally conducted the necessary procedures to as	d Certified Individual of a Minnesota-licensed SSTS Maintenance ssess the compliance status of each sewage tank in this SSTS:
Designated Certified Individual's signature:	Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 3/3/2021

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

This information	will be used for the purp	ose of conducting an	MPCA Co	mpliance Inspection.
Date of Inspection: March	n 4, 2021		Т	ime: 12:30 PM
Property Address: 18240	Forest Rd N, Fore	est Lake, MN	Z	Zip: 55025
Property Owner: Jackie	e Wishon		P	Phone: 612-819-3941
Septic 1	k(s)Material Fiberglass Plastic Metal Concrete Block Other	Soil Treatment System Rock trench Gravelless trench Chamber trench Seepage bed Mound rade	ch [Other Alternative system Experimental system Cesspool system Other system
	aintenance holes. N	Maintenance hole	e covers	proper maintenance must be should be made accessible to system.
Year house built: 1969	Year septic in			nk size (gals.): 1250
How long has seller owner				ents in home?
Number of bedrooms? 4	Are a	all floors drained		rity?
Garbage disposal?		Whirlpool	bath?	
More than one system (la			.4	
Does this property have any footing drain tiles connected to the septic system?				
Are any buildings on this property such as garages or out-buildings connected to this system?				
Are there any additional s	systems on this prop	perty serving oth	ner build	ings?
Location of septic system	on lot? North Side	;		
Location of water well on	lot? West Side		Is the w	ell a deep well? Y
Have you ever experience	ed any problems wi	th the system su	ich as: tr	ee roots, sewage back-ups,
	the ground, septic tes, explain:	tank overflowing	g, etc.; o	r have any repairs been made
When was the system last	t pumped? 3/3/2021	Name o	f pumpe	r: Olson's Sewer Service
How often pumped in pre	vious years?	Is s	system of	n a monitoring plan?
Have you received notices from any government agency concerning this system?				
Is your property located in	n a shoreland mana	gement area? N		
Do you have any addition	al information that	should be given	n to the n	new owner?
considered "non-compliant/failir local government unit within 15	ng" per MPCA rules, the days of the date of in ely responsible for pays	hat the inspector m spection completion	ust by law n. I also	also understand that if the system v submit a copy of this report to the agree that unless otherwise noted performed relative to this inspection

Date:

Owner/Occupant:



Soil Observations Log

Location of Project: 18240 Forest Rd N, Forest Lake, MN 55025							
Ob			Midwest Sewer Ser	Services Date: 3/4/2021			3/4/2021
C	lassific	ation System:	USDA				
	Soil	Observation:	ST-1		Soil C	bservation:	
Surf Elevat Obser	ion of		top of mound on nal contour	Surface Elevation of Observation			
Depth In Inches	Rock %	Soils E	ncountered	Depth In Inches	Rock %	Soils	Encountered
0-9 9-16		10YR 7/2 F (Deplete	Fine Sandy Loam Fine Sandy Loam d Matrix) With SYR 5/8 Redox				
9"	Depth T	o End Of Soil O	bservation Or Redox		Depth T	o End Of Soil	Observation Or Redox
			n Below Top Of Mound				tion Relative To System
			stribution Media				Distribution Media
=33"	Of Sepa	ration			Of Sepa	iration	
Fnd	Of Soil (Observation At:	16"	End Of	Soil Oh	servation At:	
		dox Present At:	9"	2 01		x Present At:	
Stan		ater Present At:	None	Standi		r Present At:	

Bottom Of Dist	Bottom Of Distribution Medium At: 28 Inches		
Signature:	Color Va		

SOL BORING LOG (国)的对话工程是主要是是全国的工程工程的对话是是全国的国际的工程,但是是全国的工程的工程,但是是是一个企业的工程,但是是一个企业的工程,但是是一个企业的工程, 第一个 HOUSE LOT STREET, STRE House Lot RORING DARK BROWN FINE SANDY LOAM DARK BROWN FINE SANDY LOAM 0-7" 5"-9" LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE LIGHT BROWN FINE LOAMY 7"-14" SANDY LOAM SAND 。 1916年,1917年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1918年,1 LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE 9"-14" 第 LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE 14"-20' SANDY CLAY LOAM (STIFF) SANDY CLAY LOAM LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE SANDY CLAY LOAM (STIFF) 20"-24" 14"-27" IRON STAINS-SLIGHT MOTTLED SANDY CLAY IRON STAINS LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE LIGHT YELLOW BROWN FINE SANDY CLAY LOAM (STIFF) 24"-48" SANDY CLAY HEAVY IRON STAINS HEAVY IRON STAINS-MOTTLED 27"-64" HEAVY MOTTLES (STIFF) END BORING 4811 END BORING 6411

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 Mich Haig

Nick Haig, Supervisor Certification and Training Unit