

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

Compliance inspection report form

Existing Subsurface Sewage Treatment System (SSTS)

Doc Type: Compliance and Enforcement

Owner's phone: 651-395-1353

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: _____ Local regulatory authority: <u>Washington County</u> Property address: 9668 203rd Street N, Forest Lake MN 55025

Owner/representative: Noelle Volin

Brief system description: 1250 main tank to inground gravity fed trenches

System status

System status on date (mm/dd/yyyy): 4/15/2021

Compliant – Certificate of compliance*

(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 in Local Ordinance.)

*Note: Compliance indicates conformance with Minn. R. 7080.1500 as of system status date above and does not guarantee future performance.

Noncompliant – Notice of noncompliance

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.

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) Imminent threat to public health and safety
- Tank integrity (Compliance component #2) Failing to protect groundwater
- Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) Imminent threat to public health and safety
- Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) Failing to protect groundwater
- System not abandoned according to Minn. R. 7080.2500 (Compliance component #3) Failing to protect groundwater
- Soil separation (Compliance component #5) Failing to protect groundwater
- Operating permit/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance component #4) Noncompliant local ordinance applies

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.

By typing my name below, I certify the above statements to be true and correct, to the best of my knowledge, and that this information can be used for the purpose of processing this form.

Business name: MJL Contracting Inc.

Inspector signature: Danielle Lang

Certification number:	8190
License number:	2449

Phone: 763-244-9070

Necessary or locally required supporting documentation (must be attached)

Soil observation logs

Locally required forms

(This document has been electronically signed)

- Tank Integrity Assessment
- Operating Permit

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

Compliance criteria:		Attached supporting documentation:
System discharges sewage to the ground surface	🗋 Yes* 🛛 No	Other: Not applicable
vstem discharges sewage to drain e or surface waters.	🗌 Yes* 🛛 No	_
stem causes sewage backup into elling or establishment.	🗌 Yes* 🛛 No	

imminent threat to public health and safety.

Describe verification methods and results:

2. Tank integrity – Compliance component #2 of 5

Compliance criteria:		Attached supporting	documentation:	
System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit,	🗌 Yes* 🛛 No	Pumped at time of ins	pection	
or other pit?		Name of maintenance	business:	Hassle Free
Sewage tank(s) leak below their	🗌 Yes* 🛛 No	License number of ma	intenance busines	s: <u>3287</u>
designed operating depth?		Date of maintenance:		4/15/2021
		Existing tank integrity	assessment (Attac	h)
If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:		Date of maintenance (mm/dd/yyyy):	(must be within	three years)
Any "yes" answer above indicates the system is failing to protect groundwater.		(See form instructions to ensure assessment complies Minn. R. 7082.0700 subp. 4 B (1))		
		Tank is Noncompliant	(pumping not necess	ary – explain be
		Other:		

Describe verification methods and results:

Page 2 of 4

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

	3a. Maintenance hole covers appear to be structurally unsound (damaged, cracked, etc.), or unse	cured?			
	□ Yes* ⊠ No □ Unknown				
	3b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety	y? 🗌 Yes* 🛛 No 🗌 Unknow			
	*Yes to 3a or 3b - System is an imminent threat to public health and safety.				
	3c. System is non-protective of ground water for other conditions 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.				
	Describe verification methods and results:				
pumped both the main tank and lift tank to verify no cracks and that baffles are in place and the pump is we					
	Attached supporting documentation: 🛛 Not applicable				
Ļ	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o				
•	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit?	lf "yes", A below is require			
	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Yes	lf "yes", A below is require			
•	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design?	lf "yes", A below is require If "yes", B below is require			
•	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? \[Yes \] No \[Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Yes \] No \[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	lf "yes", A below is require If "yes", B below is require			
••	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? If the answer to both questions is "no", this section does not need to be completed Compliance criteria:	lf "yes", A below is require If "yes", B below is require			
<u>.</u>	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? \[Yes \] No Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Yes \] No 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: Yes \] No	lf "yes", A below is require If "yes", B below is require			
<u>.</u>	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? Image: Yes image: No image: Yes image: No image: Yes image: No image: Yes image: Yes image: Yes image: Yes image: No image: Yes image: Ye	lf "yes", A below is require If "yes", B below is require			
<u>ı.</u>	Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* – Compliance component #4 o Is the system operated under an Operating Permit? \[Yes \] No Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design? Yes \] No 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: Yes \] No	lf "yes", A below is require If "yes", B below is require			

Attached supporting documentation: Operating permit (Attach)

5. Soil separation – Compliance component #5 of 5

Date of installation	8/9/1976 (mm/dd/yyyy)	_ 🗌 Unkr	nown		
Shoreland/Wellhead protection/Food beverage lodging?		🗌 Yes 🛛 No		Attached supporting documentation:	
				\boxtimes Soil observation logs completed for th	e report (Attach)
Compliance criteria			Two previous verifications of required separation (<i>Attach</i>)	vertical	
5a. 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*	Not applicable (No soil treatment area	a)
				□ 2013 compliance done by Zierke passed	
Drainfield has at le separation distance saturated soil or be					
 5b. 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: Drainfield has a three-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.* 		🗌 Yes	🗌 No*	Indicate depths or elevations	
		d		A. Bottom of distribution media	42"
	serving a food,			B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock	66"
	•			C. System separation	24"
	e from periodically			D. Required compliance separation*	24"
	edrock.*			*May be reduced up to 15 percent if allo Ordinance.	owed by Local
systems built unde Type IV or V syste Rules 7080. 2350 (Advanced Inspect	ms built under 2008 or 7080.2400 or License required)	☐ Yes	□ No*		
Drainfield meets th separation distance saturated soil or be	e from periodically				

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

Describe verification methods and results:

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, 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.