### **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

**Inspection Address:** 16324 Morgan Ave N, May Twp, MN 55047

#### **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 1984) consists of a pre-cast septic tank and a rock trench drainfield. It should be noted that the average life expectancy of a septic system is approximately 30 years. Pinky's Sewer Service pumped the septic tank on December 8, 2022. This house is presently vacant.

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: Inspector must submit completed form to Local Governmental Unit (LGU) and system owner within 15 days of final determination of compliance or noncompliance. Instructions for filling out this form are located on the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) website at <a href="https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-wwists4-31a.pdf">https://www.pca.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/wq-wwists4-31a.pdf</a>.

Property information	Local tracking number:
Parcel ID# or Sec/Twp/Range:	Reason for Inspection Property Transfer
Local regulatory authority info: Washington County	
Property address: 16324 Morgan Ave N, May Twp, MN 55047	
Owner/representative: Michael Renslow / Dale Renslow (Broth	ner) Owner's phone: 763-242-8981
Brief system description: A pre-cast septic tank and a rock trend	ch drainfield.
System status	
System status on date (mm/dd/yyyy): 12/8/2022	
	☐ 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	Systems failing to protect ground water must be upgraded, replaced, or use discontinued within the time required by local ordinance.
abatement under section 145A.04, subdivision 8 is discovered or a shorter time frame exists in Local Ordinance.) *Note: Compliance indicates conformance with Minn.	An imminent threat to public health and safety (ITPHS) must be upgraded, replaced, or its use discontinued within ten months of receipt
R. 7080.1500 as of system status date above and does not guarantee future performance.	of this notice or within a shorter period if required by local ordinance or under section 145A.04 subdivision 8.
Reason(s) for noncompliance (check all applicab	ile)
<ul> <li>Impact on public health (Compliance component #1) − Immin</li> <li>Tank integrity (Compliance component #2) − Failing to prote</li> <li>Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance component #3) −</li> <li>System not abandoned according to Minn. R. 7080.2500 (Compliance component #5) − Failing to prote</li> <li>Operating permit/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance Comments or recommendations</li> </ul>	ct groundwater Imminent threat to public health and safety Failing to protect groundwater Impliance component #3) – Failing to protect groundwater Fect groundwater
Certification	
	to determine the compliance status of this system. No determination of wn conditions during system construction, possible abuse of the system,
By typing my name below, I certify the above statements to be true used for the purpose of processing this form.	and correct, to the best of my knowledge, and that this information can be
Business name: Midwest Sewer Services	Certification number: 5342/9852
Inspector signature: Brian Humpal Home	License number: L2896
(This document has been electronically sign	ned) Phone: 651-492-7550
Necessary or locally required supporting do	cumentation (must be attached)
☐ Soil observation logs ☐ System/As-Built ☐ Locally red	uired forms 🛛 Tank Integrity Assessment 🔲 Operating Permit
☑ Other information (list): Report Summary, Property Information	tion, Disclaimer

Compliance criteria:		Attached supporting documentation	n:
System discharges sewage to the ground surface	☐ Yes* ☒ No	☐ Other: ☐ 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 ar			
Describe verification methods and	results:		
None of the above found.			
ank integrity – Compliance	component #2	of 5	
<b>ank integrity</b> – Compliance	component #2	of 5	
	component #2		n:
Compliance criteria:	· 	Attached supporting documentation	n:
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit,	component #2		n:
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit,	· 	Attached supporting documentation	<b>n:</b> Pinky's :
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit,	· 	Attached supporting documentation	
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?	_ Yes* ⊠ No	Attached supporting documentation  ⊠ Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:	Pinky's Service
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their	· 	Attached supporting documentation  ☑ Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector	Pinky's Service
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?	_ Yes* ⊠ No	Attached supporting documentation  ⊠ Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:	Pinky's Service
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their	_ Yes* ⊠ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance busin	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/202
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their	_ Yes* ⊠ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance businest Date of maintenance:  Existing tank integrity assessment (Attached)	Pinky's s <u>Service</u> ess: <u>L1673</u> <u>12/8/202</u> ach)
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their	_ Yes* ⊠ No	Attached supporting documentation  ⊠ Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance businest Date of maintenance:  □ Existing tank integrity assessment (Att	Pinky's <u>Service</u> ess: <u>L1673</u> <u>12/8/20:</u> ach)
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth?  If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:	☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance busines Date of maintenance:  Existing tank integrity assessment (Attached)  Date of maintenance  (mm/dd/yyyy):  (must be with	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/202 ach) nin three yea
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth?  If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:  Any "yes" answer above indicates.	☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance businest Date of maintenance:  Existing tank integrity assessment (Attached)  Date of maintenance (mm/dd/yyyy): (must be with the minus of the maintenance)  (See form instructions to ensure assessment)	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/203 ach)
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth?  If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:	☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance busines of maintenance:  Existing tank integrity assessment (Attached)  Date of maintenance (mm/dd/yyyy): (must be with the company of the compan	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/202 ach) nin three yea
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth?  If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:  Any "yes" answer above indicates.	☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance businest Date of maintenance:  Existing tank integrity assessment (Attached)  Date of maintenance (mm/dd/yyyy): (must be with the minus of the maintenance)  (See form instructions to ensure assessment)	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/202 ach) nin three yea
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth?  If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:  Any "yes" answer above indicates.	☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Yes* ☒ No	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance busines business bus	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/202 ach) nin three yea
Compliance criteria:  System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, leaching pit, or other pit?  Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth?  If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:  Any "yes" answer above indicates.	☐ Yes* ☑ No ☐ Yes* ☑ No ☐ Yes* ☑ No ☐ Attention of the system der.	Attached supporting documentation  Empty tank(s) viewed by inspector  Name of maintenance business:  License number of maintenance busines of maintenance:  Existing tank integrity assessment (Attached)  Date of maintenance (mm/dd/yyyy): (must be with the company of the compan	Pinky's Service ess: L1673 12/8/202 ach) nin three yea

https://www.pca.state.mn.us
wq-wwists4-31b • 4/28/2021

Business Name: Midwest Sewer Services    Date: 12/8/2022
3a. Maintenance hole covers appear to be structurally unsound (damaged, cracked, etc.), or unsecured?  □ Yes* ☑ No □ Unknown  3b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety? □ Yes* ☑ No □ Unknown*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:
3a. Maintenance hole covers appear to be structurally unsound (damaged, cracked, etc.), or unsecured?  □ Yes* ☑ No □ Unknown  3b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety? □ Yes* ☑ No □ Unknown*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:
<ul> <li>□ Yes* ⋈ No □ Unknown</li> <li>3b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety? □ Yes* ⋈ No □ Unknown *Yes to 3a or 3b - System is an imminent threat to public health and safety.</li> <li>3c. System is non-protective of ground water for other conditions as determined by inspector? □ Yes* ⋈ No</li> <li>3d. System not abandoned in accordance with Minn. R. 7080.2500? □ Yes* ⋈ No</li> <li>*Yes to 3c or 3d - System is failing to protect groundwater.</li> <li>Describe verification methods and results:</li> </ul>
3b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety? ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Unknown *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:
*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:
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:
3d. System not abandoned in accordance with Minn. R. 7080.2500?  *Yes to 3c or 3d - System is failing to protect groundwater.  Describe verification methods and results:
*Yes to 3c or 3d - System is failing to protect groundwater.  Describe verification methods and results:
Describe verification methods and results:
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation: ⊠ Not applicable □
Attached supporting documentation:   Not applicable
A Operating permit and nitrages DMD* Compliance company #4 of E. Maria
4. Operating permit and nitrogen BMP* − Compliance component #4 of 5 Not applicable
Is the system operated under an Operating Permit?
Is the system required to employ a Nitrogen BMP specified in the system design?   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. 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.
Describe verification methods and results:

https://www.pca.state.mn.us 651-296-6300 800-657-3864 wq-wwists4-31b • 4/28/2021

Soil separation – Compliance con	npone	nt #5 of	f 5		
Date of installation 1984 (mm/dd/yyyy)	_ Unkr	nown			
Shoreland/Wellhead protection/Food beverage lodging?  Compliance criteria (select one):		⊠ No	Attached supporting documentation:		
			Soil observation logs completed for the report		
			☐ Two previous verifications of required vertical separation. ☐ Not applicable (No soil treatment area)		
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:		□ No*			
			⊠ Reviewed design and permit records.		
Drainfield has at least a two-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.					
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.*		s □ No*	Indicate depths or elevations		
			A. Bottom of distribution media	See Attached Boring Log(s)	
			B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock		
			C. System separation		
			D. Required compliance separation*		
			*May be reduced up to 15 percent if allowed by Local Ordinance.		
5c. "Experimental", "Other", or "Performance" systems built under pre-2008 Rules; Type IV or V systems built under 2008 Rules 7080. 2350 or 7080.2400 (Intermediate Inspector License required ≤ 2,500 gallons per day; Advanced Inspector License required > 2,500 gallons per day)	☐ Yes	□ No*			
Drainfield meets the designed vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.					

**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.


800-657-3864

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

This information will be used for the purpose of conducting an MPCA Compliance Inspection.						
Date of Inspection: 12/5/2022 & 12/8/2022	Time: 11:00 AM					
Property Address: 16324 Morgan Ave N, May Tw	o, MN Zip: 55047					
Property Owner: Michael Renslow	Phone:					
Tank(s)       Tank(s)Material       Soil Treat         ⊠Septic 1       □Fiberglass       ⊠Rock         □Aerobic       □Plastic       □Grave	trench					
Are the tank maintenance covers accessible?   Yes   No *If no, proper maintenance must be performed through the maintenance holes. Maintenance hole covers should be made accessible to the ground surface to facilitate access and proper maintenance of the system.						
Year house built: 1984 Year septic installed: 1984 Tank size (gals.): 1200						
How long has seller owned the property?  Number of residents in home?						
Number of bedrooms? 3 Are all floors drained by gravity?						
Garbage disposal? Whirlpool bath?						
More than one system (laundry, etc.)?						
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 systems on this property serving other buildings?						
Location of septic system on lot? North Side						
Location of water well on lot?	Is the well a deep well? Y					
Have you ever experienced any problems with the system such as: tree roots, sewage back-ups, surfacing of sewage onto the ground, septic tank overflowing, etc.; or have any repairs been made to the system?  If yes, explain:						
When was the system last pumped? 12/8/2022 Name of pumper: Pinky's Sewer Service						
How often pumped in previous years?  Is system on a monitoring plan?						
Have you received notices from any government agency concerning this system?						
Is your property located in a shoreland management						
Do you have any additional information that should be given to the new owner?						
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 ocal 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

Owner/Occupant:	Date:



## **Soil Observations Log**

Observations Made By: Midwest Sewer Services Date: 12/5/2022  Classification System: USDA  Soil Observation: ST-1  Surface Elevation of Observation Of Obser	Locat	ion of Project:	16324 Morgan Ave	N. Mav	Twp. M	IN 55047	
Classification System:   Soil   So							12/5/2022
Surface Elevation of Observation    Same ground surface as last drainfield trench   Soils Encountered   Depth In Inches   Rock %   Soils Encountered   Depth In Inches   Rock %   Soils Encountered   Depth In Inches   Rock %   Soils Encountered   Depth Inches   Rock %	7						
Elevation of Observation   Same ground surface as last drainfield trench   Soils Encountered   Depth In Inches	Soi	l Observation:	ST-1		Soil C	bservation:	
Toches	Elevation of	_		Surface Elevation of			
12-43 43-55    Trace Of Gravel   Trace Of Grave	. I DUCK 0/2	Soils E	ncountered		Rock %	Soils	Encountered
SameElevation Of Observation Relative To SystemElevation Of Observation Relative To System-29"Depth To Bottom Of Distribution MediaDepth To Bottom Of Distribution Media≥26"Of SeparationOf SeparationEnd Of Soil Observation At:55"End Of Soil Observation At:Limiting Soil Conditions At:NoneLimiting Soil Conditions At:	12-43	10YR 3/4 Loa Trace 7.5YR 4/4 Loa	my Fine Sand With e Of Gravel amy Fine Sand With				
-29"       Depth To Bottom Of Distribution Media       Depth To Bottom Of Distribution Media         ≥26"       Of Separation       Of Separation         End Of Soil Observation At:       55"       End Of Soil Observation At:         Limiting Soil Conditions At:       None       Limiting Soil Conditions At:	55" Depth	г Го End Of Soil O	bservation Or Redox		Depth T	o End Of Soil	Observation Or Redox
≥26" Of Separation  End Of Soil Observation At: 55" End Of Soil Observation At:  Limiting Soil Conditions At: None Limiting Soil Conditions At:					Elevatio	n Of Observat	tion Relative To System
End Of Soil Observation At: 55" End Of Soil Observation At: Limiting Soil Conditions At: None Limiting Soil Conditions At:			stribution Media				Distribution Media
Limiting Soil Conditions At: None Limiting Soil Conditions At:	≥≥o jui sepa	ai aUUII			oi sepa	ıı atıvıı	
	End Of Soil	Observation At:	55"	End Of	Soil Ob	servation At:	
	Limiting Soi	l Conditions At:	None	Limitin	g Soil C	onditions At:	

Bottom Of Dist	ribution Medium At: 29 Inches
Signature:	Chan Ila

## LOG OF SOUL BORINGS

BOR	ING NO. /	BOR	ING NO.2	BORI	NG NO. 3	BORI	NG NO. 4
DEPTH IN PERT	DESCRIPTION	DEPTH IN FEET	BOIL DESCRIPTION	DEPTH IN FEET	BOIL DESCRIPTION	DEPTH IN PEET	SOIL DESCRIPTION
0	DARKBOOM	0	DARK Brind	0	DATE BOOWS	0	DATE BEAR
	Showy com		surey com		SHOT LOW		saday com
5"		6	<u>                                   </u>	7"		٠٠.	
ļ	LT. Brown.		15. Brown!-		ATIBOOW-		27 Brown -
<u> </u>	THA.	<b></b>	TAN- EINE LAPMY WAND		THE STATE		TAN AIME
<b> </b>	5040		RICKS		elawy same		recers
<b>-</b>							
56··		180		20			
<del>  ~</del>			RLO BIOWN	M <sub>O</sub>			
	SAWAY CIAY		sand coop		Elo Brown	38	
	coan		LOOM KACPS		+ RICES		RIO BANG
	KICFS		l i				pine sonny
					1		EA40.
		24					KOLES
<u></u>			RED 8.000				
46"			BAUFY HAM	45			
<u></u>	RIO BAND		RICKS		Rão arena		
	prince commy				very Five		
	5000	40			cony		
	RICKS		REO BOOM		samen Kette		
	ſ		sine conny				
			SAMO. Branch	5a ··			
			1		RLD Brown		
		44			Line commy		
		_	RED Washell		5446		
			Rive es smy		RICKS.		
			5440	57			
			Rocks				
		56			ALD GHAN		
<b>-</b>	<b> </b>	36			KICKI -		ľ
<b> </b>			ctitle commy		1		
			****	65	Ala Briwal		
<b></b>			resers		Small com		
-			j		(HARN THE)		
					(4,100)	<u>-</u>	1
ديي.		6.0.	O A SECTION	64"	06/1785///	64.	4.550,000

### **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 1<sup>st</sup> through April 1<sup>st</sup>) 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.