

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

Compliance Inspection Form

Existing Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS)

Doc Type: Compliance and Enforcement

Inspection results based on Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) requirements and attached forms – additional local requirements may also apply.	For local tracking purposes:					
Submit completed form to Local Unit of Government (LUG) and system owner within 15 days						
System Status						
System status on date (mm/dd/yyyy):12/11/2016						
 ✓ Compliant – Certificate of Compliance (Valid for 3 years from report date, unless shorter time frame outlined in Local Ordinance.) ✓ Noncompliant – Notice of Noncompliance (See Upgrade Requirements on page 3.) 						
Reason(s) for noncompliance (check all applicable) Impact on Public Health (Compliance Component #1) – Imminent threat to public health and safety Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance Component #3) – Imminent threat to public health and safety Tank Integrity (Compliance Component #2) – Failing to protect groundwater Other Compliance Conditions (Compliance Component #3) – Failing to protect groundwater Soil Separation (Compliance Component #4) – Failing to protect groundwater Operating permit/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance Component #5) – Noncompliant						
Property Information Parcel ID# or Sec/Twp/Ra	ange:					
	n for inspection: Sale					
_	's phone:					
or						
GC 26 75 GCS 979 EMM ANTONIO PRODUCT DE SONS 25	sentative phone:					
	atory authority phone: 651-430-6000					
Brief system description: Round pre-cast septic tank (1,000 gallons) and a rock to Comments or recommendations:	rench gravity drainfield					
System is 43 years old, still functioning hydraulically, has watertight pre-cast tank, at a second representative soil sample on southeast end of drainfield as area had been house and installation of the septic system.	nd has necessary soil separation. Could not get excavated and filled during construction of the					
Certification						
I hereby certify that all the necessary information has been gathered to determine the determination of future system performance has been nor can be made due to unknown possible abuse of the system, inadequate maintenance, or future water usage.	e compliance status of this system. No own conditions during system construction,					
Inspector name: Benjamin Zierke Certific	cation number: 9594					
Business name: Zierke Soil Testing Lic	cense number: 119					
Inspector signature:	hone number: 651-249-1346					
Necessary or Locally Required Attachments						
Soil boring logs	er local ordinance					
Other information (list):						

1.	Impact on Public Health —	Compliance comp	ponent #1 of 5				
	Compliance criteria:		Verification method(s):				
8.5	System discharges sewage to the ground surface.	☐ Yes ☒ No	✓ Searched for surface outlet✓ Searched for seeping in yard/backup in home				
55	System discharges sewage to drain tile or surface waters.	☐ Yes ⊠ No	 ☐ Excessive ponding in soil system/D-boxes ☐ Homeowner testimony (See Comments/Explanation) 				
	System causes sewage backup into dwelling or establishment.	☐ Yes ⊠ No	☐ "Black soil" above soil dispersal system ☐ System requires "emergency" pumping				
13	Any "yes" answer above ind system is an imminent threa health and safety.		☐ Performed dye test ☐ Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation) ☐ Other methods not listed (See Comments/Explanation)				
	Comments/Explanation:						
2.	Homeowners did not report any issue Tank Integrity – Compliance	,	f 5				
	Compliance criteria:		Verification method(s):				
	System consists of a seepage pit, cesspool, drywell, or leaching pit.	☐ Yes ⊠ No	☐ Probed tank(s) bottom ☐ Examined construction records				
	Seepage pits meeting 7080.2550 may be compliant if allowed in local ordinance.		 Examined Tank Integrity Form (Attach) Observed liquid level below operating depth 				
	Sewage tank(s) leak below their designed operating depth.	☐ Yes ☒ No					
	If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:		Probed outside tank(s) for "black soil"				
	Any "yes" answer above indicates the system is failing to protect groundwater.		 ☐ Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation) ☑ Other methods not listed (See Comments/Explanation) 				
	Comments/Explanation:						
	Examined empty tank 12/5/2016 - everything looked in good condition except for one small divot on the sidewall. Spoke with A&B who pumped the tank and they said that the operating level looked good in the tank when they opened it up for cleaning.						
3.	Other Compliance Conditio	ns – Compliance c	omponent #3 of 5				
	a. Maintenance hole covers are damaged, cracked, unsecured, or appear to be structurally unsound. ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Unknown						
	b. Other issues (electrical hazards, etc.) to immediately and adversely impact public health or safety. ☐ Yes* ☒ No ☐ Unknown *System is an imminent threat to public health and safety.						
	Explain:						
	c. System is non-protective of ground *System is failing to protect gro		itions as determined by inspector . ☐ Yes* ☒ No				
	Explain:						

4. Soil Separation - Compliance component #4 of 5						
Date of installation: 1973 (mm/dd/yyyy)	Unknown	Verification method(s):				
Shoreland/Wellhead protection/Food beverage lodging? Compliance criteria:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	Soil observation does not expire. Previous soil observations by two independent parties are sufficulties site conditions have been altered or local				
		requirements differ.				
For systems built prior to April 1, 1996, and not located in Shoreland or Wellhead	⊠ Yes □ No	Conducted soil observation(s) (Attach boring logs)				
Protection Area or not serving a food,		Two previous verifications (Attach boring logs)				
beverage or lodging establishment:		Not applicable (Holding tank(s), no drainfield)				
Drainfield has at least a two-foot vertical separation distance from periodically		Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation)				
saturated soil or bedrock.		Other (See Comments/Explanation)				
Non-performance systems built April 1, 1996, or later or for non-performance systems located in Shoreland or Wellhead Protection Areas or serving a food, beverage, or lodging establishment:	☐ Yes ☐ No	Comments/Explanation:				
Drainfield has a three-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.*						
"Experimental", "Other", or "Performance"	☐ Yes ☐ No	Indicate depths or elevations				
systems built under pre-2008 Rules; Type IV or V systems built under 2008 Rules (7080.		Bottom of distribution media	97.5'			
2350 or 7080.2400 (Advanced Inspector License required)	3	B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock	93.0'			
Drainfield meets the designed vertical		C. System separation	4.5'			
separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.		D. Boguired compliance constation*	2.0'			
Any "no" answer above indicates the system is failing to protect groundwater. D. Required compliance separation* 2.0' *May be reduced up to 15 percent if allowed by Local Ordinance. Ordinance. 5. Operating Permit and Nitrogen BMP* — Compliance component #5 of 5 Not applicable						
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						
Operating Permit number: Have the Operating Permit requirements been met?		☐ Yes ☐ No				
b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning?		g?				
Any "no" answer indicates Noncompliance.						
Ungrade Peguirements (Minn. Stat. S. 115. 55) An imminent threat to public health and a fat. (ITD) (2)						

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.

Logs of Soil Borings

Location of Project:

11010 Mayberry Trail Marine on St Croix, MN 55047

Borings Made by Ben Zierke

Date:

12/5/2016

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

Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 1	Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 2
0-6"	7.5YR 3/3 loamy sand		
6-42"	7.5YR 4/4 medium sand, 5% coarse fragments		
42-84"	7.5YR 4/4 medium sand with 2-3" fine sand bands		
84-90"	7.5YR 4/4 loamy fine sand and 10YR 4/4 silt bands,redox below 84"		
- 1 61	7.5 feet		feet
End of boring at Standing water table Present at Standing water not p Mottled Soil: Observed at Mottled soil not pres Comments:	le: feet of depth Hours after boring resent in hole 7 feet of depth	End of boring at Standing water table Present at Standing water not pr Mottled Soil: Observed at Mottled soil not prese Comments:	feet of depth feet of depth feet of depth feet of depth
Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 3	Depth, in Inches	Boring Number 4
O	feet	0	teet
End of boring at Standing water table Present at Standing water not p Mottled Soil: Observed at Mottled soil not pres Comments:	feet of depth Hours after boring resent in hole feet of depth	End of boring at Standing water table Present at Standing water not pr Mottled Soil: Observed at Mottled soil not prese Comments:	feet of depth Hours after boring feet of depth feet of depth

(top of insp. cap on outlet baffle) Benchmark: 105.6 B1 Separation: 4.5 Bottom of rock: 97.5 Top of rock: 99.0 B1: 100.0, redox 93.0 Relative Elevations (feet) © 2016 Google Imagery Date: 3/11/2016 45°14'24.49" N 92°52'53.01" W elev 977 ft eye alt 1196 ft 🔘 Google Earth