

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

Compliance Inspection Form

Existing Subsurface Sewage Treatment Systems (SSTS)

Doc Type: Compliance and Enforcement

requirements and attached for	on Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) orms – additional local requirements may also apply.	
Submit completed form to within 15 days	Local Unit of Government (LUG) and system or	wner
System Status		
System status on dat	te (mm/dd/yyyy): 4/17/2017	
	report date, unless shorter time (See U	compliant - Notice of Noncompliance Upgrade Requirements on page 3.)
Reason(s) for none	compliance (check all applicable)	
☐ Impact on Publi	c Health (Compliance Component #1) - Imminent	threat to public health and safety
Other Complian	ce Conditions (Compliance Component #3) - Imm	inent threat to public health and safety
	Compliance Component #2) – Failing to protect gro	
	ce Conditions (Compliance Component #3) - Faili	
☐ Soil Separation	(Compliance Component #4) - Failing to protect g	roundwater
Operating perm	it/monitoring plan requirements (Compliance Comp	ponerit #5) Noricompilant
\ •	amar Ave S Cottage Grove, MN 55016	wp/Range: 1202721230042 Reason for inspection: Property Transfer
or		Owner's phone: 651-402-5504
Owner's representative:		Representative phone:651_430.6655
Local regulatory authority:	VVacinity.	Regulatory authority phone: 651-430-6655
Brief system description:	1 Septic Tank to gravity drainfield	
Comments or recommend		
System was installed in the	1980's.	
Certification		the annual area of this system. No
determination of future syst	necessary information has been gathered to determ em performance has been nor can be made due to m, inadequate maintenance, or future water usage	o unknown conditions during system construction, e.
Inspector name: Dave Br	rown	Certification number: C#9370
Business name: David R	. Brown	License number: L#3649
Inspector signature:	Don't R. Bond	Phone number: 651-788-3296
Necessary or Locall	y Required Attachments	
☑ Soil boring logs☑ Other information (list	Z cyclenian is saint arranged	orms per local ordinance
	,	

1.	Impact on Public Health —	Compliance componer	nt #1 of 5			
	Compliance criteria:		Verification method(s):			
	System discharges sewage to the ground surface.	☐ Yes ⊠ No	 ⊠ Searched for surface outlet ⊠ Searched for seeping in yard/backup in home 			
	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			
	Any "yes" answer above indicates the system is an imminent threat to public health and safety.		☐ Performed dye test ☐ Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation) ☐ Other methods not listed (See Comments/Explanation)			
2.	Comments/Explanation: Tank Integrity — Compliance	component #2 of 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. If yes, which sewage tank(s) leaks:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	☐ Examined empty (pumped) tanks(s)☐ Probed outside tank(s) for "black soil"			
	Any "yes" answer above ind system is failing to protect g	licates the groundwater.	 ☐ Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation) ☐ Other methods not listed (See Comments/Explanation) 			
3.	Comments/Explanation: Other Compliance Condition					
			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 is an imminent threat to public health and safety. 					
	Explain:					
	 c. System is non-protective of ground water for other conditions as determined by inspector . \[\sum Yes* \text{No} \] *System is failing to protect groundwater. Explain: 					

Property address: 7234 Lamar Ave S Cottage Grove, MN 55016

Inspector initials/Date: DRB | 4/17/2017

Inspector initials/Date: DRB | 4/17/2017 Property address: 7234 Lamar Ave S Cottage Grove, MN 55016 (mm/dd/yyyy)

4. Soil Separation - Compliance co	mponent #4 of 5				
Date of installation:	□ Unknown	Verification method(s):			
(mm/dd/yyyy) Shoreland/Wellhead protection/Food beverage lodging? Compliance criteria:	☐ Yes ⊠ No	observations by two independent pa	oil observation does not expire. Previous soil observations by two independent parties are sufficient, nless site conditions have been altered or local equirements differ.		
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: Drainfield has at least a two-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.	⊠ Yes □ No	 ☐ Conducted soil observation(s) (Attach boring logs) ☐ Two previous verifications (Attach boring logs) ☐ Not applicable (Holding tank(s), no drainfield) ☐ Unable to verify (See Comments/Explanation) ☐ 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: Drainfield has a three-foot vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.*	⊠ Yes □ No	Comments/Explanation:			
"Experimental", "Other", or "Performance" systems built under pre-2008 Rules; Type IV or V systems built under 2008 Rules (7080. 2350 or 7080.2400 (Advanced Inspector License required) Drainfield meets the designed vertical separation distance from periodically saturated soil or bedrock.	☐ Yes ☐ No	A. Bottom of distribution media B. Periodically saturated soil/bedrock C. System separation	28" 66" 38"		
Any "no" answer above indicates to failing to protect groundwater. 5. Operating Permit and Nitroger		D. Required compliance separation* *May be reduced up to 15 percent if Ordinance. nce component #5 of 5			
Is the system operated under an Operating Is the system required to employ a Nitroge BMP = Best Management Practice(s) If the answer to both questions is "I Compliance criteria	n BMP? Ye specified in the system no", this section do	s ☐ No If "yes", B below is required design			
a. Operating Permit number: Have the Operating Permit requirements been met? b. Is the required nitrogen BMP in place and properly functioning? Any "no" answer indicates Noncompliance.					

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.

トフ

