

**1. Conduct a file review of the case information at the time of closure to answer some general questions about the site including:**

Project Manager: Jill Zalesny

Review Date: 8/14/2009

Site Name: Fraser Shipyards AOC #11

BRRTS Number: 02-16-120588

FID Number: 816047210

Parcel No.: 03-803-02127-00

Address: 3<sup>rd</sup> St. and Clough Ave., Superior, WI

Current Property Owner: Fraser Shipyard

Original Responsible Party: Same

Property Owner at Closure (if different): Same

Has the site been geolocated?  Yes  No

Site Coordinates (WTM83/91): 360354, 697886

How was site selected for audit?

Random  Regional Priority  Compliance Follow-up  Other (specify)

Complaint Received

Is the site on a GIS Registry?  Yes  No

Did the close-out letter include some specific requirements that the site owner and/or responsible party needed to address?  Yes  No

If Yes, describe specific requirements:

A concrete cap ("floor") was poured over soil impacted with lead to eliminate direct contact concerns. The closure required ongoing inspection and maintenance actions.

What types of restrictions existed at the time of case closure? (check all that apply)

- Pavement, Soil or Other Cover       Industrial Land-Use Restriction  
 Structural Impediment       Other Performance Standard

Was a maintenance plan required at closure?  Yes       No

Has/have there been amendments to the restriction(s) or has/have the restriction(s) been nullified by DNR?  Yes       No

Was/were the appropriate restriction(s) recorded with the Register of Deeds?

- Yes       No

Has the property been transferred since the restriction was recorded?

- Yes       No

Date of closure:

- Conditional 10/09/1997       Final  
 Final Closure Pending

Were there other restricted properties associated with the source site (ie. Affected neighboring properties)?  Yes       No

**2. Contact the site owner to get appropriate clearance for access, and walk the site (ideally with the owner or responsible party) to review the site conditions against the conditions documented at closure to verify or change answers to questions in #1.**

With the site owner/RP (if possible), review and answer the following for DNR RR records:

Have site conditions changed since the closure of the case that would affect either a deed restriction or other restrictions or requirements associated with the site?

Examples: a building has been razed and the location of the building prevented full investigation and/or remediation; excavation or residential development has occurred in a restricted area.

Has additional monitoring or remediation been done since the site was closed?

Yes  No

If a performance standard was the final remedy, has it been altered?

Yes  No

If yes above, was DNR notified?  Yes  No

If a maintenance agreement was required at closure, has it been followed?

Yes  No

Have local zoning changes occurred since closure?  Yes  No

If "Yes", does it appear to impact the effectiveness of the restriction?

Yes  No

Were any new potential sources of contamination identified?  Yes  No

If "Yes", does sampling need to be performed?  Yes  No

**3. Answer the following and document for the file the results of the compliance review of the case:**

Is the site in general compliance with the closure approval document?

Yes  No

(May depend on extent of non-compliance, non-maintenance of remedy or changed ownership/conditions. If case is out of compliance, it should be prioritized by the region, for new casework or enforcement, as needed.)

Is soil contamination located beneath an existing structure (i.e. building, road etc.)?

Yes  No

Is the structure still present?  Yes  No

Is an asphalt cap or soil cap/cover removed or in disrepair?  Yes  No

If "Yes", should it be replaced or repaired?  Yes  No

Is soil monitoring needed to determine if the final remedy has been modified such that a direct contact threat exists?  Yes  No

For example, an asphalt cap has been removed or is in disrepair or a new contaminated site is present upgradient, etc.

If a new threat to public health or the environment exists, what should be done to address the problem and by whom?

Are additional actions warranted at the site?  Yes  No If yes, please explain:

Does the site require follow-up by DNR?  Yes  No

Does the site restriction need to be changed?  Yes  No

Has the GIS Registry code for the site been entered into BRRTS?  Yes  No

Has the Closure Compliance Review code for the site been entered into BRRTS?

Yes  No

BRRTS #: 02-16-120588

Closure Compliance Review Tracking Table

Check if applicable, to be added to BRRTS:	BRRTS Action Code	Meaning
x	185	Closure Compliance Review completed
	186	Closure Compliance Review follow up needed
	187	Closure Compliance Review follow up completed
x	50	Add to GIS Registry
	51	Deed notice (if code was missing)
	52	Deed restriction (if code was missing)
	LUCs:	
x	220	Soil at industrial use level
x	222	Cap/cover/engineered containment system (pavement, etc.)
	224	Structural impediment
	226	Vapor mitigation/other vapor control
	228	Site-specific
	230	LGU was directed to take a protective action
	Other:	
	232	Site closed with residual soil ("manage as waste" paragraph)
	234	Monitoring well needs to be abandoned, when found
	236	Site closed with groundwater > ES