State of Wisconsin
Department of Natural Resources
PO Box 7921, Madison WI 53707-7921

Remediation & Redevelopment Continuing Obligation Review

Form 4400-232 (R 5/15)

BRRTS ID No. 02-72-000080

Reviewer: Hvizdak, Thomas

Region: WCR

Review Date: 06/14/2017

Site Name: Winch Oil Wood Cnty Farm Supply

See RR5242 for instructions http://intranet.dnr.state.wi.us/int/aw/rr/guidance/RR5242.pdf . Steps with an * denote DNR follow up; ** denote RP/property owner follow up. If auditing a VPLE site, use the applicable LUST or ERP BRRTS number. Use the NOTES area in each section to add information not otherwise addressed.

File Review:

1. Review BRRTS, and the file if needed, to identify the File Review information:

Site Address	City	ZIP Code
6564 East Cameron Ave/4969 Depot St	Vesper	54489

County Parcel Identification Number (PIN)	FID Number
2900440/2900443	772072180

Original Responsible Person

William Winch & Harmony Country Coop (Currently Provision Partners)

Has the property been transferred since the continuing obligation was recorded/applied? ○ No ◉ Yes

If Yes: Current Property Owner

Citizens State Bank of Loyal, Michael Dieck (Pcl 2900440) Novinsky Acquisitions LLC (Pcl 2900443)

Phone Number	Email
(715) 659-5159	mdieck@csbloyal.com

Select all continuing obligations applied (at case closure or RAP approval or letter to LGU):

Add to BRRTS	AC in BRRTS	AC	Action Code (AC) Meaning
		51	Deed notice
		52	Deed restriction for soil
		730	Groundwater use restriction
		95	Deed instrument conditions met *(for audits, use if deed restriction was updated by filing a deed notice)*
		101	GIS Registry PDF modified - date DNR letter sent
		104	Site removed from GIS Registry - date DNR letter sent
		696	Continuing obligation required of LGU to maintain liability exemption
		605	Green Space Grant awarded (deed restriction)
	X	56	Continuing Obligation applied *(use with codes 220-238)*
		220	Soil at industrial use level
	X	222	Cover/engineered containment system *(pavement, soil cover, etc.)*
	X	224	Structural impediment *(buildings or other structures)*
		226	Vapor mitigation/response
		228	Site-specific *(identify in comment field)*
		230	LGU was directed to take a protective action
	X	232	Residual soil contamination > RCLs/SS RCLs *(use with AC 220, 222, 224)*
	X	234	Monitoring well needs to be abandoned
	X	236	Site closed with groundwater contamination > ES
		238	Maintenance and inspection documentation required to be submitted
X		185	Closure Compliance Review completed
		186	Closure Compliance Review - RP follow up needed
		187	Closure Compliance Review follow up completed
X		99	Use this code with comments, for actions not listed under AC 186 (i.e. submittal of inspection reports)

How was site selected for audit? (AC = BRRTS Action Code)

- ☐ Vapor Mitigation AC 226
- ☐ VPLE with AC 56
- ☐ Enforcement Follow-up
- ☐ Other:
- ☐ Green Space Grant AC 605
- ☒ AC 220, 222, 224, 228, or 230
- ☐ Deed Restriction AC 52 or 696 (LGU)
- ☒ Age of Remedy
- ☐ Complaint Received
- ☐ Regional Priority

Date of:

- ☒ Final Closure 08/20/2007
- ☐ Certificate of Completion
- ☐ Green Space Grant
- ☐ Remedial Action Plan Approval
- ☐ General Liability Clarification Letter
- ☐ Local Gov't Unit (LGU) Letter

Describe any site-specific requirements (AC 228) that the site owner and/or responsible party needed to address:

Is the site on the GIS Registry? ◉ Yes ○ No – *Add it to the GIS Registry**

Were neighboring properties affected? ○ Yes ◉ No

If yes, are these properties listed on the GIS Registry and in BRRTS? ○ Yes ○ No – *Update the GIS Registry/BRRTS, use form 4400-246**

Was a maintenance plan required at closure? ○ NA ○ No ◉ Yes – It is: ◉ in the file ○ PDF ○ missing

If no maintenance plan was required, offer the property owner the template model with inspection log, and note in the follow up section of the audit that one was provided on the audit date

Was/were the appropriate restriction(s) recorded with the Register of Deeds? ○ Yes ○ No ◉ NA

Has a restriction been amended, or been nullified by DNR? ○ No

○ Yes: Was BRRTS updated? (95) ○ Yes ○ No*

Was the GIS Registry PDF updated? ○ Yes ○ No*

Notes:

At the time of closure the site encompassed 2 properties. These properties went into foreclosure within the last year and each parcel is now owned by different parties. The address for the front-lot remains the same, the address for the back-lot is now 4969 Depot St., Vesper, WI, owner contact information is John (Jack) Novinsky 715-677-3100 jack@rightwayandstratfordpropane.com

Site Visit:

2. Contact the site owner for access. Provide a copy of the maintenance plan, if applicable. If the audit is being conducted for a CO which would now require a maintenance plan, provide a template version if no maintenance plan was required at closure, for the property owner's use (voluntary).

3. Walk the site (ideally with the owner or responsible party) to review the site conditions against the conditions documented at closure/other to verify or change answers to questions in #1. Discuss use of the maintenance plan or template.

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

Did the site owner know about the continuing obligation(s)? ○ Yes ◉ No

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

- ◉ No
- ○ Yes – Explain:

Examples: 1) a building has been razed and investigation and remediation occurred.
2) excavation or residential development has occurred in a restricted area.

Has a pavement (asphalt or concrete) cover, soil cover or other sort of cover, such as a building, been removed or is it in disrepair?
- (●) No/NA
- ( ) Yes – Should it be replaced or repaired? ( ) Yes** ( ) No

If a performance standard was the final remedy, has it been altered?
- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Explain:

Was the DNR notified? ( ) Yes ( ) No

Have local zoning changes occurred since closure?
- (●) No/NA
- ( ) Yes – Does it appear to impact the effectiveness of the restriction?
  - ( ) No
  - ( ) Yes – Describe:

Is soil sampling needed to determine if the final remedy has been modified such that a direct contact threat exists?
- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Describe:

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

Has additional monitoring or remediation been done since the site was closed?
- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Describe:

Does a new threat to public health or the environment exist (e.g. new sources or exposure routes)?
- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Does sampling need to be performed?
  - ( ) No
  - ( ) Yes** – Describe what should be done to address the problem, and by whom:

Is the vapor mitigation system or sub-slab depressurization system (SSDS) operating as designed? (pressure gradient being maintained)
- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No** – Describe any follow up needed:
- (●) NA

Have any of the exposure assumptions used for closure changed at this site?
- ( ) NA
- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Describe any follow up needed:

Has the land use at this site changed such that a vapor intrusion pathway may now exist?
- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Describe any follow up needed:

Has the land use changed such that there are either health or safety issues?

- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Describe any follow up needed:

Notes:

COMPLIANCE AND FOLLOW-UP SUMMARY:

5. Identify compliance and any follow up needed.

Is the site in compliance with the continuing obligations/closure approval document?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No – Describe what's not in compliance and the reasons for noncompliance:

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

Has the maintenance agreement required at closure been followed?

- ( ) Yes
- (●) No – Describe: The property ownership changed due to foreclosure and so there is no available documentation regarding any inspections prior to foreclosure.
- ( ) NA

Was the property owner reminded to complete and document the (yearly) inspections?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No – Why not?
- ( ) NA

Was a maintenance plan or template provided to the property owner at the site visit?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No – If no, why not?
- ( ) NA

6. Are additional actions by the RP property owner warranted at the site?** *The intent is to return the site to compliance with continuing obligation. If a significant land use change has occurred, and/or further remedial action is needed, determine if the site meets the NR 726 reopening criteria.)*

- (●) No
- ( ) Yes – Summarize the actions needed to return the site to compliance and identify who is responsible:

Notes:

Add AC 186 for RP/property owner follow-up required. Use AC 99 if a reminder was provided to the property owner to complete and document inspections.

7. * Does the site require follow up by DNR?

- (●) No
- ( ) Yes:
  - [ ] contact or enforcement to return site to compliance with continuing obligation
  - [ ] updating the GIS Registry (adding or modifying a packet)
  - [ ] reopen site (add ACs 186, 12 and 13)
  - [ ] other: _____

8. * Attach photographs of the site, documenting site conditions. Label the photos with the site name/BRRTS Activity number/date/view. If a follow-up letter is sent, include a copy with the audit. (audit/photos/follow-up letter)

9. * Save a copy of the audit using the following naming convention: BRRTS#_COAUDIT_Year.pdf (example: 0365001149_COAUDIT_2008.pdf).

10. Update applicable BRRTS action codes on the Table on page 1. Send a copy of the audit to your Regional EPA for updating ACs and uploading the PDF into BRRTS.

11. Notify Central Office when the audit has been completed and loaded into BRRTS.

{Click to Add/Edit Image File (*.bmp;*.jpg;*.gif;*.png;*.tif)} Date added: 06/19/2017

Title: 6564 E Cameron St. Gravel and paved cover on front-lot, view looking south from alley.

{Click to Add/Edit Image File (*.bmp;*.jpg;*.gif;*.png;*.tif)}

Date added: 06/19/2017

Title: 4969 Depot St. Gravel and paved cover on back lot, view looking North from alley