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## INTRODUCTION

## General

This report presents the findings for the subsurface investigative activities performed at the Hugo Speaker Property located at 6382 US Highway 18, Mount Ida, Grant County, Wisconsin since the most recent Status Update, which was submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) on August 13, 2015. In addition, this report presents recommendations for additional work, based on the findings. The activities were performed at the request and authorization of Mrs. Sharon Speaker, the former property owner and responsible party for the release.

## Purpose

The purpose of the investigation was to further evaluate the extent of petroleum affected groundwater resulting from a release from a former underground storage tank system.

## Scope

The scope of the most recent site investigation activities included the advancement of three (3) soil borings; air rotary drilling; the installation of three monitoring wells, collection of two (2) rounds of groundwater samples from the monitoring wells for laboratory analysis, an analysis of the data obtained; and preparation of this report. The investigation activities were structured specifically to address the presence of constituents associated with the former USTs.

## Authorization

Authorization to perform this site investigation was in the form of an acceptance copy of the Wisconsin Department of Commerce agent contract, dated May 12, 2010 and signed by Sharon Speaker on June 3, 2010. This report has been prepared on behalf of, and exclusively for the use of Sharon Speaker. The information contained in this Status Update/Groundwater Monitoring Report may not be relied upon by any other parties without the expressed written consent of General Engineering and Client, and acceptance by such parties of General Engineering's General Conditions.

## SITE FEATURES AND BACKGROUND

## Site Features

The project site is located at 6832 U.S. Highway 18 in Mount Ida, Wisconsin. More specifically, the property is located within the Northwest $1 / 4$ of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of Section 29, Township 06 North, Range 03 West, Grant County, Wisconsin. The site is located within a rural area surrounded by primarily residential properties and wooded land. A site location map is shown in Figure 1, Appendix A.

The subject site is currently occupied by a residence on the southwestern portion of the property. The surrounding properties are comprised of residential properties to the west; vacant or wooded land to the north; dense wooded land followed by a residential property to the east; and US Highway 18, followed by residential properties to the southwest.
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## Background

According to Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) records, one (1) 500 gallon single wall tank containing unleaded gasoline and one (1) 500 gallon single wall tank containing leaded gasoline are registered to the site as closed/removed on December 9, 1997. It is understood that the tanks were formerly located to the west of the northwest corner of the building and the dispensers were located along the southwestern portion of the property, located along Hwy 18. The locations of the former USTs are shown on Figure 2, Appendix A.

The WDNR was reportedly notified of a release on December 12, 1997 and a responsible party (RP) letter was sent on December 23, 1997. The case remained idle for several years and a push action was taken by the WDNR on December 27, 2004 followed by a deed affidavit for enforcement on March 28, 2005, and an additional push action on October 9, 2009. As a result, General Engineering Company was retained in May of 2010 to perform a soil and groundwater investigation at the site.

As part of the initial site investigation activities, six (6) soil probes, designated GP-1 to GP-6, were advanced on September 23, 2010. Due to the uneven and steep terrain, an all-terrain soil probe unit advanced seven additional probes, designated GP-7 to GP-13, on October 14, 2010 to further evaluate the extent of affected soil. The probes were advanced until refusal on bedrock at depths ranging from 4 feet to 14 feet below ground surface. Petroleum affected soils were encountered west/southwest of the structure near the location of the former tank bed and beyond toward the southwest and the former dispenser area.

Due to the presence of soil contamination to the depth of bedrock, one (1) boring was advanced into bedrock on June 3, 2011. Due to the terrain, a truck-mounted drilling rig could not access the former tank or dispenser area. Therefore, soil boring MW-1 was advanced just west of the property boundary, northwest of the former tank system. The boring was blind drilled to a depth of 8 feet to auger refusal on bedrock and advanced to a depth of approximately 32 feet utilizing air rotary drilling techniques. The boring was converted to a monitoring well, designated MW-1. Due to the presence of petroleum compounds within the initial groundwater sample collected from MW-1, two additional soil borings were advanced into bedrock on September 2, 2011. One boring was advanced to the south/southeast of the former tank bed (MW-2) and one was advanced to the northeast of MW-1 beyond the subject property boundary to the west (MW-3). The borings were blind drilled to bedrock at depths of about 10 feet and 8 feet below grade, respectively. The borings were advanced utilizing air rotary drilling techniques to depths of about 59 feet and 36 feet, respectively. The locations of the soil probes, soil borings, and monitoring wells are shown on Figure 3, Appendix A.

The soils at the probe locations generally consisted of gravel or grass/topsoil underlain by variable natural soils consisting of reddish brown and brown silty clay, silty sand, and sandy silt with varying amounts of gravel extending to bedrock at depths of 4 to 14 feet below grade. Groundwater was not encountered within the soil probes. At the soil borings, groundwater was encountered within bedrock at depths ranging from about 15 to 40 feet below grade.

Petroleum odors and PID results were observed within the samples collected from GP-2, GP-4, GP-7, GP-8, GP9 , and GP-10. The highest PID levels ( 983 IU to $1,242 \mathrm{IU}$ ) were detected within the soil samples collected from GP-7 (southwest of the former tank system) and GP-10 (near the southeast corner of the former tank system) at depths of about 13 feet and 9 feet, respectively.

Soil samples were collected from each probe at depths of approximately 4 to 14 feet below grade, where bedrock was encountered. Soil samples were collected and analyzed for the presence of PVOC, naphthalene, and GRO. The soil samples collected from GP-2, GP-4, GP-7, GP-8, and GP-10 contained petroleum compounds at levels exceeding each compound's respective NR 720 cancer risk based residual contaminant level (C RCL) or soil to groundwater standards. The highest levels of petroleum compounds were detected within the sample collected from GP-7 (near the former dispensers) at a depth of 13 to 14 feet below ground surface (bgs). The sample contained benzene at a concentration of 1,240 micrograms per kilogram ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}$ ), ethylbenzene ( $27,100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg}$ ), naphthalene $(9,300(\mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg})$, toluene $(8,660 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg})$, total trimethylbenzene $(84,200 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg})$, and total xylenes
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$(127,800 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{kg})$. The detected concentrations exceed their respective NR 720 Cancer Residual Contaminant Level (C RCL) and/or soil to groundwater RCL. Soil analytical results are summarized on Table 1, Appendix A.

The samples collected at the remaining locations either did not contain petroleum compounds or did not contain them at levels exceeding their respective standards. None of the collected samples from the direct contact zone contained petroleum compounds at concentrations exceeding their respective standards. The results of the chemical analyses on the soil samples are summarized on Table 1, Appendix B.

Groundwater samples were collected from MW-1 on July 5, 2011. Groundwater samples were collected from monitoring wells MW-1 to MW-3 on November 22, 2011, June 21, 2012, June 4, 2013, and August 8, 2014. The groundwater samples collected from monitoring wells MW-1 and MW-3 have generally contained benzene, ethylbenzene, naphthalene, and trimethylbenzene, and 1,2 dichloroethane (1,2 DCA) at levels exceeding each compound's respective NR 140 ES of 5 micrograms per liter ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{l}), 700 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 100 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 480 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$, and $5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$, respectively. The highest levels were observed within the samples collected from MW-1, which contained benzene levels of $2,540 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 1,640 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 2,710 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 1,260 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$, and $2,490 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ during the sampling rounds performed. The samples collected from MW-3 contained benzene levels of $1,210 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 19.9 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}, 364 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$, and $990 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{I}$. The samples collected from MW-2 contained benzene at levels exceeding its NR 140 PAL during the initial two sampling rounds but did not contain PVOCs or naphthalene during the June 4, 2013 and August 8, 2014 sampling rounds. The results of the groundwater analyses are summarized in Table 2 in Appendix B.

Based on the soil probes and borings/monitoring wells performed to date, it appears that the extent of soil contamination has generally been defined and is confined to the area of the former USTs and to the southwest of the former USTs (GP-2, GP-7, GP-8, and GP-10). However, it is possible that soil contamination may extend beneath the residence to the southeast of the former tanks. At the time of the most recent Status Update (August 13,2015 ), the house on the subject site was unoccupied. GEC recommended that a preliminary vapor sample be collected from the lowest level of the house to address concerns related to the migration of vapors into the structure. Since submittal of the August 13, 2015 Status Update, the property is under new ownership and the house is being occupied by the new owner. The vapor testing has not been performed as of the date of this report and funds to perform the testing will be requested as part of a bid deferral request, which will be submitted subsequent to this status update.

With regard to the groundwater, since groundwater samples collected from MW-1 and MW-3 contained PVOCs, naphthalene, and 1,2 DCA at concentrations exceeding the NR 140 ES, GEC recommended the installation of three additional bedrock monitoring wells the northeast, north and northwest of the former tank area, beyond MW1 and MW-3. The installation of the three additional wells and additional groundwater sampling rounds are discussed herein.

## FIELD ACTIVITIES AND PROCEDURES

## Scope Summary

The scope of field exploration during the most recent site investigation activities included the advancement of three (3) soil borings; air rotary drilling; installation of a monitoring well (MW-6); two bedrock monitoring wells (MW-4 and MW-5); and performance of two (2) rounds of groundwater sampling. The monitoring wells were installed to further evaluate the extent of affected groundwater and the stability of the contaminant plume.

The soil borings/monitoring wells were performed by Ground Source (MW-4) or Soils \& Engineering Services, Inc. (MW-5 and MW-6) under the direction of General Engineering. Soil samples were collected by driving a 24 -inch split spoon into undisturbed soils. Two of the borings (MW-4 and MW-5) were advanced to bedrock and were completed utilizing air rotary drilling techniques.

Since the area of affected soil appears to have been defined and no petroleum odors or PID results were detected within the samples or cutting from the soil borings, no soil samples from MW-4, MW-5, and MW-6 were submitted for laboratory analysis.
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## Field Exploration

As part of the additional site investigation activities, one (1) monitoring well (MW-6) and one (1) bedrock monitoring well (MW-4) were performed on June 30, 2016 and October 11, 2016, respectively. A bedrock monitoring well (MW-5) was also performed on October 11, 2016. Refusal was encountered within MW-4 and MW-5 at depths of 22 feet and 9 feet bgs, respectively. Refusal was not encountered at MW-6 to a depth of 26 feet. MW-4 and MW-5 were advanced utilizing air rotary drilling techniques to depths of 45.5 feet and 29 feet, respectively. The wells were installed to depths of 45 feet, 29 feet, and 22 feet, respectively. The locations of the monitoring wells are shown on Figure 3, Appendix A.

The monitoring well construction consisted of a 15-foot (MW-4 and MW-5) to 10-foot (MW-6) section of 2-inch diameter, machine slotted PVC screen placed at or near the bottom of the borehole. This was surrounded by a properly graded granular filter medium in the annular space, with un-slotted riser pipe extending from the screened section to about 6 -inches below the ground surface. A bentonite seal of approximately 2 feet, was placed above the granular filter medium. The remaining annular space was filled to the ground surface with bentonite chips. Flush mounted protective covers were used to protect the wells. Monitoring well construction forms are included within Appendix D.

## Field Volatile Vapor Emission Screening

Soil samples collected from the soil borings were screened for volatile organic vapor emissions with a Photovac Photoionization Detector (PID). The soil samples were placed in a plastic bag and permitted to equilibrate to at least 70 degrees Fahrenheit for a period of at least 15 minutes, based upon the ambient outdoor temperature. The screening was then performed by inserting the probe in the bag and measuring the headspace. The PID is an electronic instrument that measures the relative concentration of volatile organic vapor emissions in the headspace of a container. The response of the instrument is dependent upon volatility, temperature, and the ionization potential of the compounds measured. The meter serves as one tool in selecting samples for analytical testing, as it only gives a relative indication of the presence of volatile organic vapor emissions, but cannot quantify concentrations of individual compounds. PID readings were not detected within the auger cutting from MW-4 or the soil samples collected from MW-5 and MW-6.

## DESCRIPTION OF SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

## General

A description of the subsurface conditions encountered at the soil probe locations is shown on the soil boring logs in Appendix D. The lines of demarcation shown on the logs represent an approximate boundary between the various soil classifications, but the transition is likely to be more gradual. It must be recognized that the soil descriptions are considered representative for the specific location, and that variations may occur between and beyond the sampling intervals and probe locations. A summary of the major soil profile components is described in the following paragraphs.

## Soil Conditions

The soils at the boring locations generally consisted of grass/topsoil underlain by variable natural soils consisting of reddish brown clayey silty or brown sandy silt with varying amounts of gravel to the refusal or termination depths of the borings at depths ranging from 9 feet to 26 feet bgs. Bedrock was encountered at depths of 22 feet at MW4 and 9 feet at MW-5. Groundwater was not encountered within the upper soils at MW-4 and MW-5, but was encountered at a depth of about 12 feet at MW-6. At MW-4 and MW-5, groundwater appeared to be encountered within bedrock at depths ranging from about 15 to 35 feet below grade.

No soil staining or petroleum odors were detected within the auger cutting collected at MW-4 or within the soil samples collected from MW-5 and MW-6. No PID results were detected in the collected samples.
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## GROUNDWATER MONITORING ACTIVITIES

## Monitoring Well Development

Monitoring wells MW-4 to MW-6 were developed on October 17, 2016. The monitoring wells were developed by alternately surging and purging with a bailer. The well development and other pertinent details are shown on Well Development Forms (Form 4400-113B), included in Appendix D.

## Groundwater Sampling

Groundwater samples were collected from MW-1 to MW-6 on February 11, 2016 and October 17, 2016. The samples were submitted for laboratory analysis for the presence of PVOCs, naphthalene, and/or 1,2 dichloroethane (DCA).

Samples submitted for PVOC, naphthalene, or 1,2 DCA analysis where transferred into a laboratory prepared 40milliliter vials containing Hydrochloric Acid preservative. The sample containers were placed on ice and standard chain-of-custody procedures were initiated. The samples submitted for lead analysis were field filtered and transferred into laboratory prepared $250-\mathrm{mL}$ containers containing nitric acid preservative. The groundwater samples were submitted to Synergy Environmental Lab in Appleton, Wisconsin.

## Groundwater Well Elevations

Depth to groundwater at the site has ranged from 12.51 feet below (TOC) at MW-6 on October 17, 2016 to 48.23 feet below TOC at MW-2 on October 17, 2016. The groundwater elevation has ranged from EL. 1166.33 at MW-2 on October 17, 2016 to EL. 1197.79 at MW-1 on June 4, 2013. Groundwater elevation data is summarized on Table 3 in Appendix B.

The depth to groundwater and groundwater elevations appear to be highly variable based on the information collected to date with over 20 feet of groundwater elevation difference between wells MW-2 (near the former tank area) and the five outlying wells (MW-2 to MW-6). However, the groundwater elevations within MW-2 to MW-6 appear to be more consistent. It is likely that the water elevations are representative of perched groundwater based on the site topography. Based on the groundwater analytical results the groundwater flow direction appears to be toward the north/northeast. A groundwater elevation contour and flow direction map, dated October 17, 2016 is included as Figure 4 in Appendix A. Additional sampling and other monitoring points would be necessary to further evaluate groundwater flow on the subject property.

## EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION

## Groundwater Quality Standards

The Enforcement Standards (ESs) and Preventive Action Limits (PALs) are Groundwater Quality Standards, which have been established in NR140 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. These Standards are referenced when evaluating the need for further study or remedial activities. The PAL is the more stringent guideline, in terms of being lesser in magnitude than the ES, but will typically require less response action when exceeded. The required action is determined by DNR regulations, based on various site-specific considerations.

## Laboratory Groundwater Results

Groundwater samples were collected from MW-1 to MW-3 on February 11, 2016. The samples collected from MW-1 and MW-3 contained a few PVOCs, naphthalene, and/or 1,2 DCA at concentrations exceeding their respective NR 140 ES. The concentrations detected were similar to those detected in the previous four sampling
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rounds. The samples collected from MW-2 did not contain detectable concentrations of PVOCs, naphthalene, or 1,2 DCA.

Groundwater samples were collected from MW-1 to MW-3 and newly installed monitoring wells MW-4 to MW-6 on October 17, 2016. The samples collected from MW-1 and MW-3 contained a few PVOCs and naphthalene at concentrations exceeding their respective NR 140 ES. Specifically, benzene was detected at concentrations of $2,220 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{I}$ and $930 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$, respectively. The samples collected from MW-5 and MW-6 contained benzene at levels exceeding the NR 140 ES with concentrations of $77 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ and $5.6 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$, respectively. The sample collected from MW-4 contained benzene ( $0.79 \mathrm{~J} \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{I}$ ), which exceeds its NR 140 PAL of $0.5 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$. The sample collected from MW-2 did not contain detectable levels of PVOCs or naphthalene.

The results of the chemical analyses of the groundwater samples are summarized in Table 2 in Appendix $B$. Laboratory analytical results and chain of custody forms are included in the Appendix C.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the soil probes and borings/monitoring wells performed to date, it appears that the extent of soil contamination has generally been defined and is confined to the area of the former USTs and to the southwest of the former USTs (GP-2, GP-7, GP-8, and GP-10). However, it is possible that soil contamination may extend beneath the residence to the southeast of the former tanks. Additionally, the residence has recently been purchased and is currently occupied by the new owner of the property. Therefore, it is recommended that vapor testing be performed within the residence to address concerns related to the migration of vapors into the structure. Pending the results of that testing, General Engineering will provide recommendations regarding the need for the excavation of petroleum affected soils and/or vapor mitigation systems.

With regard to the groundwater, based on the collected groundwater samples, it appears that the extent of groundwater contamination has been generally defined and extends from the area of the former tank system/dispensers toward the northeast beyond MW-5. Although benzene ( $77 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ ) was detected in the sample collected from MW-5, the concentration is well below the benzene concentrations of $2,220 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ and $930 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{l}$ detected at MW-1 and MW-3, respectively, during the most recent sampling round. In addition, there is an overhead power line and heavily wooded area beyond MW-5 to the northeast and installation of an additional monitoring well is not feasible at the present time.

GEC proposes to submit a bid deferral request, which includes the costs to perform vapor testing within the residence (specific test locations and the type of vapor tests will be included within the request), collect two rounds of groundwater samples from the site monitoring wells (MW-1 to MW-6 and the potable well), and prepare a soil and groundwater site investigation report, which includes recommendations for a remedial action and/or additional groundwater monitoring, if it appears necessary.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

The investigative activities have been conducted in a manner consistent with that level of care ordinarily exercised by members of the profession currently practicing in the same locality under similar conditions. The findings, recommendations and opinions contained herein have been promulgated in accordance with generally accepted practice in similar fields. No other representations, expressed or implied, and no warranty or guarantee is included or intended in this report.

The conclusions presented in this report were formulated from the data obtained during the course of exploratory work on the site, which may result in a redirection of conclusions and interpretations where new information is obtained. The regulatory climate and interpretation may also have an effect on the outcome of the environmental investigation for this site. The information contained in this report may have an effect on the value of the property, and is considered confidential. Copies of this report will be submitted to others only with authorization from the client.
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## APPENDIX A
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## APPENDIX B

TABLES
TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF SOIL ANALYTICAL RESULTS SPEAKER PROPERTY 0610-133

$\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{kg}=$ milligrams per kilogram
$\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}=$ micrograms per kilogram
$\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{kg}=$ micrograms per kiogram
$\mathrm{RCL}=$ Residual Contaminant Level
SSL $=$ Soil Screening Level
DCL $=$ Direct Contact Level
NA = Parameter not analyzed
NE $=$ NR 720 RCL not established
$J=$ Analyte detected above laborato
$J=$ Analyte detected above laboratory limit of detection but below limit of quantitation.
Bold indicates analytical results exceed NR 720 RCL

| Monitoring Well | NR 140 |  | MW-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | MW-2 |  |  |  |  |  | MW-3 |  |  |  |  |  | MW-4 | MW-5 | MW-6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sampling Date | ES | PAL | 715/2011 | 11/22/2011 | 6/21/2012 | 6/412013 | 8/8/2014 | 2/1/12016 | 10/17/2016 | $611 / 22 / 2011$ | 6/21/2012\| | 6/4/2013 | 8/8/2014 | 2/11/2016 | 10017/2016 | \|11/22/2011 | 6/21/2012 | 6/4/2013 | 8/8/2014 | 2/11/2016 | 10117/2016 | 6 10177/2016 | 10117/2016 | (10117/2016 |
| VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS (VOC) (HgL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benzene | 5 | 0.5 | 2540 | 1640 | 2710 | 1260 | 2490 | 1820 | 2220 | 1.3 | 1.7 | $<0.34$ | $<0.27$ | $<0.44$ | $<0.46$ | 1210 | 19.9 | 364 | 990 | 660 | 930 | 0.79J | 77 | 5.6 |
| Ethylbenzene | 700 | 140 | 1200 | 1230 | 454 | 437 | 1890 | 1370 | 1310 | $<0.54$ | $<0.41$ | $<0.34$ | $<0.82$ | $<0.71$ | $<0.73$ | 910 | 8.5 | 586 | 840 | 800 | 650 | $<0.73$ | 58 | $<0.73$ |
| Methyi ter--butyl ether | 60 | 12 | <12.2 | 16.1 | <15.2 | <7.4 | <3.7 | <55 | $<24.5$ | $<0.61$ | $<0.38$ | $<0.37$ | $<0.37$ | $<1.1$ | $<0.49$ | <15.2 | 1.2 | 7.4 | $<1.85$ | $<11$ | $<4.9$ | <0.49 | <0.49 | <0.49 |
| Toluene | 1000 | 200 | 544 | 283 | 428 | 264 | 810 | 750 | 820 | $<0.67$ | 0.55J | $<0.34$ | $<0.8$ | $<0.44$ | $<0.39$ | 164 | 2.3 | 95.6 | 180 | 130 | 135 | $<0.39$ | 5.3 | $<0.39$ |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | 480 | 96 | 973 | 1380 | 798 | 55.2 | 2870 | 2680 | 1570 | $<0.97$ | <0.43 | $<0.33$ | <0.83 | $<1.6$ | <0.68 | 1170 | 31.9 | 1030 | 1550 | 1410 | 1140 | $<0.68$ | 31.2 | $<0.68$ |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene |  |  | 210 | 349 | 225 | <7.1 | 780 | 700 | 470 | $<0.83$ | $<0.40$ | $<0.36$ | $<0.86$ | $<1.5$ | $<0.83$ | 241 | 59.3 | 296 | 440 | 370 | 307 | $<0.83$ | 3.5 | $<0.83$ |
| Xylenes, $-\mathrm{m}, \mathrm{p}$ | 10000 1000 |  | 4540 |  |  | 792 | 7720 | 7390 | 5180 | $<2.63$ | $<1.25$ | <1.03 | <2.41 | <3.1 | <2.06 | 3025 | 114.7 | 2011 | $2815$ | 2875 | 2194 | <2.06 | 52.02 | <2.06 |
| OTHER DETEGTED VOLATILE ORGAMCCOMPOUNDS (VOC) (pgli) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chloromethane | 30 | 3 | <4.8 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 1.2 | NA | NA | NA |  | NA | NA | $<6.0$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| n-Buylbenzene | NE | NE | $<18.6$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | $<0.93$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 45.2 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 1,2-Dichloroethane | 5 | 0.5 | 163 | NA | NA | NA | NA | $<24$ | NA | $<0.36$ | NA | NA | NA | $<0.48$ | NA | <9.0 | NA | NA | NA | 27 | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| \|sopropylibenzene | NE | NE | 49.1 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | $<0.59$ | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 63.9 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| Napthalene | 100 | 10 | 134 | 207 | 152 | 17.8J | 430 | 400 | 320 J | $<0.89$ | <0.40 | $<0.37$ | $<1.2$ | $<1.6$ | $<2.6$ | 111J | 3.3 | 125 | 178 | 183 | 105 | <2.6 | <2.6 | <2.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Lead

ES $=$ Enforcement Standard
PAL = Preventive Action Limi
$\mu g / L=$ micrograms per liter
$N E=N R 140 E S$ not established
= Analyte detected above laboratory limit of detection but below limit of quantitation.
Bold indicates analytical results above NR 140 ES

TABLE 3
WATER LEVEL DATA SPEAKER PROPERTY

0610-133


# APPENDIX C 

SOIL AND GROUNDWATER ANALYTICAL REPORTS AND CHAIN OF CUSTODY FORMS

## Synergy Environmental Lab, INC.

BRIAN YOUNGWIRTH
GENERAL ENGINEERING
916 SILVER LAKE DRIVE
PORTAGE, WI 53901

Report Date 25-Feb-16


| Project Name SPEAKER/ Project \# | OUNT IDA |  | Invoice \# E30488 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lab Code 5030488C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID MW-3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Matrix Water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Date $2 / 11 / 2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Result | Unit | LOD | LOQ |  |  | Method | Ext Date | Run Date | Analyst | Code |
| Organic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVOC + Naphthalene + 1,2 DCA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benzene | 660 | ug/1 | 4.4 | 14 | 4 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,2-Dichloroethane | 27 | ug/l | 4.8 |  | 5 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Ethylbenzene | 800 | ug/1 | 7.1 | 23 | 23 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) | $<11$ | ug/1 | 11 |  | 37 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CIR | 1 |
| Naphthalene | 183 | ug/ | 16 |  | 52 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CRR | 1 |
| Toluene | 130 | ug/1 | 4.4 |  | 4 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | 1410 | ug/ | 16 |  | 50 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CIR | 1 |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | 370 | ug/1 | 15 |  | 48 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CIR | 1 |
| m\&p-Xylene | 2600 | ug/ | 22 |  | 69 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/2012016 | CJR | 1 |
| o-Xylene | 275 | ug/1 | 9 | 29 | 29 | 10 | 8260B |  | 2/20/2016 | CR | 1 |

"J" Flag: Analyte detected between LOD and LOQ
LOD Limit of Detection
LOQ Limit of Quantitation

## Code Comment <br> 1 Laboratory QC within limits.

All solid sample results reported on a dry weight basis unless otherwise indicated. All LOD's and LOQ's are adjusted for dilutions but not dry weight. Subcontracted results are denoted by SUB in the analyst field.

## Authorized Signature



## Synergy Environmental Lab, INC.

BRIAN YOUNGWIRTH
GENERAL ENGINEERING
916 SLLVER LAKE DRTVE
PORTAGE. WI 53901

Report Date 24-Oct-16

| Project Name SPEAKER Proiect \# |  |  |  |  |  | Invoice \# E31927 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lab Code 5031927A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID MW-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Matrix Water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Date 10/17/2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Result | Unit | LOD | LOQ | Dil | Method | Ext Date | Run Date | Analyst | Code |
| Organic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVOC + Naphthalene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benzene | 2220 | ug/ | 23 | 75 | 50 | GR095/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Ethylbenzene | 1310 | ug/1 | 36.5 | 115 | 50 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) | $<24.5$ | ug/1 | 24.5 | 80 | 50 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CIR | 1 |
| Naphthalene | 320 "J" | ug/l | 130 | 415 | 50 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Toluene | 820 | ug/l | 19.5 | 60 | 50 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | 1570 | ug/l | 34 | 110 | 50 | GR095/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | 470 | ug/ | 41.5 | 130 | 50 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CIR | 1 |
| m\&p-Xylene | 4100 | ug/l | 70 | 220 | 50 | GRO9S/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| o-Xylene | 1080 | ug/ | 33 | 105 | 50 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/21/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Lab Code 5031927B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample ID MW-2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Matrix Water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Date 10/17/2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Result | Unit | LOD | LOQ | Dil | Method | Ext Date | Run Date | Analyst | Code |
| Organic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVOC + Naphthalene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benzene | < 0.46 | ug/ | 0.46 | 1.5 | 1 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Ethylbenzene | $<0.73$ | ug/ | 0.73 | 2.3 | 1 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) | $<0.49$ | ug/ | 0.49 | 1.6 | , | GR095/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Naphthalene | $<2.6$ | ug/1 | 2.6 | 8.3 | 1 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Toluene | <0.39 | ug/ | 0.39 | 1.2 | 1 | GR095/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | $<0.68$ | ug/1 | 0.68 | 2.2 | , | GRO95/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | $<0.83$ | ug/1 | 0.83 | 2.6 | 1 | GR095/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| m\&p-Xylene | $<1.4$ | ug/1 | 1.4 | 4.4 | 1 | GR095/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJ | 1 |
| o-Xylene | $<0.66$ | ug/1 | 0.66 | 2.1 | 1 | GRO95/802 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |

Project Name SPEAKER
Proiect \#

| Lab Code | 5031927 C |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sample ID | MW-3 |
| Sample Matrix | Water |
| Sample Date | $10 / 17 / 2016$ |

Organic
PVOC + Naphthalene
Benzene
Ethylbenzene
Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE)
Naphthalene
Toluene
1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene
1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene
m\&p-Xylene
o-Xylene

| Lab Code | 5031927 D |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sample ID | MW-4 |
| Sample Matrix | Water |
| Sample Date | $10 / 17 / 2016$ |


|  | Result | Unit | LOD | LOQ D | Dil | Method | Ext Date | Run Date | nalyst | Code |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVOC + Naphthalene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benzene | 0.79 "J" | ug/ | 0.46 | 1.5 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Ethylbenzene | $<0.73$ | ug/1 | 0.73 | 2.3 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) | $<0.49$ | ug/1 | 0.49 | 1.6 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Naphthalene | <2.6 | ug/1 | 2.6 | 8.3 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Toluene | $<0.39$ | ug/l | 0.39 | 1.2 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | $<0.68$ | ug/1 | 0.68 | 2.2 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | C.IR | 1 |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | $<0.83$ | ug/ | 0.83 | 2.6 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| $\mathrm{m} \& \mathrm{p}$-Xylene | $<1.4$ | ug/ | 1.4 | 4.4 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| o-Xylene | $<0.66$ | ug/ | 0.66 | 2.1 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |

Lab Code 5031927E
Sample ID MW-5
Sample Matrix Water
Sample Date 10/17/2016

Result
Organic
PVOC + Naphthalene

| Benzene | 77 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ethylbenzene | 58 |  |
| Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) |  | $<0.49$ |
| Naphthalene |  | $<2.6$ |
| Toluene | 5.3 |  |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene | 31.2 |  |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene | 3.5 |  |
| m\&p-Xylene | 50 |  |
| o-Xylene | 2.02 "J" |  |

Result
Unit

| 930 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 650 |  |
|  | $<4.9$ |
| 105 |  |
| 135 |  |
| 1140 |  |
| 307 |  |
| 1950 |  |
| 244 |  |

Invoice \# E31927

LOD LOQ Dil
Method
Ext Date Run Date Analyst Code

| ug/1 | 4.6 | 15 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ug/1 | 7.3 | 23 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 4.9 | 16 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 26 | 83 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 3.9 | 12 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 6.8 | 22 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 8.3 | 26 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 14 | 44 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |
| ug/1 | 6.6 | 21 | 10 | GRO95/8021 |


| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |
| $10 / 21 / 2016$ | CJR | 1 |

Unit LOD LOQ Dil Method
Ext Date Run Date Analyst Code

Project Name SPEAKER
Invoice \# E31927
Proiect \#

| Lab Code | 5031927F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample ID MW-6 | MW-6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Matrix Water |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sample Date 10/17/2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Result |  | Unit | LOD | LOQ |  | Method | Ext Date | Run Date | Analyst | Code |
| Organic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PVOC + Naphthalene |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Benzene | 5.6 |  | ug/1 | 0.46 | 1.5 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Ethylbenzene |  | < 0.73 | ug/1 | 0.73 | 2.3 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Methyl tert-butyl ether (MTBE) |  | $<0.49$ | ug/ | 0.49 | 1.6 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Naphthalene |  | <2.6 | ug/ | 2.6 | 8.3 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| Toluene |  | <0.39 | ug/ | 0.39 | 1.2 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzere |  | <0.68 | ug/1 | 0.68 | 2.2 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CIR | 1 |
| 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene |  | $<0.83$ | ug/l | 0.83 | 2.6 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
| m\&p-Xylene |  | < 1.4 | ug/ | 1.4 | 4.4 | 1 | GRO95/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |
|  |  | <0.66 | ug/l | 0.66 | 2.1 | 1 | GR095/8021 |  | 10/20/2016 | CJR | 1 |

"J" Flag: Analyte detected between LOD and LOQ
LOD Limit of Detection
LOQ Limit of Quantitation

## Code Comment <br> 1 Laboratory QC within limits.

All solid sample results reported on a dry weight basis unless otherwise indicated. All LOD's and LOQ's are adjusted for dilutions but not dry weight. Subcontracted results are denoted by SUB in the analyst field.

Authorized Signature

CHAIN OF , STUDY RECORD

| Lehi.0. : |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Account No.: |  |
| Project : |  |
| Sampler isignaturei | Quote No.: |

- Spakiof
990 Prospect Ct. Appleton, WI 54914
$920-830-2455 \cdot$ FAX $920-733-0631$
Mount Idun
Chain 402788
Synergy

Page ___ of | Sample Handling Request |
| :---: |
| Rush Analysis Date Required |
| (Rushes accepted only with prior authorization) |
| Normal Turn Around |



[^0]CHAIN OF UUSTODY RECORD
 ii, Studge ete.)
Page ___ of

| Sample Handling Request |
| :---: |
| Rush Analysis Date Required. |
| (Rushes accepled only with prior authorization) |
| Normal Turn Around |



APPENDIX D
MONITORING WELL ABANDONMENT FORMS

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Route To: Solid Waste Emergency Response WastewaterHaz. Waste
Soil Boring Log Information
Form 4400-122
7-91

| $\square$ Other |  |  |  | Page 1 of 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Facility / Project Name Speaker Property | License /Permit /Monitoring / GEC Project No. 0610-133 |  | Boring Number |  |
| Boring Drilled By (Firm name and name of crew chief) Groundsource | Drilling Method HSA/ Air Rotary | Borehole Diameter 12" |  |  |
| Date Drilling Started Date Drilling Ended <br> $6 / 30 / 2016$ $6 / 30 / 2016$ | Boring Location State Plane NE - NW, Sect. 29,T06N,R03W |  | $\begin{aligned} & 42.972042 \\ & -90.760444 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | DNR County Code $20$ |
| Local Grid Location (If applicable) <br> Feet S $\quad$ Feet $W$ | County Grant |  | Civil Town / City / Village Town of Mt. Ida |  |



I hereby certify that the information on this form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge


Brian Youngwirth Firm

[^1]Lines of demarcation represent approximate boundaries between soil types. Variations may occur between sampling intervals and between boring locations, and the transition may be gradual.

16. Additional comments on development
Well developed by: Person's Name and Firm
Name: $\quad$ Brian Youngwirth
Firm $\quad$ General Engineering Company certify that the above information is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.
Signature:

Env. Response \& Repair $\square$
Route To:
$\square$ Solid Waste $\square$ Haz. Waste $\square$ Wastewater Underground Tanks $\qquad$ Other $\square$

16. Additional comments on development
Well developed by: Person's Name and Firm
Name: $\quad$ Brian Youngwirth
Firm $\quad$ General Engineering Company

16. Additional comments on development
Well developed by: Person's Name and Firm
Name: $\quad$ Brian Youngwirth
Firm $\quad$ Signature:


Lines of demarcation represent approximate boundaries between soil types. Variations may occur between sampling intervals and between boring locations, and the transition may be gradual.

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

Route To:

## Solid Waste

 Emergency Response WastewaterHaz. Waste Underground Tanks Water ResourcesOther
Page 1 of 1

| Facility/Project Name <br> Speaker Property <br> Boring Drilled By (Firm name and name of crew chief) <br> Soils \& Engineering Services, Inc. |  | License/Permit/Monitoring/ GEC Project No. 0610-133 |  |  | Boring Number <br> MW-6 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Drilling Method HAS | Borehole Dia 12 |  | MW-6 |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|r} \hline \text { Date Drilling Started } \\ 10 / 11 / 2016 \end{array}$ | Date Drilling Ended 10/11/2016 | Boring Location State Plane N, E NE - NW, Sect. 29,T06N,R03W |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \text { Lat } \\ \text { Long } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42.972042 \\ & -90.760444 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | DNR County Code 20 |
| Local Grid Location (If applicable)  <br> Feet S Feet W |  | County <br> Grant |  | Civil Town / City / Village |  |  |



Lines of demarcation represent approximate boundaries between soil types. Variations may occur between sampling intervals and between boring locations, and the transition may be gradual.

State of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources

MONITORING WELL CONSTRUCTION
Form 4400-113A Haz. Waste $\square$ Wastewater $\square$ Underground Tanks $\square$ Other $\square$

Route To: Solid Waste $\square$
Env. Response \& Repair $\square$

Well Name

| Facility/Project Name Speaker Property | Local Grid Location of Well FeetS $\quad$ Feet W | Well Name MW-5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| License/Permit/GEC Project No. 0610-133 | Grid Origin Location | Wis. Unique No. N/A |
| Type Of Well   <br> Water Table Observation $\boxed{y y y}$  <br>  11  <br> Piezometer  12 | Section Location of Waste/Source NW - NW, SECT. 29, T06N, R03W | Date Well Installed $10 / 11 / 2016$ |
| Distance Well is From Waste/Source Boundary <br> Is Well a Point of Enforcement Std. Application <br> $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Location to Well Relative to Waste/Source   <br> $\mathrm{u} \square$ Upgradient s <br> $\square$ Sidegradient  <br> $\mathrm{d} \square$ downgradient n <br> $\square$ Not Shown  | Well Installed By: (Persons Name \& Firm) Soils \& Engineering Services, Inc. |



## Thereby certify that the information on this form is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.





[^0]:    Comments/'Special Instructions ("Specify groundwater "GW", Drinking Water "DW", Waste Water "WW", Soil "S", Air "A", Oil, Sludge etc.)
    

[^1]:    General Engineering Company 916 Silver Lake Dr., P.O. BOX 340

