D. Describe the alternatives considered during the Green and Sustainable Remediation evaluation in accordance with NR 722.09 and any practices implemented as a result of the evaluation.

Soil cuttings, from the soil borings conducted under the supervision of REI personnel, were taken to the Lincoln County Landfill for direct burial. All impacted water, removed by REI personnel, was either disposed of at the Wausau Waste Water Treatment Plant or the Lakeland Sanitary District for treatment and returned to the environment.

E. Describe the nature, degree and extent of residual contamination that will remain at the source property or on other affected properties after case closure.

No known residual soil contamination exceeding enforcement thresholds remains on the source or neighboring properties. Limited laboratory analysis and documentation regarding the locations and depths of the samples exists for the early site work conducted under the direction and supervision of the WDNR.

F. Describe the residual soil contamination within four feet of ground surface (direct contact zone) that attains or exceeds RCLs established under s. NR 720.12, Wis. Adm. Code, for protection of human health from direct contact.

No residual soil contamination exceeding the NR720.12 RCL's has been documented within the direct contact zone.

G. Describe the residual soil contamination that is above the observed low water table that attains or exceeds the soil standard(s) for the groundwater pathway.

No residual soil contamination exceeding the groundwater pathway has been documented.

H. Describe how the residual contamination will be addressed, including but not limited to details concerning: covers, engineering controls or other barrier features; use of natural attenuation of groundwater; and vapor mitigation systems or measures.

No residual soil contamination exceeding the groundwater pathway has been documented.

I. If using natural attenuation as a groundwater remedy, describe how the data collected supports the conclusion that natural attenuation is effective in reducing contaminant mass and concentration (e.g., stable or receding groundwater plume).

Tetrachloroethene contaminant detections in the groundwater have documented trends showing decreasing or stable concentrations in all wells. Graphs documenting Tetrachloroethene Concentrations over Time for all monitoring wells and potentiometers are included in Attachments A.7.a through A.7.s.

J. Identify how all exposure pathways (soil, groundwater, vapor) were removed and/or adequately addressed by immediate, interim and/or remedial action(s).

Both sub-slab vapor sampling and indoor air sampling was conducted to to rule out vapor intrusion into the on-site building.

The extent of both pre-remedial and post remedial soil contaminant concentrations were addressed directly by the WDNR Project Manager. Refer to the documentation presented in Attachment C.6 to address residual soil contamination.

While groundwater contamination exceeding the NR140 ES is present in the groundwater monitoring wells associated with this investigation, There is a 37 year history that documents the contaminant trends are reducing in all the impacted wells.

A single sewer gas sample was collected from the bathroom sink of the subject building and submitted for TO-15 analysis. None of the detected concentrations exceeded the WDNR Small Commercial Sub-Slab Vapor Risk Screening Levels.

K. Identify any system hardware anticipated to be left in place after site closure, and explain the reasons why it will remain.

No systems were installed for this investigation and no system hardware will remain after site closure.

L. Identify the need for a ch. NR 140, Wis. Adm. Code, groundwater Preventive Action Limit (PAL) or Enforcement Standard (ES) exemption, and identify the affected monitoring points and applicable substances.

An exemption to WAC NR140 is not needed.

M. If a DNR action level for vapor intrusion was exceeded (for indoor air, sub slab, or both) describe where it was exceeded and how the pathway was addressed.

Laboratory analytical results showed no exceedances of the WDNR Small Commercial Sub-Slab Vapor Risk Screening that was conducted in two (2) locations in the building on the subject property.

No Vapor Action Levels (VAL's) were exceeded in the indoor air sample collected in the building on the subject property.

A single sewer gas sample was collected from the bathroom sink of the subject building and submitted for TO-15 analysis. None of the detected concentrations exceeded the WDNR Small Commercial Sub-Slab Vapor Risk Screening Levels.