Isles Quarry Contamination Concerns

The URS remediation process notes that parts of Area 1 could not be sampled because of stock heaps left by Hanson when the new Hornet estate entrance was built, and that as soon as that material was removed, new sampling should take place. That sampling did not happen.

We know that work began on Area1 in early November 2013, firstly demolition of the steel buildings, and I have a picture taken 14 Nov showing final clearance of the steel.



We know from the Ground Obstruction Report that the hardstanding and asphalt was also removed in November. The first sample taken was BG1 on 22 Nov, but that was taken from the extreme western boundary. (see Remediation Survey Drawing 002 - Rev G). Drg 002 also shows that samples BG2,3,4,5 taken 27 Nov from Area 2 & 3, and that BG6,7 & 8 were taken 2Dec at low level, after excavation.

It is very important to read the sampling results in conjunction with the locations and depths noted in Drg002-RevG, and the sampling dates noted on the test results. A sample taken after excavation at low level, could easily be mistaken for a sample taken at high level before excavation, and a wrong conclusion reached that as the sample is clean, there was no contamination.

Drg002 notes a pink area as "Contaminated Earth", but there are **no samples** taken in this area. This pink Area corresponds with the contamination noted in my report to the LDF Inquiry, and one wonders why it is highlighted on the map, but not sampled.

Pictures taken by Crest Nicholson on 5th December show a large area of dark material being spread in area 2&3



Other pictures taken an hour later at 1027 show clean material cover of the same area.



This clean covering is also very evident in our aerial picture of 8th December, which also shows that Area 1 is now excavated to construction level.



It is suggested that the known contaminated material was excavated from Area 1 and moved to the "quarantine bund", and Crest insist this happened on the 28th November.

However, Crest's own picture of the compound on 5th December shows an excavator being repaired on the spot that the bund will be built, and I can see no evidence of the bund behind it.



Our aerial picture on 8th December shows the bund under construction. Crest reasoned that our aerial picture showed the bund in use, but with one end left open to allow material to be delivered.



However, the bund is supposed to have a plastic liner, and as our picture below of the bund on 28 March (below) shows that liner is black, and overlaps the bund walls to create a "pond", and this is clearly not in position on 8th December. The black liner should be clearly visible around the whole perimeter above if it was installed, and across the entire base, even if we accept the premise that the bund wall will not be completed whilst the bulk is being filled. Albert Prince swears he has dated pictures of the bund in earlier times, but 3 weeks later these still have not been forthcoming, and as they were allegedly taken on 28th November, why have they not been produced in the many months that I have been expressing my doubts?



I accept that sampling and testing cannot be carried out whilst diggers are poised to excavate, sampling should have been carried out as a record, and visual observations during the process would decide whether material was nominally clean and could be re-used, or contaminated and removed. I also accept that bad weather during the period would have made visual identification of contaminated material difficult, but proper prior sampling would have provided guidance.

Based on the evidence to hand, both my own, and that supplied by T&M/Crest, leads me to suspect that the heavy oil contamination from Area 1 was removed unsampled, and buried in Area 2/3 under the clean(ish) material from the Hanson stockpiles.

A quick glance by someone without a detailed knowledge of the layout and history of the site, at the drawing showing sampling, pictures of the quarantine bund as supplied, and the swathe of test results, could lead a casual check to conclude that testing was widespread, and that contaminated material was removed and segregated for later disposal.

It would have been extremely useful if samples had been taken from that pink area before excavation, and compared to the disposal tests BG32,33,34 & 39 when that material left site, that would have provided evidence that the known contamination material had been removed from site.

During the year Crest, T&M and the EA have all expressed opinions that the material in the bund was only lightly contaminated, and that a few weeks in the sun would clean it enough for re-use. Why then did Crest suddenly decide to move 52 loads of it to landfill? And why were the delivery tickets marked "inert".

I need further convincing that the bund material was the Area 1 contamination. The evidence I have seen to date leads me to suspect the Area 1 contamination was buried in Area 2 & 3 on the 5th December, and the bund filled with material from elsewhere at some later date.



supplied	Sampled	Sce	Ident	Colour	QTY
5/7/2014	22/11/2013	CD	BG1,BG2	Grey Loam, Black	2
				Loam	
			CD arr 5th July		
5/7/2014	27/11/2013	CD	BG3, BG4, BG5	Brown, Lt Brown	3
5/7/2014	2/12/2013	CD	BG6	Lt Brown	1
6 10 10 04 4	6/42/2042		207004044		
6/8/2014	6/12/2013	Russ	BG 7,8,9,10,11		5
5/7/2014	17/12/2013	CD	BG13, BG14, BG15	Brown Orange	3
5/7/2014	18/12/2013	CD	BG12	Tank Sludge	1
				Ţ.	
23/7/2014	14/3/2013	Eml	32,33,34, (bund samples)		7
			39 (bund water)		
			35,36,37,38 Rxed		
			Eml arr 23 July with sampling map		
5/7/2014	25/3/2014	CD	BG41,42,43,58,59	BLACK WITH TAR	19
			BG 45, 51, 47	Sandy grey	
			BG44,46,48,49,50,52,53,54,55,56,57	No description	
= /= /2 2 4 4	10/07/0011				
5/7/2014	12/05/2014	CD	TP2,2,1,1,	Grey Sludge	4
5/7/2014	9/6/2014	Cd	Contaminated Pile	Grey	2
		CD	Entrance and Haul Rds	BLACK WITH TAR	3
6/8/2014	24/7/2014	Russ	91,92,93, 94 TPMT2		4