Jennings Design
8 Feast Field,
Horsforth,
Leeds,
LS18 4TJ

Geo² Remediation Ltd
Coniston House
Louisa Street
Idle
Bradford
BD10 8NE
Tel: 0113 2575397

15th August 2024

Dear Harvey,

Fuel Tank Validation Letter Report – Moto Sawtry, Toll Bar Way, Sawtry, PE28 5XW.

Geo² Project Reference: 4333.1.1

During redevelopment works undertaken at the Moto Sawtry site, Toll Bar Way, Sawtry, PE28 5XW, Geo² were commissioned to produce a Validation Letter Report to provide details outlining validation works, laboratory testing of sub-surface samples and to provide advice relating to the removal of the fuel storage infrastructure on-site and the environmental condition of the property.

The site is located at the former Sawtry services, off the A1M. At the time of the visit the former site had been demolished and construction works were ongoing. During the redevelopment works two tank farms were identified, one on the eastern boundary of the site and one in the centre. A plan presented in Appendix A identifies the location of the two tank farms.

The validation works are part of a redevelopment of the site to construct a new motorway service station. A plan of the proposed development is presented in Appendix A.

1.0 Summary of Validation Works

Geo² were asked to attend site on the 22nd July 2024 to validate the areas surrounding the former tank. This involved the collection of sub surface soil samples from around the base and the sides of the tank where possible. At the time of the site visit two tanks had been removed from the central tank farm, however, all other tanks are to remain in situ.

It should be noted that groundworks were underway including areas for plant and vehicle transport and underground services had already been installed severely limiting the locations and amount of validation samples that could be collected.

In the eastern tank farm, there were two tanks that had been concrete filled. A total of two samples were obtained from the side and base of the edge of the tank farm were collected from this location.

In the central tank farm two tanks had been removed, prior to Geo²'s arrival, which had been decommissioned with a foam fill, a further three tanks were also discovered in this area which had also been decommissioned. These tanks were to remain in the ground. Three samples were obtained from around sides and base of the tank farm area where possible.

In addition, the contractor onsite provided a statement saying that they did not identify any gross contamination around the tanks and provided photos of how the tanks were exposed. Photographic evidence does not show any staining on the brick surround at the visible. Both are presented in the Appendices of this report.

It should be noted that these works do not constitute a wider assessment of the site condition and are limited to the tank excavation only and on-site contractor evidence only.

Photographs showing the site validation works are present in Appendix B.

1.1 Site Specific Details

Historically the site was a motorway service station but currently is undergoing redevelopment as a new motorway service station.

At the time of the site visit the site had been demolished with redevelopment well underway. Groundworks had been undertaken and routes were in place for construction plant. Some underground services were also in place severely limiting the locations available to excavate to allow for collection of validation samples.

Two tank farms were identified with one on the eastern boundary containing two tanks that have been decommissioned and filled with concrete and will remain in the ground. It is understood that the tanks in this area were single skinned with a brick surround.

The other tank farm located in the centre of the site contained five tanks of which two were removed. Due to stability issues, the other three tanks are to remain in the ground and were also decommissioned in the same manner as the two tanks that were removed with a foam fill. Upon inspection of the removed tanks there was no visual or olfactory evidence of contamination, indicating that the tanks had been decommissioned correctly and were in good condition. It is understood that the tanks in this area were single skinned with a brick surround.

1.2 General Soil Profile

The general soil profile, as observed across the excavations, is summarised in Table 2 below. It should be noted that all hardstanding had been removed prior to Geo^2 attending site:

Description of Stratum	Proven Thickness (m)	Depth Encountered (m bgl)
Made Ground: Yellow, beige sandy fine to medium sub-angular gravel of sub-base. Compacted and tested.	0.4	0.0 – 0.4
Made Ground: Soft brown gravelly clay. Gravels are fine to coarse, sub angular and include brick. Other inclusions are pottery, wire, concrete, metal objects.	1.9	0.4 – 2.3
Superficial: Firm to stiff grey-brown CLAY with occasional gravel.	1.5	2.3 – 3.8
Bedrock: Not encountered over the course of the investigation.	-	-

Table 1. General Soil Profile developed from observations on-site.

It should be noted that the brick surround of the eastern tank farm was identified during the validation works, but the central tank farm surround was not. However, contractors on site identified the area in which the tanks were initially located, and an excavation was dug where possible to allow for collection of samples.

Ingresses of water were observed around the eastern tank farm at approximately 2.3m bgl. This stopped the excavation works but this depth is believed to be at or close to the base of these tanks. There was no notable evidence of contamination within the groundwater.

During the validation works visual and olfactory evidence of significantly impacted material in the area of both tank farms was not identified.

2.0 Validation Soil Sampling

Five samples were recovered from the sides and base from adjacent to the tank farm areas. The samples recovered for analysis are presented in Table 2, below, along with justification for each sample. Sampling locations are detailed in Figures 3a – 3b, Appendix A.

Using a mechanical excavator, representative samples were taken from the sides and bases of the excavation. Throughout the works there were no visually contaminated soil samples recovered.

Samples of soil obtained from around the USTs excavation were submitted to the laboratory for chemical analyses. Testing of the samples from the excavation was to determine whether the soils that remained on-site were contaminated with hydrocarbons at concentrations which could pose a risk to human health and the surrounding environment.

Sample Reference	Depth (m bgl)	Justification	PID (ppm)	Suite of Analysis
V1	1.5	Eastern Tank Farm - Wall	0	TPH (CWG), BTEX, MTBE.
V2	2.3	Eastern Tank Farm - Base	0	TPH (CWG), BTEX, MTBE.
V3	1.5	Central Tank Farm – Wall	0	TPH (CWG), BTEX, MTBE.
V4	3.2	Central Tank Farm – Base	0	TPH (CWG), BTEX, MTBE.
V5	1.8	Central Tank Farm - Wall	0	TPH (CWG), BTEX, MTBE.

Table 2. Details of Validation Soil Sampling

3.0 Results of Laboratory Analysis

Laboratory certificates for the results of validation testing of the samples taken from soils surrounding the excavation are included within Appendix C.

Based on the proposed redevelopment of the site as a commercial development, the soil analysis testing results have been compared against 'commercial/industrial' end use Generic Assessment Criteria (GACs) thresholds. GAC concentrations associated with a conservative 1% Soil Organic Matter (SOM) have been utilised.

None of the samples collected for laboratory analysis were recorded to contain contaminant concentrations above the GACs for a commercial/industrial site use.

4.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

Geo^2 Remediation Ltd were commissioned to attend the site located at Moto Sawtry, Toll Bar Way, Sawtry, PE28 5XW, in order to validate the soils around seven historic underground storage tanks, of which five remain in the ground and two have been removed.

On-site visual and olfactory assessments of the soils were completed, and a total of five soil samples were collected from the sides and base of the location of the tanks, where possible, which were sent on to an accredited laboratory to determine the concentrations of potential contaminants. The number of samples was restricted due to ongoing development works, however, there was no evidence of contamination in the excavations that were progressed and investigated.

Concentrations of hydrocarbons in the five samples were all recorded below the GAC for a commercial/industrial setting.

In addition, the onsite contractor has provided photos and a statement stating that no significant contamination was noted around the tanks when they were exposed.

Furthermore, the clay surrounding the tanks is considered likely to reduce the likelihood of any migration of potentially significant contamination.

On this basis, Geo^2 consider the risks to environmental receptors and human health in the context of the proposed development to be **Low.**

Yours sincerely,



15th August 2024

Date

15th August 2024

Date

Appendix A Figures
Appendix B Photographs
Appendix C Certificates of Laboratory Analysis

5.0 Limitations

The conclusions, recommendations and opinions are based on information gathered at the time of the investigation from a variety of third party sources and from observations made during site reconnaissance and ground conditions encountered during the field work and on the results of laboratory and field tests performed during the investigation. However, there may be conditions at the site that have not been taken into account, such as unpredictable soil strata and water conditions between or below intrusive locations. It should also be noted that groundwater levels may vary due to seasonal or other effects and may at times differ to those measured during the investigation.

A portion of this report is based solely upon information provided by third parties. The information has not been independently verified by Geo^2. Whilst this report and the opinions given in it are accurate to the best knowledge of Geo^2, Geo^2 cannot guarantee the completeness or accuracy of any descriptions, opinions or conclusions based solely upon information that has not been independently verified.

The recommendations contained within this report represent our professional opinions. These opinions were arrived at in accordance with currently accepted industry practices and hydrological and engineering practices at this time. As such they are not a guarantee that the site is free of hazardous materials or conditions.

Geo^2 prepared this report for our Client; any third parties using this report do so entirely at their risk. Geo^2 makes no warranty or representation whatsoever, express or implied, with respect to the use by a third party of any information contained in this report or its suitability for any purpose. Geo^2 assumes no responsibility for any costs, claims, damages or expenses (including any consequential damages) resulting from the use of this report or any information contained in this report by a third party.

6.0 References

CL:AIRE

CL:AIRE in association with AGS and EIC. The Soil Generic Assessment Criteria for Human Health Risk Assessment. January 2010.
Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Groundwater Guidance (Final Version), February 2017

EIC
Environment Industries Commission (EIC); The Association of Geotechnical and Geo-Environmental Services (AGS); and Contaminated Land Applications in Real Environments (CL:AIRE). The EIC/AGS/CL:AIRE Soil Generic Assessment Criteria for Human Health Risk Assessment. December 2009.

Environment Agency
Environment Agency 2006: Remedial Targets Worksheet v3.1: User Manual
SR7: Compilation of Data for Priority Organic Pollutants for Derivation of Soil Guideline Values, Science Report SC050021/SR7, Environment Agency, November 2008
SR3: Updated technical background to the CLEA model, Science Report SC050021/SR3, Environment Agency, January 2009.
SR4: CLEA Software (Version 1.06) Handbook, Science Report SC050021/SR4, Environment Agency, January 2009.
CLR 11: Model Procedures for the Management of Contaminated Land. 2009
Groundwater Protection: Principles and practice. GP3. November 2012
Petroleum Hydrocarbons in Groundwater: Supplementary Guidance for Hydrogeological Risk Assessment. 2009
R+D P95, Guidance on the Assessment and Monitoring of Natural Attenuation of Contaminants in Groundwater. M.A. Carey,et al.
GP3, Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice. 2013 v1.1

Other Standards:

World Health Organisation (WHO) - Guidelines for Drinking-water Quality THIRD EDITION 2008

Drinking Water Inspectorate - The Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2000 (in England) and the Water Supply Regulations 2010 (in Wales)

Guidance on the Water Supply (Water Quality) Regulations 2016

Water Framework Directive (WFD) **-** http://www.wfduk.org/ 2010

Land Quality Management/CIEH

Nathanail, C.P.; McCaffrey,C.; Gillett, A.G.; Ogden, R.C. & Nathanail, J.F. - Suitable 4 Use Levels Land Quality Press, Nottingham 2015

Yorkshire and Humberside Pollution Advisory Council (YAHPAC)

Verification Requirements for Cover Systems - Technical Guidance for Developers, Landowners and Consultants, Version 3.1 – October 2014



Figure 1 - Site Location



Figure 2 - Site Location

Figures 1 & 2 - Site Location

NOT TO SCALE

Moto Sawtry, Toll Bar Way, Sawtry, PE28 5XW

Geo² Remediation Limited, The Coniston, Louisa Street, Idle, West Yorkshire, BD10 8NE

Tel: (0113) 2575397

www.geo2.co.uk

© Whittam Cox Architects - Disclaimer:

This drawing is copyright of WCEC Group Ltd trading as Whittam Cox Architects, and shall not be reproduced nor used for any other purpose without the written permission of the Architects. This drawing must be read in conjunction with all other related drawings and documentation. It is the contractors responsibility to ensure full compliance with the Building Regulations. Do not scale from this drawing, use figured dimensions only. It is the contractors responsibility to check and verify all dimensions on site. Any discrepancies to be reported immediately. IF IN DOUBT ASK.
Materials not in conformity with relevant British or European Standards/Codes of practice or materials known to be deleterious to health & safety must not be used or specified on this project.

LEGEND:

SITE OWNERSHIP BOUNDARY:

A1M Southbound

A1M Northbound

A1 (M)

A1 (M) - JUNCTION 15 SLIP ROAD

A1 (M) - JUNCTION 15 SLIP ROAD

TOLL BAR WAY

TOLL BAR WAY

TOLL BAR WAY

Pond

25m TURNING CIRCLE

AMENITY BUILDING
FFL 8.925

12x7m
PLANT ZONE

TURNING AREA

6 No. 20m BAY SPACES

10 No. MOTORCYCLE SPACES

170 No. CAR PARKING SPACES (TOTAL)

4 No. CARAVAN PARKING BAYS

8 No. COACH PARKING BAYS

38 No. HGV PARKING BAYS

12 No. EV CHARGING BAYS

8 No. PRIVATE CAR FFS CANOPY

8 No. PARKING BAYS

HGV FFS CANOPY

FFS KIOSK
FFL 33.940

FFS SERVICE LAY-BY

SUB STA

CYCLE SHELTER

C01	15.03.24	PATH TO REAR OF AMENITY BUILDING SPLAYED AT CORNER TO ENABLE RETAINING WALL TO BE OMITTED. FOOTPATH FROM HGV PARKING ADJUSTED IN LENGTH TO SUIT SITE LEVELS. DRAWING STATUS UPDATED TO CONSTRUCTION.	GN/SJS
T01	05.12.23	SOFT LANDSCAPING / TREES INDICATED OFF CENTRAL WALKWAY. BOLLARDS REMOVED TO SUIT.	GN/SJS
-	05.10.23	FIRST ISSUE.	PA/LG

CONSTRUCTION

No	Date	Description	Drwn/Chkd By

CLIENT
Moto Hospitality Limited

PROJECT
Sawtry A1(M) Services

TITLE
Proposed Site Layout Plan

DRAWING STATUS
Construction

DRAWN	P.A.	CHECKED	L.G.
SCALE	1:500 @ A1		
DATE	October 2023		

0m 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50
1:500

Whittam Cox ARCHITECTS
Chesterfield / 01246 260261
London / 020 3388 0019
Leeds / 0113 468 2450
whittamcox.com

JOB NO.	DRAWING NO.	REV
220464	A-90-101	C01



Figures 4—Approximate Tank Farm and Sample Locations **NOT TO SCALE**

Former Sawtry Services, Toll Bar Way, PE28 5XW

Geo² Remediation Limited, The Coniston, Louisa Street, Idle, West Yorkshire, BD10 8NE

Tel: (0113) 2575397 www.geo2.co.uk



Photo 1: Location of eastern tank farm



Photo 2: Clays beneath the central tank farm showing no evidence of contamination



Photo 3: Condition of the removed tanks showing no contamination



Photo 4: Evidence of the foam fill within the removed tanks



Photo 5: Exposed tanks in central area. No significant staining on the brick surround or sheen on the pooled water.

[redacted]

Sent: 15 August 2024 14:48

[redacted]

Subject: FW: tanks

[redacted]

Sent: Wednesday, August 7, 2024 9:20 AM

[redacted]

Subject: Re: tanks

[redacted]

We exposed the tanks so we could dewater and concrete fill. We excavated and exposed the tanks vault and dug some test holes which didn't appear to have any contamination.

Since then we have installed drainage and ducting in this area and we haven't came across any suspicious looking ground thanks

Kind regards

[redacted]
Contracts Manager
[redacted]
Brooms Barn, Little Tey Road, Feering, Colchester, Essex CO5 9RS
www.broham.co.uk

Broham Forecourt Developments Ltd is a company registered in England and Wales. Reg No is: 1519054. Registered Office: 4&5 The Cedars, Apex 12, Old Ipswich Road, Colchester, Essex CO7 7QR

***** Email confidentiality notice *****

This message is private and confidential. If you have received this message in error, please notify us and remove it from your system. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifies and with authority, states them to be the views of one or any of Broham Forecourt Developments Ltd

envirolab
Hattersley Science & Technology Park
Stockport Road, Hattersley, SK14 3QU

FINAL ANALYTICAL TEST REPORT

Envirolab Job Number: 24/07239
Issue Number: 1 **Date:** 30 July, 2024

Client: Geo2 Remediation Ltd
Coniston House,
Louisa Street
Bradford
BD10 8NE

Project Manager: Ben Wilson/Paul Stapleton/Steven Jackson
Project Name: Sawtry
Project Ref: N/A
Order No: Sawtry/BW
Date Samples Received: 24/07/24
Date Instructions Received: 25/07/24
Date Analysis Completed: 30/07/24

Approved by:

[redacted]
Client Manager

Envirolab Job Number: 24/07239

Client Project Name: Sawtry

Client Project Ref: N/A

Lab Sample ID	24/07239/1	24/07239/2	24/07239/3	24/07239/4	24/07239/5			Units	Limit of Detection	Method ref
Client Sample No										
Client Sample ID	V1a	V1b	V2a	V2b	V2c					
Depth to Top	1.50	2.30	1.50	3.20	1.80					
Depth To Bottom										
Date Sampled	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24					
Sample Type	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL					
Sample Matrix Code	5A	5AE	6A	3A	3A					
% Stones >10mm$_A$	17.6	11.8	2.9	<0.1	<0.1			% w/w	0.1	A-T-044

Envirolab Job Number: 24/07239

Client Project Name: Sawtry

Client Project Ref: N/A

Lab Sample ID	24/07239/1	24/07239/2	24/07239/3	24/07239/4	24/07239/5			Units	Limit of Detection	Method ref
Client Sample No										
Client Sample ID	V1a	V1b	V2a	V2b	V2c					
Depth to Top	1.50	2.30	1.50	3.20	1.80					
Depth To Bottom										
Date Sampled	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24	22-Jul-24					
Sample Type	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL	SOIL					
Sample Matrix Code	5A	5AE	6A	3A	3A					
TPH CWG with Clean Up										
Ali >C5-C6$_A$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
Ali >C6-C8$_A$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.02			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
Ali >C8-C10$_A$	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Ali >C10-C12$_A^{M\#}$	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Ali >C12-C16$_A^{M\#}$	2	2	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Ali >C16-C21$_A^{M\#}$	3	4	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Ali >C21-C35$_A^{M\#}$	11	29	<1	2	2			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Total Aliphatics$_A$	16	36	<1	2	2			mg/kg	1	Calc-As Recd
Aro >C5-C7$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
Aro >C7-C8$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
Aro >C8-C10$_A$	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Aro >C10-C12$_A$	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Aro >C12-C16$_A$	2	3	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Aro >C16-C21$_A^{M\#}$	7	24	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Aro >C21-C35$_A^{M\#}$	33	172	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	A-T-055s
Total Aromatics$_A$	42	199	<1	<1	<1			mg/kg	1	Calc-As Recd
TPH (Ali & Aro >C5-C35)$_A$	57	235	<1	2	2			mg/kg	1	Calc-As Recd
BTEX - Benzene$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
BTEX - Toluene$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
BTEX - Ethyl Benzene$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
BTEX - m & p Xylene$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
BTEX - o Xylene$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s
MTBE$_A^{\#}$	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01			mg/kg	0.01	A-T-022s

Report Notes

General

•This report shall not be reproduced, except in full, without written approval from Envirolab.
•The client Sample No, Client Sample ID, Depth to top, Depth to Bottom and Date Sampled are all provided by the client and can affect the validity of results.
•The results reported herein relate only to the material supplied to the laboratory.
•The residue of any samples contained within this report, and any received within the same delivery, will be disposed of **four weeks** after the initial scheduling. For samples tested for Asbestos we will retain a portion of the dried sample for a minimum of **six months** after the initial Asbestos testing is completed.
•Analytical results reflect the quality of the sample at the time of analysis only.
•Opinions and Interpretations expressed are outside our scope of accreditation.
•A deviating sample report is appended and will indicate if samples or tests have been found to be deviating. Any test results affected may not be an accurate record of the concentration at the time of sampling and, as a result, may be invalid.
•If a sample is outside of the calibration range or affected by interferences then it may need diluting. This will result in the limit of detection (LOD) being raised.
•Subcontracted Analysis: Please see the appended report for any deviations, current LODs and accreditation status of the test.

Key

Superscript "#"	Accredited to ISO 17025
Superscript "M"	Accredited to MCertS
Superscript "U"	Individual result not accredited
None of the above symbols	Analysis unaccredited
Subscript "A"	Analysis performed on as-received Sample
Subscript "D"	Analysis performed on the dried sample, crushed to pass 2mm sieve.
Subscript "D" on Asbestos	Analysis performed on a dried aliquot of sample provided.
Subscript "^"	Analysis has dependant options against results. Details appear in the comments of your Sample receipt
IS	Insufficient Sample for analysis
US	Unsuitable Sample for analysis
NDP	No Determination Possible
NAD	No Asbestos Detected
Trace	Asbestos found not suitable for Gravimetric Quantification – not enough to accurately weigh.
N/A	Not applicable

Asbestos

Identification: Asbestos in soil analysis is performed on a dried aliquot of the submitted sample and cannot guarantee to identify asbestos if only present in small numbers as discrete fibres/fragments in the original sample.
Stones etc. are not removed from the sample prior to analysis
"Trace Asbestos Identified" will be reported if there is not enough present to verify the type.
Quantification: Generally a 2 stage process including visual identification, hand picking and weighing, and fibre counting. Where ACMs are found a percentage asbestos is assigned to each with reference to 'HSG264, Asbestos: The survey guide' and the calculated asbestos content is expressed as a percentage of the dried soil sample aliquot used. If asbestos is identified as being present but is not in a form that is suitable for analysis by hand picking and weighing (normally if the asbestos is present as free fibres). "TRACE" will be reported as a quantification result.
PLEASE INFORM THE LABORATORY IF YOU WOULD LIKE THE STAGE 3 SEDIMENTATION PROCESS CARRIED OUT. Note this will be subcontracted.

Assigned Matrix Codes

1	SAND	6	CLAY/LOAM	A	Contains Stones
2	LOAM	7	OTHER	B	Contains Construction Rubble
3	CLAY	8	Asbestos Bulk (Only Asbestos ID accredited)	C	Contains visible hydrocarbons
4	LOAM/SAND	9	Incinerator Ash (some Metals accredited)	D	Contains glass / metal
5	SAND/CLAY			E	Contains roots / twigs
Note: 7,8,9 matrices are not covered by our ISO 17025 or MCertS accreditation, unless stated above.					

Soil Chemical Analysis:
All results are reported as dry weight (<40°C).
For samples with Matrix Codes 1 - 6 natural stones, brick and concrete fragments >10mm and any extraneous material (visible glass, metal or twigs) are removed and excluded from the sample prior to analysis and reported results corrected to a whole sample basis. This is reported as '% stones >10mm'.
For samples with Matrix Code 7 the whole sample is dried and crushed prior to analysis and this supersedes any "A" subscripts
All analysis is performed on the sample as received for soil samples which are positive for asbestos or the client has informed asbestos may be present and/or if they are from outside the European Union and this supersedes any "D" subscripts.

TPH by method A-T-007:
For waters, free and visible oils are excluded from the sample used for analysis, so the reported result represents the dissolved phase only.
Results "with Clean up" indicates samples cleaned up with Silica during extraction.

EPH CWG (method A-T-055) from TPH CWG:
EPH CWG results have humics mathematically subtracted through instrument calculation.
Where these humic substances have been identified in any IDs from "TPH CWG with clean up" please note that the concentration is **NOT** included in the quantified results but present in the ID for information.

Electrical Conductivity of water by method A-T-037:
Results greater than 12900µS/cm @ 25^0C / 11550µS/cm @ 20^0C fall outside the calibration range and as such are unaccredited.

Please contact your client manager if you require any further information.

Envirolab Deviating Samples Report

Hattersley Science & Technology Park, Stockport Road, Hattersley, SK14 3QU
Tel. 0161 368 4921 email. ask@envlab.co.uk

Client: Geo2 Remediation Ltd, Coniston House,, Louisa Street, Bradford, BD10 8NE

Project No: 24/07239

Date Received: 25/07/2024 (am)

Project: Sawtry

Cool Box Temperatures (°C): 23.8

Clients Project No: N/A

NO DEVIATIONS IDENTIFIED

If, at any point before reaching the laboratory, the temperature of the samples has breached those set in published standards, e.g. BS-EN 5667-3, ISO 18400-102:2017, then the concentration of any affected analytes may differ from that at the time of sampling.

Envirolab Analysis Dates

Lab Sample ID	24/07239/1	24/07239/2	24/07239/3	24/07239/4	24/07239/5
Client Sample No					
Client Sample ID/Depth	V1a 1.50m	V1b 2.30m	V2a 1.50m	V2b 3.20m	V2c 1.80m
Date Sampled	22/07/24	22/07/24	22/07/24	22/07/24	22/07/24
A-T-022s	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024
A-T-044	30/07/2024	30/07/2024	30/07/2024	30/07/2024	30/07/2024
A-T-055s	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024
Calc-As Recd	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024	29/07/2024

The above dates are the analysis completion dates, please note that these are not necessarily the date that the analysis was weighed/extracted.

End of Report