

PERMIT CONDITIONS COMPLIANCE CHECK REPORT

Installation Address:	PD Port Services The Quays and Jetties of Immingham Dock Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN36 4AS	
Contact:	Mick Cruddas	
Permit Ref:	EP/20020005	
Date of Varied Permit:	Due for vericher.	
Permitted activity:	Process using coal, coke, coal product and petroleum coke	
Guidance Note:	PG3/5 (04)	
Date of Visit: Report Reference:	02/09/14 PD1	
	away art) watched the loading	
1.1 No visible emissions beyond	of Koren C pet cake.	_
site boundary?	No visible exission during vis	16
1.2 Operator prevents release of particulate emissions from the site that are harmful or offensive?	Yes.	
2.1 Notified of any changes to wheel wash facility?		
2.2 Wheel wash provided with frost protection?	wheel wash in use.	
2.3 exhaust emissions from mobile plant directed upwards?	Yes	
2.4 All product being loaded or unloaded sufficiently damp?	Yes	
2.5 temporary quayside stockpiles maintained in sufficiently damp conditions?	Yes	
2.6 Wind speed and directions information kept on site?	Yes.	

3.15 Staff Training	Tool Box eath given to start at start of operation and signed of.
3.14 Maintenance	ABP equipment used.
3.13	# Emission release providing on tool box.
3.12 Particulate monitoring?	Yes.
Recorded?	
start and 4 hourly intervals?	
3.11 Visual assessment made at	Yes - site log checke.
3.10 Site log kept for 2 years?	Yes
3.9 Site log available on site?	Yes.
spillage / release?	Yes
3.8 Procedure in place in case of	V
for build up of dusty material?	
3.7 Machinery examined prior to use	Yes.
3.6 Vehicle routes inspected?	Yes + Goodsweeper emplo
damage that could result in spillage?	and contract that sheets.
3.5 Checks on vehicles on no	Yes Supervisor Checks
3.4 Vehicles fully sheeted?	Yes in howlage contracts
3.3 On site speed limit 10mph?	
3.2	
content sufficient to prevent fugitive dust emissions?	Yes
3.1 No product worked unless moisture	
and under-body wash?	Yes
2.8 Lorries leaving quay via wheel	1
for suppression equipment?	Yes

Risk Assessment Score Sheet

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmenta	Illmpact Potential	F
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Category 1	10	
(B) Category 2	20	20
(C) Category 3	30	v.

Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading		
Status of Upgrading	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	Awardeu
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note deadline has passed	10	
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC Requirements	0	0
(D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC Requirements	-10	

િંગામું ભાવતા ઉખ્ રામા પ્રોપ્તોપ્ર and Prexim ity જહેરા કંપના	3.00	(আডিলিল) ivity of Rec	
Proximity to Emission Source	(x) High	(y) Medium	(z) Low
(A) < 100m* Reason Humber Estuary designated a SSSI	20	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) > 500m*	0	0	0

^{*} All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes and by a factor of 4 for combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal processes.

Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site boundary.

Summonent 45 Other Lingels		
	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local	10	10
area to which process is a potential contributor		
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	

Total Score for Environmental Impact	Range 0 to	42
Appraisal	70	980 15 1 25 4 5 15 17 1

Operator Performance Appraisal

Components Compliance Assessment Scale of Non-Compliance (Within 12 month period prior to review)	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific authorisation condition or of general/residual BATNEEC condition	0 points	0

(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	5 per incident	0
(C) Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action (Updated by AQ 18)	10 per breach	0
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident	0
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident	0
Total	(Max. 50)	0

^{*} Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unreasonable or which cannot be clearly linked to an incident at the process.

ScoringholdComponental@Assessment of M Records	lonitoi	ing, (lainte	naince and
	Possible Scores			Score Awarded
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation?	0	10	0	УО
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	0	NIA O
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	5	0	NIA-O
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation?	0	5	0	NIA O
(E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site?	0	5	0	γO
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	0	Ϋ́O
Total score	(-5 to 30)		O	

ABP

	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded	
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation?	0	5	0	γО
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	γO
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	0	YO
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	0	Y O

(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	УО	15014001
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	<i>-</i> 5	U	U	y -5	
Total	(-	5 to 2	5)	-5	

Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to	Κ.
	105	7

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175	37
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY	LOW, MED,	20.7
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	HIGH	LOW

Officer: VICKY WRAY

Officer Signature: V Wrog.

Operator Signature M.J. CRUDAS

Date: 02/09/14