

PERMIT CONDITIONS COMPLIANCE CHECK REPORT

Installation Address:	Phillips 66 Ltd. Coke Silos Immingham Docks Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 2NT
Contact:	Tim Goldby
Permit Ref:	EP/200200090V2
Date of Varied Permit:	18.07.12
Permitted activity:	Process using coal, coke, coal product and petroleum coke
Guidance Note:	PG3/5(04)
Date of Visit:	02/07/14.
Report Reference:	CP90/1
Condition number:	
1.1 Any visible emissions of	no visible emissions during . visit, watched vessel loading.
particulates beyond site	visit, watched vessel loading.
boundary?	
1.2 Prevent harmful, offensive	Suitable measures in place.
emissions?	
2.1 Designated traffic routes on	Yes - signage for drivers on
site?	routes.
2.2 Onsite speed limit 10mph?	
2.3 Vehicles fully sheeted?	Yes - in contract for requirement
2.4 Vehicles checked for	Yes but has also has automatic
damage that could result in	release anddown set of if
spillage?	Seal not made. Automatic
2.5 Designated traffic routes	
monitored?	Yes, staff corry out dowly
2.6 Machinery examined for	Yes:
build up of dusty machinery?	, 23

2.7 Escape/ breakdown	V
procedure and records?	Yes
2.8 Site log with wind direction	
and speed recorded?	Yes.
2.9 Bulk loading chute properly	Yes
seated on tanker?	763
3.1 All petroleum on site oil	~
sprayed?	Yes
3.2 Petroleum coke received via	~
enclosed loading bays or	Yes
warehouse?	
3.3 roller shutter doors fully	Yes
closed and extract system in	
operation? When last serviced?	SAP system.
3.4 Written operational	Yes
procedure for discharge to ship?	
3.5 Vacuum equipment for	Yes.
spillages?	
3.6 side panels and deck plates	Yes
in place when loading to ship?	Think
3.7 Scrap coke loaded to	Yes.
suitable bags?	
3.8	
4.1 Visual monitoring during	Yes.
start up and 4 – hourly intervals?	
Locations indicated on site plan?	
4.2 Particulate monitoring?	Yes-
4.3 Silos manually dipped and	Yes
recorded prior to filling?	763
4.4 Coke fine hoppers manually	Yes
dipped and recorded during	
filling?	
5.1 Staff training?	Yes
5.2 Maintenance?	Yes

Risk Assessment Score Sheet

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential			
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores	Score Awarded	
(A) Category 1	10	10	
(B) Category 2	20		
(C) Category 3	30	Security of the	

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	
(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	

Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors (circle appropriate score)

27	Sensitivity of Receptors			
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.

Component 4 - Other Targets				
	Possible Scores	Score Awarded		
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a potential contributor	10	10		
(B) No such air pollution problems	0			

Total Score for Environmental Impact	Range 0 to	25
Appraisal	70	

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - 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 * Univertified compleints may be a graph and the property of the proper	(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.

		ossib Score:	Score Awarded	
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation?	0	10	0	y O
(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	MIA O
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation?	0	5	0	YO
(E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site?	0	5	0	YO
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	0	NIAO
Total score	(-5 to 30)		0	

Component 7 - Assessment of Management,	Trainir	ng and	d Resp	onsibility
	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded	
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	7 Waraca
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation?	0	5	0	yo
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	Yo
(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	YO
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	YO
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	y -5.
Total	(- :	5 to 2	5)	-5

Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 105	-5.
La Million Company		
OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to	20
	175	20
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY	LOW, MED,	
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	HIGH	

Officer: VICKY WRAY

Officer Signature: V way

Operator Signature

Date: 2 17