

PERMIT CONDITIONS COMPLIANCE CHECK REPORT

Installation Address:	WTG Treatment Ltd Shed 6, Immingham Dock Immingham North East Lincolnshire DN40 2LZ
Contact:	Mr Soott A. J
Permit Ref:	Mr Scott Anderson EP/201500001
Data of William	
Date of Varied Permit:	New Permit issued 2016
Permitted activity:	Wood Preservation Process A2
Guidance Note:	1100d Freservation Process A2
Date of Visit:	23/10/19
Report Reference:	
Condition number:	
Records Required records kept and available?	Ves Yes Permit on site
Written procedures and training issued to staff?	Signage and procedures on
Maintenance programme?	wall. Delivery procedure +
Reporting	
Emissions monitoring	
ncident procedure	Written procedure on would
Written Management systems	
Maintenance !	Koppers Complete & monthly Service on vessely. Iclest
A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	completed on 22/10/19.
of the state of th	Daily checks by stell.
9 Odour	,
0 Particulate Matter	No oder
	No pariable emission.
1 Resource utilisation	Discussed review
	required next year.
2 waste recovery/ avoidance	
- J. S. Siddiloe	
3 – 41 Protection of atmosphere	
The rotection of atmosphere	Chucked terriary bund, tank bunding. Spill kit and absorbert
	meteral.
	The state of the s

SMP provided for 2018 data	meats Turset level.
42 - 43 Atmospheric Monitoring	* need 2017 + 2018 dates should be submitted in
Solvent Management Plan	Jenuary - Not complian
Protection of soil and ground water	Discussed that an assessment of risk management on prevent pollulion to grandwater + soil recultood next year
Soil and groundwater monitoring	D plantifeporting of groundwater
Additional	Nead to submit surp.

Risk Assessment Score Sheet

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmenta	al Impact P	otential	
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Category 1		10	
(B) Category 2	4	20	
(C) Category 3		30	30

Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading Status of Upgrading	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Upgrading not complete but SG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and SG 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 Rescore)		ivity of Rece	
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	Now year advisors as a
(B) No such air pollution problems	Λ	

Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to	35

Operator Performance Appraisal

	The state of the s	
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	O
* Univertified compleints may be a set these services	(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	уО
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	0	NIA O
(C) Process operation modified where any	0	5	0	NIA O

problems indicated by monitoring?				
(D) Fully documented and adhered to	0	5	0	
maintenance programme, in line with authorisation?				Y 0
(E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site?	0	5	0	y 6
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	0	25
Total score	(-	5 to 3	0)	5

tomord sup in

Component 7 - Assessment of Management,	Trainii	ng and	d Resp	oonsibility	
	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	уО	
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	УО	
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	0	y 0	
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	0	уО	
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	0	Y G	
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	NO to	No 1m
Total	(-	5 to 2	5)	0	2,7

Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 105	5
	103	

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

Officer Signature: V- Thompson

Operator Signature

Date: 23/10/19.

POLITIFICA DEFERENCE AND SECONIFECTION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE