

Operational phase SCR evaluation template

Sections 4.0 to 7.0 may be completed annually in line with normal record checks.

4.0 Changes to the activities (Source)	
Have there been any changes to the following during the operation of the site?	Response (Specify what information is needed from the applicant, if any)
a) Activity boundaries b) Permitted activities c) "Dangerous substances" used or produced	
Yes. Unit 4B was added to the installation boundary in January 2012. This was determined under permit variation V003 and was signed 05/03/2012. (The date it was saved to EDRM is 07/03/2012). Unit 4B was used for the treatment of used cooking oils (UCO), involving the settlement, filtration and drying of UCO to produce a highly refined oil product which is used as a vehicle fuel (Ultra Biofuel).	

5.0 Measures taken to protect land To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Pathway)
Has the applicant provided evidence from records collated during the lifetime of the permit, to show that the pollution prevention measures have worked?
Yes – This is included in ('Measures Taken to protect land' in the SCR)) and details the measures which comprise: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All internal floor areas are concrete surfaced• All external floor areas are concrete surfaced• All external storage tanks are bunded The applicant has provided photographs throughout the SCR.

6.0 Pollution incidents that may have impacted on land and their remediation To be completed by EM/PPC officers (Sources)
Has the applicant provided evidence to show that any pollution incidents which have taken place during the life of the permit and which may have impacted on land or water have been investigated and remediated (where necessary)?
There was a known (unreported) pollution incident involving the release of waste cooking oil into the River Croco. The incident occurred in April 2009 as a result of a loss of containment of waste water. The operator understands that a number of spill incidents have occurred involving releases of used cooking oils, however, these have been onto hard surfaced ground and are not believed to have impacted on soil and/or groundwater quality. One spillage occurred at a customer premises in January 2012. The spill was cleaned up and recorded on a 'Waste Spill and Leak Report' (saved to EDRM 25/01/2012). There are no other recorded incidents on EDRM. There are no known spill incidents involving loss of containment of biodiesel or associated chemicals.

7.0 Soil gas and water quality monitoring (where relevant)
Where soil gas and/or water quality monitoring has been undertaken, does this demonstrate that there has been no change in the condition of the land? Has any change that has occurred been investigated and remediated?
No soil, gas or groundwater monitoring has been undertaken at the site.

Surrender SCR Evaluation Template

If you haven't already completed previous sections 4.0 to 7.0, do so now before assessing the surrender.

8.0 Decommissioning and removal of pollution risk

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

Has the applicant demonstrated that decommissioning works have been undertaken and that all pollution risks associated with the site have been removed? Has any contamination of land that has occurred during these activities been investigated and remediated?

Storage tanks: The UCO tanks were drained of any residual oil which was containerised into IBCs. The majority of waste oil was shipped to Olleco's processing site in Liverpool. However, a quantity of peanut oil (approximately 10,000 litres) was collected by Oil Recoveries Ltd for recycling.

The biodiesel, glycerol and methanol tanks were drained and the residual product containerised into IBC's. The IBC's were then shipped to Olleco's UCO and biodiesel processing site in Liverpool (permit reference EPR/LP3032NC).

The methanol tank was cleaned out by Mantank Environmental Services Ltd. The tank was rag dried and the waste rags disposed of as a hazardous waste to BIP Environmental Ltd, Cheshire. All other tanks were cleaned by LIS Group. A steamer was used to remove any sludge and the tanks washed out. The wash water was tankered off site to LIS Group's treatment facility at Haydock Lane, St Helen's, Merseyside.

Unit 1B Tank Compound: Three storage tanks were situated externally adjacent to Unit 1B within a compound at the adjacent site (a tank wash facility). The tanks were all self bunded and sited within a low level bund. Heavy oily staining was evident within the bund, arising from spillages during filling/ off-loading operations. –The tanks were drained and cleaned out on site by Lees Industrial Services (LIS Group). A steamer was used to remove any sludge's and the tanks washed out. The wash water was tankered off site to LIS Group's treatment facility at Haydock Lane, St Helen's, Merseyside. The clean tanks were moved to other sites within the Olleco group for re-use.

Unit 4B Tank Compound: This unit housed the Ultra biofuel production process. The tanks were drained of any residual oil and containerised into IBC's. The tanks were cleaned out with warm water prior to shipping to Olleco's Liverpool depot. All tanks are of steel construction.

Drums and IBC's: All IBC's and barrels of used cooking oil (UCO) were shipped to Olleco's Liverpool depot. The Liverpool recycling facility operates under permit number EPR/LP3032NC. Approximately 14.5 tonnes of UCO was moved to Liverpool in IBC's between April 2016 and September 2016 under EWC code 20 01 25 (edible oils and fats).

Convert 2 Green operated a small laboratory for process testing. All residual quantities of laboratory chemicals were disposed of by Greenway Environmental Limited via their transfer station in Liverpool.

All other residual chemicals in drums and IBC's were also disposed of by Greenway Environmental Limited. This included chemical additives used in the production process such as potassium hydroxide, Baynox Plus- 2, 2'-methylene-bis-(4-methyl-6-tert-butylphenol) and Wintron Synergy (polymethacrylate compounds in a mineral oil base).

Approximately 4000 litres of waste oils and chemicals were disposed of as hazardous waste (consignment note no. Olleco/15516).

Equipment: All equipment was drained, cleaned and removed from site. Equipment that could be reused within the Olleco group was moved to Olleco's Liverpool depot. Other equipment was sold for scrap.

Pipework: All transfer pipework associated with the storage tanks and pipework was drained and removed off site. Some pipework has been retained for re-use with the storage tanks at other Olleco depots, however the majority was sold to licensed scrap metal dealer. All pipework at the site ran above ground.

Surfacing – internal floor areas

Unit 1B: The inside of the building is concrete surfaced. The floor was generally in good condition, although degradation of the surface was evident in places due to physical and chemical damage. Where damaged sections were evident, these were cut away and the concrete replaced. In all cases, any surface oil staining was found to have penetrated no more than 10-15mm into the concrete. The floor was thoroughly cleaned prior to vacating the building. There were no internal drains or sumps within the production areas of Unit 1B.

Unit 4B: The floor in Unit 4B is concrete surfaced. Within the production area there were four shallow floor drains (approximately 300mm in depth) and two deeper sumps. The sumps were approximately 1m in depth and lined with metal sheeting. The floor drains and sumps were used to collect leaks, spills and wash water associated with the oil treatment process. The drains and sumps were not interconnected. Residual wash water was pumped out of the sumps and drains on completion of the decommissioning activities. The sumps and floor drains were then cleaned out and backfilled with concrete. The floor of the building was cleaned down with industrial floor cleaners with rotating brushes and then coated with an epoxy resin floor paint.

External surfacing:

Unit 1B: Externally, the yard is concrete and tarmac surfaced. There are no unsurfaced areas.

Two above ground used cooking oil (UCO) tanks were sited in a concrete bund within the yard area adjacent to the building. The floor and walls of the bund were heavily oiled. Once the tanks were removed off site and the bund cleaned out, the bund walls were removed and the concrete patch repaired. The area was then thoroughly cleaned with industrial steam cleaning unit. The cleaning demonstrated that the staining was superficial.

Within the yard area, a below ground sump was used for the collection of oily water separated from the UCO settlement tanks. This was located within a low level concrete bund adjacent to the diesel tank. The sump was approximately 0.5m wide by 0.6m in length and 1m deep.

The sump comprised a metal chamber set in concrete. On vacating the site, oily water within the sump was pumped out into an IBC for transfer to Olleco's Liverpool site for treatment. The sump was then washed out and emptied again. The integrity of the sump chamber was visually inspected. No corrosion or cracks were identified. The sump was filled with clean water which was allowed to stand for 24 hours. No discernible drop in water level was recorded and the sump was subsequently emptied and backfilled with concrete.

Unit 1B Tank Compound: Three storage tanks were situated externally adjacent to Unit 1B within a compound at the adjacent site (a tank wash facility). The tanks contained oily wash water, biodiesel and used cooking oil. Although the tanks were all self bunded, spillages during filling/ off-loading operations had resulted in heavy oil staining on the concrete surfacing in front of the tanks. A low level brick bund wall had been constructed around the tanks to prevent oily water run-off into the adjacent yard area. Upon removal of the tanks, the bund area was cleaned using a high pressure jet washer and detergent with the wash water contained for off-site disposal. Following cleaning, the bund walls were removed and the concrete patch repaired. Once cured, the area was cleaned down again to remove any stubborn staining.

Unit 4B

Externally, the yard area is concrete and tarmac surfaced. There are no unsurfaced areas.

The external yard areas were cleaned using a jet washer, with wash water directed into the interceptor.

Drainage:**Unit 1B**

Surface water drainage from the yard area flows by gravity to the access road that runs adjacent to the north of the unit. The drain within the roadway runs down a gentle incline to an interceptor situated within the curtilage of the adjacent industrial unit. Prior to vacating the unit, upon completion of all cleaning and washing activities, the interceptor was emptied, desludged and jet washed out by Greenway Environmental Ltd. All surface water drains within the yard were also emptied and cleaned out using a jet vacuum tanker. The condition of the interceptor was visually inspected as far as possible upon emptying and no structural issues were identified.

Unit 4B

Internally within the production area of Unit 4B there were four shallow floor drains (approximately 300mm) and two deeper sumps. The sumps were approximately 1m in depth and lined with metal sheeting. The floor drains and sumps were used to collect leaks, spills and wash water associated with the oil treatment process. The drains and sumps were not interconnected. Residual wash water was pumped out of the sumps and drains on completion of the decommissioning activities. The sumps and drains were cleaned and then visually inspected. No corrosion or cracks were identified. The sumps were filled with clean water which was allowed to stand for 24 hours. No discernible drop in water level was recorded. The sumps and floor drains were then emptied out and backfilled with concrete.

Externally, the yard drainage discharges into an oil interceptor. The interceptor was emptied and cleaned out once cleaning of the yard areas was complete. The interceptor was emptied, desludged and jet washed out by LIS North Western Ltd. All surface water drains within the yard were also emptied and cleaned out using a jet vac tanker. The wastewater was removed by LIS to their treatment facility at Haydock Lane, St Helen's, Merseyside. Approximately 5,000 litres of wastewater was removed off site. The condition of the interceptor was visually inspected as far as possible upon emptying and no structural issues were identified. The interceptor was installed in the first half of 2015 by Convert 2 Green.

The decommissioning works have ensured that all edible oil product waste materials have been removed from the site in compliance with relevant waste management legislation. All tanks and associated pipework have been drained and removed off site. The foul and surface water drains and associated interceptors have been cleaned out and the wastewater disposed of off-site.

Where surface staining of oil was evident, this was found to be superficial, having penetrated no more than 12-15mm into concrete.

Convert 2 Green believe that given the decommissioning works undertaken there is no residual pollution risk associated with the site.

A final site inspection was undertaken on the 8th June 2017 to confirm that the site was in a satisfactory state to be surrendered. At the time of the inspection full access to the site could not be gained but two small blue drums and a number of IBCs were observed being stored. However, it was unclear whether the IBCs were being stored on land covered by the permitted area or whether these were empty or full containers. An additional site inspection was undertaken on 20 June 2017 which confirmed the IBCs were not being stored on land covered by the permit and that the site has been appropriately decommissioned and all pollution risks removed from the site which is confirmed in the Corrective Action Report (CAR) (Ref: CP3837MM/0287822) dated 22 June 2017 as detailed within Appendix I below.

Based on the information above we are satisfied that all decommissioning works have been undertaken and pollution risks associated with the site have been removed.

9.0 Reference data and remediation (where relevant)

To be completed by GWCL officers

Has the applicant provided details of any surrender reference data that they have collected and any remediation that they have undertaken?

(Reference data for soils must meet the requirements of policy 307_03 Chemical test data on contaminated soils – quantification requirements). If the surrender reference data shows that the condition of the land has changed as a result of the permitted activities, the applicant will need to undertake remediation to return the condition of the land back to that at permit issue. You should not require remediation of historic contamination or contamination arising from non-permitted activities as part of the permit surrender.

The applicant has not provided details of any surrender reference data for soils and groundwater. Given the low risk posed by the activities and the pollution prevention measures appear to have been appropriate and any minor spills have been cleaned up appropriately we do not consider that surrender reference data is warranted to support the permit surrender application.

10.0a Statement of site condition

To be completed by EM/PPC officers

Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?

Yes. See section 4 of Site Closure Report dated December 2016.

10.0b Statement of site condition

To be completed by GWCL officers

Has the applicant provided a statement, backed up with evidence, confirming that the permitted activities have ceased, decommissioning works are complete and that pollution risk has been removed and that the land and waters at the site are in a satisfactory state?

Yes. See section 4 of Site Closure Report dated December 2016.

Surrender SCR decision summary

To be completed by GWCL officers and returned to NPS

Tick relevant decision

Sufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed and that the site is in a satisfactory state – accept the application to surrender the permit; or

X

Insufficient information has been supplied to show that pollution risk has been removed or that the site is in a satisfactory state – do not accept the application to surrender the permit. The following information must to be obtained from the applicant before the permit is determined:

Date and name of reviewer: Lindsey Berends 23 June 2017