

**Annex II: Feedback received following the Statutory Consultation carried out for the application of variation and renewal of Gasparell Bailing Co Ltd. permit (IP0004/12/B) carried out between 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020 –7<sup>th</sup> January 2021 , 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2021 – 17<sup>th</sup> March 2021 , 21<sup>st</sup> May 2021–4<sup>th</sup> June 2021, 25<sup>th</sup> October 2021 –8<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and 24<sup>th</sup> June 2021 – 8<sup>th</sup> July 2022.**

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
<b>External Consultees Feedback</b>													
<b>Environmental Health Directorate</b>	<p>With reference to request to provide any comments on the contents of such application regarding subject in caption, please be informed that this Directorate would like to submit the following comments/recommendations regarding this proposal: The proposed changes consist of the removal or rather the non-installation of fuel pump and associated ancillary facilities such as pipes and underground storage tank and the increase in storage area.</p> <p>1. Being that such fuel pump and associated ancillary facilities have never been installed this Directorate has no objection;</p> <p>2. As for the increase in the storage area of this site in order to retain a larger quantity of scrap metals and also for</p>	All comments have been addressed through the assessment and conditions in IP 0004/12/B.	Noted	No further comments.	–	–	With regards to BAT 3, reusing second class water it must be treated with a biocide such as chlorine to prevent Legionnaire's diseases. Kindly note that said water cannot be used for human consumption , including any wash hand basins and/or showers.	Operator to note.	Noted	EHD has no further comments on the IPPC application.	Kindly note that we do not have any further comments.	–	

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
Malta Resources Authority	No feedback received	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
Planning Authority	No feedback receive	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
Regulator y for Energy and Water Services	<p>The Regulator conducted an inspection recently at Gasparell Baling Plant. The plant has a number of storages which are not duly registered with the Regulator.</p> <p>The application form submitted by Gasparell is therefore incomplete. With our recent findings, and through this consultation, REWS is advising the applicant to contact a competent person (under Legal notice 53 of 2010) to write a report on all the fuel storages discovered in the most recent REWS inspection. This would naturally be accompanied by a fresh application form with all documentation referenced within.</p> <p>The applicant is expected to complete the above by the 15th February 2021.</p>	Operator to obtain the necessary authorisation from REWS.	Please note that contrary to what REWS have communicated the applicant has until the at least the beginning of March 2021 since the letter they sent was dated 27 <sup>th</sup> January and it clearly states that he has 30 days from RECEIPT of letter to reply. Considering the dates found on the enclosed letter definitely, the date stated is incorrect. Furthermore, REWS	In his email below Dr Joe Doublet is stating that Gasparell Baling submitted a secondary storage application to the REWS. This was submitted in 2018. The attached correspondence dated 2018 is not the application itself, but documents which were submitted with the application. These documents show a Secondary Storage Facility Commission Report Declaration form and a Report from BNel Consultancy addressing only two known storages used for end of life vehicle fuel retrieval. As advised in our email dated 11th January, the REWS carried out an inspection in January 2021, uncovering other fuel storages. To date, Gasparell Baling Plant did not submit a detailed inspection report covering all storages. Therefore nothing new has been learnt from Dr J. Doublet's submission. Also our recent consultation with ERA for Gasparell (dated 16th March) to take action still holds.	Applicant is to liaise with REWS to address their requirements in a timely manner.	Please note that REWS have been sent report by engineer regarding these issues	The report by b.Nel Engineering services Ref no. VB/mz/R566 9//21 has been reviewed by the Regulator and we are currently engaged in further communication with the applicant. We have no objection to this final consultation.	Noted.		The Regulator has sent an email asking for further documentation to Gasparell on the 25/05/21, but to date we still have not received a reply. The REWS is therefore objecting to this final round of consultation on Gasparell's variation application, because the site is not in line with our requirements.	The Regulator for Energy and Water Services is objecting to this round of consultation because in the meeting with Gasparell Baling representatives, held with the ERA on the 19/05/22, a number of documents and clarifications had to be submitted. To date these have not been received and the site is still not authorised by the REWS to store fuel.  <u>Update dated :</u>  We note that this development will be tackled from a waste management perspective. Fixed equipment working with fuel (possibly equipped with separate fuel storage) still needs to be regulated if the combined	Operator to address REWS queries with respect to fixed equipment handling fuel and associated fuel storage tanks/mobile containers.	Please note that I believe that this issue has been resolved in December 2022 when you were informed that operator doesn't want to proceed with transferring fuels to his own machinery but will dispose of them through a licenced waste carrier. Furthermore, years back it was also agreed with REWS that operator will install a limiter in the fuel storage tanks used

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
			had been submitted with a full list of fuel stored on site on the 25 <sup>th</sup> April 2019 but it seems that they ignored it.								storage of diesel is greater than 300 litres. Gasparell therefore today remains unauthorised.		in the ELV dismantling plant so that the 300ltr limit is not exceeded and REWS had accepted that. I am also attaching correspondence which took place with Mr Stephen J Mifsud dated 17/5/2018 whereby the respective literature of the probe was also sent but to date there was no reply from his side about this matter. Furthermore, client had also sent REWs a copy of the insurance covering the tanks used as requested

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
													by REWS (enclosed). This was sent on 26/4/2019 and ERA were also in copy. Hence, I fail to understand why this issue keeps coming up over and over again.
Civil Protection Department	With reference to the above IPPC for variation in the application, the same fire safety conditions still stand and should be applied as those imposed back in PA 2453/10 of 3/02/2012. It is important that they should be maintained and kept ready in case of need, and fire safety sign have decayed or faded out they should be made new. It is important that the water reservoir is always kept full and have full fire brigade access.	Operator to take note of suggested conditions.	Noted	—	—		It is important that all of the batteries when removed from their respective vehicle they are stored on a spill proof pallet were multiple batteries are stored.  The corrosive properties of battery acid can affect walls, floors, electrical or most things in close proximity. It is recommended closed off battery	Operator to reply	Batteries are stored on pallets inside one of the stores. They are only taken outside when the waste collector or is due to come to collect them.	—	We have no further comments to add provided that they do not except electric vehicles for scrap.	Noted, the proposed will not allow electric vehicles to be processed.	



Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							<p>boxes are use if such are stored outside to safely secure the storage of batteries. These large yellow Outside Battery Containment Boxes with removable lids are the perfect solution. They are large enough to store multiple units and they be procure designed to allow handling with forklifts or lift-trucks, and a snug fitting lid to protect spillage and airborne acid transfer.</p> <p>Secondly, we are all aware towards to push of Electrical Vehicles, if the company intends to handle such</p>		For the time being, electric cars will not be accepting such vehicles				

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							vehicles they should start planning for them, if an electrical car for some unforeseen reason catch fire there is the possibility of it reignites again, therefore if a car is taken to such a facility after it was involved in a fire they have to be prepared like a bunker pit to store the car for at least 48 hours, this has to be built away from it causing further fire spread, and have water sprinklers at ground level to keep the battery cooled, the water used during fire fighting should be stored until it is disposed of						

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							through the proper way.						
<b>Water Services Corporation</b>	<p>No objections from DPU.</p> <p>As mentioned in the application form, this premises is covered by a valid Public Sewer Discharge Permit</p>	Noted.		Gasparell is in process of renewing their discharge permit. Further to the inspection performed by our inspectors on 3/2/21, it transpired that there is the need for an update of their permit conditions, i.e. from a domestic discharge to a trade effluent discharge due to the oil interceptor effluent is being used as second class water for flushing. This effluent will be analysed in order to assess conformity to the requirements of the law.	Noted, Operator to provide ERA with sewer discharge permit once and if available.	Enclosed	No objections from DPU regarding this application. Public Sewer Discharge Permit has been issued on 31/5/21	Noted	–	–	No objections from our end	–	
<b>OHSA</b>	N/A	–	–	<p>a) All work activities comply with the requirements of Act XXVII of 2000 and all relevant OHS regulations;</p> <p>b) One or more persons having the necessary aptitude, capabilities, competence and training shall be designated to assist the employer in undertaking the measures which are required to be taken in relation to the protection of occupational health and safety and the prevention and control of occupational risks, as per LN 36 / 2003;</p> <p>c) ALL work activities falling under one's responsibilities are covered by a suitable, sufficient and</p>	Operator to take note.	Noted	–	–	–	OHSA finds no objection to this variation, provided the applicants abides with the comments OHSA sent to ERA earlier this year.	–	No further comments	

[illegible]



[illegible]

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
				<p>disease or condition may occur under the particular conditions of work, as per LN 36 / 2003 and other applicable OHS regulations.</p> <p>d) All work equipment complies with the relevant provisions of LN 293 / 2016, including where applicable, by ensuring that work equipment is duly examined by a competent person and a report of such examination is kept by the employer and (where applicable) also sent to OHSA and;</p> <p>Any intended construction related works comply with the relevant provisions of LN 88 / 2018</p>									
<b>EWA</b>	No feedback received	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
<b>Transport Malta</b>	No feedback received	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
<b>Radiation Protection Board</b>	N/A	–	–	No further comments from our side.	–	–	–	–	–	In reference to the Deflagration Manageme	–	Operator to take note and ensure consistency between the “deflagration	Noted and updated Deflagration Plan

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
										<p>nt Plan document supplied, in particular to 1st and 2nd paragraph sentences:</p> <p><i>“Material which could have any radioactive sources such as material originating from industries is also check to ensure that radioactive material doesn’t enter the site. All material entering the site is visually inspected and materials or parts thereof for which the site is not licenced to accept are turned away.”</i></p> <p>Regulation 118(2) of</p>		<p>SOP” and the “Measuring of radioactivity levels’ SOP. In addition the SOP for the “Measuring of radioactivity levels” needs to be amended to include a notification to the Radiation Protection Board should radioactive contamination be found.</p>	<p>Note that SOP was submitted in December 2018 and this is the first time that we are receiving communication about it i.e. 4.5 years later.</p>



Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
										<p>S.L.585.01 states:</p> <p><i>“Scrap recycling installations and operators of monitoring equipment at ports shall promptly inform the Secretariat if they suspect or have knowledge of any contaminated material or radioactive source at their facility.”</i></p> <p>This is not reflected in these sentences, since although we accept that the scrap yard does not accept, however we need to ensure that they bind themselves to notify us</p>			

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
										<p>should they encounter such radioactive material and not simply turned away. Apart from this, this document does not reflect the SOP, since it is stated that</p> <p>“ All material entering the site is visually inspected “</p> <p>This does not reflect the SOP since the SOP states (or implies) that all material entering the yard follows items 1-5 of the procedure within the SOP With regards to the SOP that was</p>			

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
										<p>previously forwarded to us, we need to see some amendments in order to reflect legal obligations.</p> <p><i>“6 If any indication of radioactivity is detected the vehicle and contents are not accepted on the premises and the driver is asked to leave immediately. Reason for refusal would also be communicated.”</i></p> <p>Once again the SOP must reflect communication between the applicant and the</p>			

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
										<p>Radiation Protection Commission . Furthermore, should radioactive material be located, the driver cannot be made to leave immediately since this will breach Class 7 transport requirements</p> <p>Unless these issues are addressed in the process, the SOP should not be considered as finalised or even approved.</p>			
Internal Consultees Feedback													
Environmental Assessment Unit	Following review of the referred documentation, we have no comments to raise from an environmental	Noted.	–	No comments	–	–	–	–	–	–	Kindly note that we have no comments from our end.	–	

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
	assessment point of view.												
<b>Biodiversity &amp; Water Unit</b>	No further comments as no discharges to water apply.	Noted.	–	No further comments	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	
<b>Air &amp; Waste Air Quality Team</b>	No feedback received	–	–	No comments	–	–	No comments from an AQ perspective.	–	–	–	From an emission inventory perspective we would like to request a description of the equipment utilised with regards to type of technology and the annual consumption of fuel per piece of equipment is included within the AER.	Fuel consumption is already catered for the annual environmental Report, however we can amend the permit to include the fuel consumption per combustion plant.  Secondly a description of the equipment is already provided in the permit. The revised AER template will accommodate the request,	Noted
<b>Air &amp; Waste Waste Management Team</b>	No feedback received	–	—	No feedback received	–	–	Kindly find below comments from the waste team on the Waste Management Plan - Reference to	Operator to take note of the following points and amend the waste	Amended	We reviewed the Waste Management Plan updated (here after referred to as WMP) and Doc	Same comment applies.	1.Operator to comment, the WMP is to provided clarity by means of a flow chart indicating the inputs and outputs and associated	WMP revised as instructed

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							<p>waste regulations (S.L.549.63) should be added to the waste management plan;</p> <p>- The first para on page 3 indicates that <i>'Material for which the facility doesn't have any permit to process is removed before storage and placed in the quarantine site'</i>. However Site Plan II does not indicate the location of this quarantine area. In this</p>	management plan accordingly.	<p>Amen ded site plan</p> <p>Amen ded</p> <p>Amen ded</p>	<p>C1.3. Below kindly find comments from our end:</p> <p>1. The WMP is to provide further details on the planned treatment for cables falling under 17 04 10* and 17 04 11. In addition, clarifications are needed on the EWC code that will be assigned to the fractions arising from the removal of the insulation of these cables.;</p> <p>2. While the WMP provides a description of activities carried out, certain EWC codes listed in Table 1 (EWC codes</p>		<p>processes with the incoming EWC and outgoing EWC codes stated</p> <p>2. It is to be noted that the outgoing waste codes 17 04 01, 17 04 05, 19 12 02 and 19 12 03 are currently permitted outgoing waste streams in IP 0004/12/B. Operator to see Reply to point 3)</p> <p>3. Operator to revise and ensure that the EWC codes listed in Table 1 are reflected in Table 2.</p> <p>4. Operator to clarify and if necessary a different code should be assigned or update mass flow diagram showing the origin of such bulky waste.</p> <p>(Link 1: <a href="#">Commission notice on technical guidance on the classification of waste</a>)</p>	

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							<p>context, kindly indicate the location of the quarantine area on the site plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the last paragraph in page 3, a reference is missing and hence is to be amended accordingly;</li> <li>- The table in page 5-6 is to be captioned. In addition, hazardous waste needs to be classified according to HP codes and not H codes, in line with Schedule 3 of the Waste</li> </ul>		<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>	<p>for incoming and outgoing waste at Gasparell Baling Facility) are not addressed in Table 2 (Details of wastes handled (incoming and outgoing) at the Gasparell Baling plant facility). For example, from AERs provided in previous years, certain metals waste streams (17 04 01, 17 04 05, 19 12 02, and 19 12 03) were also reported as outputs, however Table 2 only indicates export of 19 10 metal codes. In addition, while the</p>		<p>Link 2: <a href="#">Guidance on classification of waste according to EWC-Stat Categories</a>)</p> <p>5. Apart from the solid fraction, oil-water interceptors usually generate a more liquid fraction of oily waste prior to being separated from discharged treated water. Kindly include such EWC code and the associated information.</p>	

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regulations (SL 549.63);</li> <li>The waste description is to be included for waste classified under the EWC code 160115;</li> <li>Clarifications are needed on the fate of engine, gear, lubricating oils. The table is indicating that this waste will be reused, however the table is indicating that the material will be sent to 'Waste Oils Company Ltd',</li> </ul>		<p>Amended</p> <p>Amended</p>	<p>table is titled 'Details of wastes handled (incoming and outgoing)', only details about the outgoing waste seems to be provided (for example, ELVs under 16 01 04* are not listed, while the output from shredding of incoming waste under 19 10 is listed). In this context, Table 2 is to be amended;</p> <p>3. Doc C1.3 is requesting the inclusion of several EWC codes as outgoing. However not all of these codes have</p>			



Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							which receive and separate oil for export, and not for reuse of oil. On a general note, we would also like to point out that ‘re-use’ means <i>any operation by which products or components that are <u>not waste</u> are used again for the same purpose for which they were conceived</i> (Waste regulations, S.L. 549.63). To clarify, material that is waste cannot			been included in Table 2. In this context, Table 2 is to be amended to include the codes 13 07 03*, 16 08 01, and 19 12 11*/19 12 12; 4. In addition, clarifications are requested on waste which would be classified under 20 03 07 (bulky waste). Codes under Chapter 20 are to be applied only for waste generated from municipal sources (i.e. households, and similar commercial, industrial and institutional wastes). If this will be			

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							<p>be reused, and would need to either be recovered or disposed of;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The document is to also include a list of incoming waste streams/ EWC codes;</li> <li>- The column 'Offsite Disposal Site/ Waste Management Company' also lists countries, in addition to Offsite Disposal Sites and Waste Management Companies. For coherence, the</li> </ul>			<p>applied to waste upholstery generated from ELVs, the code 20 03 07 would not be applicable. In addition, this seem to be catered for with the EWC code 16 01 99;</p> <p>5. In Table 2, the EWC code 13 05 01* (solids from grit chambers and oil/water separators) assigned to the waste described as 'Sludge oil/water separator' does not seem to match the description, since the EWC code chosen refers to solids while the description refers to sludge. In this</p>			

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
							country of destination should be listed in a separate column from the one listing 'Offsite Disposal Site/ Waste Management Company'; and - Acronyms are to be defined (e.g. WSC should be defined).			context, an alternative code is to be provided;			
<b>Air &amp; Waste Noise</b>	The proposed variation to the current IPPC permit for Gasparell relates to the Use of wire/ cable shearer and baler together with wire/cable shredder machine. In view that from the plans it is understood that the above equipment will be housed within a store and in view that there are already ongoing operations	Noted.	–	In view that from the plans it is understood that the above equipment will be housed within a store and in view that there are already ongoing operations which generate noise, it is not being suggested that an additional noise monitoring study is carried out to assess the impact of the new addition of the above equipment.	Noted		ERA agrees with this approach in view of the past noise monitoring studies for Gasparell and the improvements made through the installation of the acoustic	Noted.		–	The attached Terms of Reference are being referred to replace those currently available in Schedule 4 of IP0004/12/B.  Update:  In line with the below-proposed change to reduce the number of	Operator to note Annex II Terms of reference for noise monitoring will be included as part of the permit.	Noted

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
	which generate noise, it is not being suggested that an additional noise monitoring study is carried out to assess the impact of the new addition of the above equipment.						panelling around the shredder. Nevertheless, if in the interim any new noisy equipment is installed and commissioned, a new noise study might need to be requested in this regard as stipulated in condition 2.2.9.4.				locations from 7 to 3, we would like to revise the 3 sites proposed in the Noise monitoring plan Doc C 3.10, if possible, to match those proposed by the consultant in the recent 2022 annual report submitted as per condition 2.2.9.4 of IP0004/12/B. In this report the consultant argues that some of the proposed monitoring points are not representative of any sensitivity or location of possible complaint vis-à-vis the site since they are located along the Hal Far Bypass and indeed he proposes 3 revised monitoring points for future noise studies. We agree with his approach and would like to revise the 3 monitoring locations as found in figure 5-55 in the attached report as these		

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
											would assess any direct impact on local residents across the valley located <a href="#">behind Gasparell site.</a>		
<b>Compliance &amp; Enforcement</b>	A clarification is needed as to why the covering page of the supporting documents all refer to Damian Whitehead as being the applicant; however this is not reflected anywhere else in the main application forms. It should be clarified with the consultant/operator accordingly as to whether MIP are involved in the project.	With reference to section A3 of the Application Form, kindly clarify and if necessary update application with details of the correct applicant.	Since the site is owned by MIP, whenever any application was submitted this was always submitted under their name. This was always the case throughout all the planning and IPPC processes. However, the applicant for the operating permit was always client.	CED has no comments on the documents submitted as part of the variation application. The Operator is to ensure that audits required by the permit is submitted without delay.	Operator to take note.	Noted	CED has no comments on the documents submitted as part of the variation application. The Operator is to ensure that audits required by the permit is submitted without delay.	–	–	–	<p><b><u>Application documents:</u></b></p> <p>There are no comments on the attached application document.</p> <p><b><u>Compliance status:</u></b></p> <p>As of the last inspection in May 2022, the site overall was achieving a good state of compliance, with some minor issues related to clear waste segregation and waste labelling. It was noted that a small part of the extension area had already been concreted with some metal waste encroaching on this new hardstanding; however the operator was informed to refrain from</p>	<p><b><u>Application documents:</u></b></p> <p>Noted</p> <p><b><u>Compliance status:</u></b></p> <p>Operator to comment</p> <p><b><u>Improvement Programme:</u></b></p> <p>Operator to comment</p> <p><b><u>Reporting:</u></b></p> <p>Operator to give update to comments in Annex II.</p> <p><b><u>Further comments/suggestions:</u></b></p> <p>Operator to comment.</p> <p><b><u>Amendment/Revision required in</u></b></p>	

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
											<p>placing metal waste in this area until the full impermeable flooring of the extension was installed with the appropriate guttering.</p> <p><u>Improvement Programme:</u></p> <p>Only IP items 14 and 16 remain to be submitted/implemented. IP 14 is enforced by REWS; but as far as the latest information we have on it goes, discussions on this are ongoing but not finalized. The deadline for IP Item 16 is two months following construction; and in view that construction has not yet been completed, this IP item is not yet due.</p> <p><u>Amendment/Revision required in</u></p>	<p><u>Section 2.2.1 Emissions to Air:</u></p> <p>MCPD form was submitted, and ELV will be updated as per previous communication.</p>	

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
											<p><u>Section 2.2.1 Emissions to Air:</u></p> <p>Emission point 1, as listed in Table 2.2.1 of the permit is the shredder plan diesel engine stack. The operator had brought to ERA's attention that the 200mg/Nm3 NOx emission limit value in Table 2.2.2 is incorrectly quoted from Table 1 of SL549.122. Table 1 makes references to 'other than engines and gas turbines'. The operator argued that Table 3 should be considered as it denotes the limits for engines and gas turbines, with a limit of 1850mg/Nm3 for engines constructed before 18 May 2006. The shredder engine is from 1984 with the tag provided by the operator as part of the emissions report.</p>		

Comment received by:	Feedback	ERA reply and comment	Operator reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator Reply	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Reply July 2021	Comment received by:	Comment received by:	ERA reply	Operator reply
TFS	No comments provided	–	–	No comments provided	–	–	Kindly note that there are no comments from a TFS perspective.	–	–	–	Kindly note that there are no comments from a TFS perspective as long as any exports of waste are in line with the requirements of Regulation (EC) 1013/2006 on shipments of waste.	–	

Annex I:

## Terms of Reference for Noise Monitoring

### 1. Introduction

The noise monitoring shall be carried out by the Operator. A consultant that is either an accredited Acoustic expert or qualified professional Engineer and is approved by ERA according to the following criteria shall be commissioned who will propose a monitoring procedure for measuring noise levels within and around the installation as described in section 2 below.

The person(s) undertaking the “on field monitoring” shall be in possession of a certification for the collection of data.

The noise monitoring and impact study report shall be compiled and reviewed by a person who is in possession of a:

- (a) Bachelors degree in Acoustics, **or**
- (b) Bachelors degree in any of the following: Physics, Architecture, Civil Engineering or Engineering, Environmental Health, Environmental Science/Management, Occupational Health and Safety, **and** an MQF Level 7 specialisation in Acoustics, **or**
- (c) Bachelors degree in any of the following: Physics, Architecture, Civil Engineering or Engineering, Environmental Health, Environmental Science/Management, Occupational Health and Safety **and** in addition the consultant must be at least an associate member of the Institute of Acoustics or be employed by an organization who are members of the Association of Noise Consultants or equivalent grade of Membership of a professional body for those working in acoustics and noise in any one of the EU member states or any other reputable professional body to the satisfaction of ERA, **or**



- (d) Certification for the collection of data, such as “Certificate of Competence in Environmental Noise Measurement” issued by the Institute of Acoustics (IoA) or any other equivalent qualification issued by a comparable Professional Association dealing with acoustics in any one of the EU and EEA Member States or any qualifications issued by an educational institution to the satisfaction of ERA **and** five (5) years experience in noise measurements and assessments.

Copies of such qualifications and certification shall be submitted to ERA prior to the monitoring proposal.

The consultant, in collaboration with ERA, may, where applicable need to consult and seek advice from the Local Council during the selection of the sensitive receptors.

## **2. Content of monitoring study**

The monitoring study should address the following issues:

1. A description of the installation – this shall include a description of all processes carried out on site and related equipment and infrastructures.
2. A description of the surrounding areas – this shall include identification of the types of activities, whether residential or commercial, roads and other amenities. These shall be location-specific taking into account their location with respect to the site.
3. Identification of the main sources of noise and vibration – this shall include all processes on site, including aspects such as transport noise on site, plant equipment, mechanical operations, etc (amongst others) and their times of operation.
4. Identification of the closest noise sensitive receptors – this shall be carried out after assessing the noise levels in the plant’s perimeter and in the other locations identified in point 2 above under normal operating conditions of the plant. The various monitoring points shall be identified with a unique code and an analyses of the ambient noise to which each monitoring point is subjected to.
5. Environmental Noise Study – this shall include details of the standards used for measurements, equipment used including calibration details and certificates, resultant measurement data, assessment methods and complaints significance scale. The study is to be carried out according to the latest revisions of ISO1996 and the rating of industrial noise affecting residential areas shall be according to the latest revisions of BS4142. The study should include perimeter noise levels, baseline noise study of sensitive receptor sites, noise impact on site sensitive receipts including day and night background levels.

The data compiled for both day and night is a typical representation of the current situation at all receptor points and the measurement time interval is sufficient enough to obtain representative value of a typical background when the specific noise source will be operating. For facilities that operate continuously for 24 hours, it may be appropriate to measure at a time when all other noises have subsided. If it is possible ‘specific noise’ is estimated by measuring the noise level with and without the facility running.

6. The monitoring shall be performed exclusively using a calibrated type 1 sound level meter conforming to BS 6698/IEC 61672 Class 1. The use of type 2 sound level meters or less is not considered acceptable and will not be considered. The sound level meter, calibrator and microphone must hold a valid current calibration certificate from an accredited laboratory (ex. UKAS)

7. Prior to the initial data collection and at the end of the monitoring day, all acoustic instrumentation system such as the sound level meters are calibrated, and checked immediately before and after each series of monitoring readings. Results must be within  $\pm 1.0$ dB, otherwise discarded and read again.

8. As a basis for the collection of background data, monitoring shall be carried out during a period when there are no operations at the facility. If this is not possible, operations are to be temporarily suppressed during readings. If this is still not possible, a measurement at an alternative location where the residual sound is comparable to the assessment location(s) with justifications shall be provided.

In case that operating conditions of the site are significantly different during the day, evening or night periods, the measurement procedure will be repeated for those periods of day/evening or night. Therefore, information from the operator is requested prior to the commencement of the measurements. If the information requested is not provided in time, the Consultants will assume that the site operates uniformly during the day, evening and night periods and measure during the daytime only. However, baseline noise levels would still need to be measured at the nearest noise sensitive locations at night in order to determine the impact.

9. The background noise measurements shall be accompanied by a critical listening of all the other noise sources present in the background. Due to certain acoustic features such as tonality, impulsivity and intermittency the inclusion of specific noise level plus any adjustment for the different noise characteristic features, the rating level,  $L_{Ar,Tr}$  should be reported in accordance with BS 4142:2014, and any revision thereof, depending on the subjective assessment made while taking the readings.

10. Monitoring shall consider seasonal variations including but not limited to the occurrence of the fireworks and any other similar typical seasonal predominant noise sources. The recommended time periods over a twenty-four hour period are categorized in terms of daytime, from 0700-2300 hrs ( $L_{Aeq,16hrs}$ ) and night-time period from 2300 – 0700 hrs ( $L_{Aeq,8hrs}$ ).

11. For the propagation of noise from the power plant, the use of ISO 9613, ISO 8297: 1994, ISO 3744:2010 and ISO 3746:2010; and any revision thereof (as per the interim methods of the Environmental Noise Directive 2002/49/EC) is strongly recommended.

12. In the case of multioperator installations where the evaluation and monitoring needs to distinguish between the impact caused by different or interconnected operators within the same installation, the application of the following standards is deemed necessary: standard ISO 8297: 1994 and any revision thereof, and ISO 37XX series or specifically ISO 9614-2:1996.

13. Impact assessment of noise events on noise sensitive receptor site – this shall include an assessment according to the guidelines BS 4142:2014, ISO 1996 and ISO 9613 or any other standard and any other standard methodology stipulated by the Authority. A summary of the data obtained after the study has been carried out in relation to the noise sensitive receptors identified above shall be submitted.

14. Conclusions and Mitigation measures – this shall include a summary report of findings from the noise monitoring study including the impact assessment of noise events on noise receptors sites and any remedial action and/or mitigation measures to be implemented by the operator in order to reduce impacts resulting from the site of operation.

