



06/01/2014

Mr I Oakes
Natural Resources Wales
Chester Road
Buckley
Flintshire
CH7 3AJ

Dear Mr Oakes

PART B REPORT (SCHEDULE 1) – PPC PERMIT NUMBER BU 2357

Please find enclosed the information provided as a Part B report for the following Part A notification:-

Part A ref. No. 23/12/2013

Yours sincerely
FOR WARWICK CHEMICALS

MR PETER BRYANT
HEALTH SAFETY & ENVIRONMENT MANAGER

	INITIALS	DATE
OK FOR PUBLIC REGISTER	<i>JB</i>	7/1/14
COPIED TO PUBLIC REGISTER	<i>JB</i>	EDem

TITLE :	Part 'B' Report Form			ISSUE NO.	15.0
REF :	RCF20	AREA:	SITE	DATE OF ISSUE:	08.05.13
RELATED DOCUMENT:	WI 903 App C			PAGE:	2 of 2
FILENAME:	24th December 2013 Part B Form.doc			Last printed 06/01/2014 17:29:00 Created on 06/01/2014 14:34:00	



Part B Notification (schedule 1) in accordance with condition 5 (5.1.1 and 5.1.2) of PPC Permit BU 2357.

REFERENCES

Part A form, Ref. N°. 23/12/2013 submitted to the Environment Agency on 24/12/2013.

Further, more accurate information on the matters for notification under Part A.

Following a shutdown on the DAED plant and subsequent slowdown of the TAED production in Plant 5 there were a number of transfer line blockages as a result of TAED dropping out of solution. The main reason for the blockage was the reduction in transfer rate frequency and the reduction in the line wash that keeps the line clear. As a result of the blockages the lines had to be dismantled and jetted out. This activity resulted in a quantity of material being discharged to the site drainage system resulting in a lowering of the overall pH of the waste water. Sodium hydroxide solution was added to the site system to balance the pH and to bring it back within the internal limits of 5.2 and 8.5. An early test carried out on the material being held in the tank gave a high COD reading. The response to this was to dilute the tank contents with Mostyn water.

Following this dilution another hold, or pre-discharge, sample from Tank 2 gave a result of:

Solids – 85mg/l
pCOD – 5838 mg/l
pH – 5.8

All these results were within the emission consent limits so the discharge was authorised by the Plant operator.

Further investigation has shown that the monitoring equipment located in the discharge pipeline had detected that the pH was below the emission limit and had shut the discharge valve. Owing to the weather conditions at the time (heavy rain) and the plant operations (the other waste water hold tank was full) this discharge had to be completed so the decision to override the discharge valve (following the internal procedure) was made and the discharge was allowed to continue.

When the composite discharge sample was analysed the resultant pH was 4.6, below the consent limit.

Measures taken (or intended to be taken) to prevent a recurrence of the incident.

Information about this incident will be disseminated amongst the operators on each shift. Discussions are being held with regard to revising the shut-down procedure for any plant equipment and the requirement to ensure that any pipework associated with the equipment is suitably flushed or cleaned out. The revised procedure would also apply to any situation when the production rate had slowed down for any protracted period.

Measures taken (or intended to be taken) to rectify, limit or prevent any pollution of the environment or harm which has been or may be caused by the emission.

It is thought that no measurable environmental damage has occurred as a result of this incident.

Dates of unauthorised emissions from the installation in the previous 24 months.

14&15/01/2012, 6&7/08/2012, 20/09/2012, 28/11/2012, 13/01/2013, 06/05/2013, 09/10/2013, 07/11/2013.

