

**Question for written answer E-008625/2016
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Xabier Benito Ziluaga (GUE/NGL), Lola Sánchez Caldentey (GUE/NGL), Josu Juaristi Abaunz (GUE/NGL), Florent Marcellesi (Verts/ALE) and Ernest Maragall (Verts/ALE)

Subject: The Petronor (Repsol) refinery, Biscay

Written question E-0057/10 of 21 January 2010 concerned the Petronor refinery and the extension of the facility via the construction of a coke plant. The Commission answered that question on 2 March 2010.

Those living in the area are still experiencing serious problems, and they are still unable to protect themselves against the damage the plant is causing.

Reports drawn up by the Basque Country's Ombudsman in 2012 and 2014 confirm that the residents of Muskiz, Abanto, Abanto-Zierbana and the surrounding area have time and again been exposed to pollution and emissions levels that exceed the limits laid down in EU directives (2000/60/EC, 2001/80/EC and 2008/1/EC).

The Basque and Spanish governments and institutions are complicit here, as there is a 'revolving doors' relationship between them and this subsidiary of Repsol. This means it is impossible to assess emissions measurements that are labelled as emergency 'shutdowns'. In the light of the foregoing, we should like to ask once again:

1. Given that the legal proceedings that the Commission cited as a reason not to intervene at the time have now been concluded (with bizarre rulings in Petronor's favour), will the Commission be seeking to ensure compliance with environmental directives?
2. What is its view of the fact that EU financing and aid (EUR 400 million from the European Investment Bank) has been used, and yet there is a failure to comply with the legislation and people living in the vicinity of the refinery are not being protected?