United Utilities Water Limited
Haweswater House
Lingley Mere Business Park
Lingley Green Avenue
Great Sankey
Warrington WA5 3LP

Telephone: 01925 237000

unitedutilities.com

Our ref: EIR-980
Email: EIRRequests@uuplc.co.uk

Dear [redacted],

Thank you for your request for environmental information. We appreciate your interest, and we want to let you know that your request has been carefully considered in accordance with the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR). Following a review of your request we have determined which questions can be answered under EIR and which questions will be answered under the UU complaints procedure. The table below sets this out:

Questions answered under EIR	Questions answered under United Utilities complaints procedure
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	10,13,14,15

As your request contains a number of specific questions, we have restated each part of the request (in bold) and provided our response below. I have also marked those questions with 'EIR Response'.

EIR Response

1. Dry-day spills, January – May 2026
Please state the exact number of suspected dry-day storm-overflow discharges recorded on United Utilities' network between 1 January 2026 and 31 May 2026.
Please state the number clearly rather than giving a percentage, trend or general statement.

We can confirm that there were 199 dry day spills recorded on United Utilities network between 1 January 2026 and 31 May 2026.

EIR Response
2. Event-level dry-day data (EIR Response)
For every event referred to in answer 1, please provide the underlying event-level information, including:

- **name or identifier of the overflow;**
- **asset/site name;**
- **water body receiving the discharge;**
- **location and, where held, grid reference or coordinates;**
- **date;**
- **discharge start time;**
- **discharge end time;**
- **total duration;**

- **rainfall information used in determining that it was a suspected dry-day event; and**
- **the relevant EDM or monitoring data.**

If this information is already available in a dataset, please provide that dataset rather than manually reproducing it.

The relevant Event Duration Monitoring (EDM) data is attached in *Appendix 1 - Dry Day Spills Jan to May 2026*.

- **name or identifier of the overflow** – see column named 'Unique identifier'
- **asset/site name** – see column named 'Site name'
- **water body receiving the discharge** – see column named 'Water body receiving the discharge'
- **location and, where held, grid reference or coordinates** – see column named 'Discharge Location (NGR)'
- **date** – see column named 'Date of Dry Spill Day'
- **discharge start time** - see column 'Discharge start time'
- **discharge end time** – see column 'Discharge end time'
- **total duration** – see column 'Duration of discharge'
- **rainfall information used in determining that it was a suspected dry-day event** – see columns named 'Rainfall (mm)' and 'Previous Day Rainfall (mm)'
- **the relevant EDM or monitoring data –** see all columns

Each row within this dataset represents a single discharge recorded by an EDM. It shows both the start and stop time of the discharge to the nearest second. There might be multiple start and stop discharges recorded for the same overflow identifier within a 24-hour period.

When recording dry day spills, all start and stop discharges that occur at the same site on the same calendar day are treated as a single dry day overflow spill. As a result, a site may have several individual discharges recorded on a particular day, but these are classified as one dry day spill.

In *Appendix 1 – Dry Day Spills Jan to May 2026*, there are 638 rows of data, with each row representing a single discharge at one overflow with a given start and stop time. These rows have been grouped into individual dry day spills by matching the outflow identifier and the date of the spill (day, month and year). This is why the dataset contains 638 individual records, and 199 dry day spills have been reported as per the response to question 1. This approach is in line and consistent with the Environment Agency's approved guidance to reporting spills.

EIR Response
3. Regulatory outcome of the 2026 dry-day events
Of the events identified in answer 1, please state separately how many have been:
a. investigated;
b. confirmed as pollution incidents;
c. confirmed as environmental permit breaches;
d. determined to be legitimate catchment drain-down following previous rainfall;
e. attributed to faulty or inaccurate monitoring equipment;
f. otherwise discounted, together with the reason; and
g. not yet determined.
The totals should reconcile with the figure supplied in answer 1.

a. 186 of the 199 spills recorded and set out above have been investigated and we have determined the date, time duration and root cause of the spill. 13 of the 199 events listed have had the date and time duration determined. These 13 are still under investigation to determine the root cause of the spill.

b. Dry day spills are currently classified separately from pollution incidents, so none of the 199 spills are categorised as pollution incidents. This is in line with the Environment Agency's guidance on dry day spills. The Environment Agency have stated its ambition to classify dry day spills as pollution incidents, but that reporting requirement is yet to be introduced.

c. None of the 199 spills recorded are categorised as environmental permit breaches. Environmental permit breaches are classified as failing works, pollution incidents and CAR forms with CCS1 and CCS2 classifications. Therefore, dry day spills currently do not classify as environmental permit breaches. Please see our response to question 17 for further detail on events that are classed as environmental permit breaches.

d. 40 of the 199 dry day spills recorded can be attributed to extended drain-down following previous rainfall.

e. 6 of the 199 dry day spills recorded can be attributed to faulty or inaccurate monitoring equipment.

f. None of the 199 dry day spills recorded have been discounted and all have been reported to the Environment Agency.

g. 13 of the 199 dry day spills recorded are still under investigation to determine the root cause of the spill.

EIR Response
4. Reporting to the Environment Agency
Please state when each suspected dry-day event identified in answer 1 was notified or otherwise made available to the Environment Agency, and identify any events that were not reported to the Environment Agency together with the reason why.

This data can be found in the column named 'Date reported to the EA' in *Appendix 1 - Dry Day Spills Jan to May 2026*. All 199 dry day spills have been reported to the Environment Agency.

EIR Response
5. United Utilities' final 2025 dry-day figure
Please state United Utilities' final confirmed total number of suspected dry-day storm-overflow discharges during calendar year 2025.
Please distinguish between:
a. suspected dry-day events identified by monitoring;
b. events subsequently confirmed as pollution incidents; and
c. events determined to constitute permit breaches.

During calendar year 2025 the final confirmed number of suspected dry day spills was 1,216. In answer to your specific sub-questions:

a. *Appendix 2 - Dry Day Spills 2025* reports this data and identifies all dry-day spills.
b. As set out in the response to question 3 (b) above, when following the Environment Agency guidance dry day spills are not classified as pollution incidents.

c. Dry day spills are not categorised as environmental permit breaches. Please see the response to question 3 (c) and question 17 for further information on this.

EIR Response
6. Previously reported figure of 1,216
Previous media reporting has attributed a figure of 1,216 suspected or unlawful dry-day spills during 2025 to United Utilities.
Please confirm whether 1,216 is or was a figure contained in United Utilities, Environment Agency or other regulatory data.
If it is not United Utilities' final figure, please explain precisely what that figure represented and why it differs from the final figure supplied in answer 5.

As outlined above in our response to question 5, we can confirm that this number is correct.

EIR Response
7. 2025 storm-overflow totals
Please confirm whether the Environment Agency 2025 EDM figures of:

- **60,843 spills;**
- **327,453 total hours of discharge;**
- **2,270 monitored overflows; and**
- **26.8 average spills per overflow**

are correct for United Utilities.
If United Utilities disputes any of those figures, please provide the corrected figures and supporting evidence.

We confirm that the above figures quoted are correct for United Utilities.

EIR Response
8. Highest number of spills in England
Please explain why United Utilities recorded the highest absolute number of storm-overflow spills of any English water and sewerage company in the Environment Agency's 2025 annual return, despite years of customer charges, regulatory commitments and investment programmes intended to improve wastewater infrastructure.
Please provide a substantive operational explanation rather than simply stating that rainfall varies geographically.

The specific reasons why United Utilities currently records relatively high absolute numbers of storm-overflow spills, are set out in detail within the document "UUW64R Wastewater (Quality - Overflows) Enhancement". This is a detailed technical submission that we made to Ofwat as part of the last price review (PR24) and is published on our website at this location:

https://www.unitedutilities.com/globalassets/z_corporate-site/pr24/supplementary-documents/uuw64r.pdf

This document sets out the details and technical support for the programme of work that we were proposing to enhance the performance of our storm overflows, for the 2025 to 2030 (AMP8) period and explains why UUW requires, and is now delivering, a significantly larger enhancement programme in that five-year period than the other water companies. This document demonstrates that the different spill levels that each company currently experiences have been driven by two main factors:

1) The impact of the historic regulatory frameworks, and

2) The combined impact of the local rainfall levels and the nature of the local sewerage systems.

In summary, the historic legislation and regulatory framework that has been used to facilitate previous enhancement programmes for storm overflows, has focused on cost-beneficial reductions in environmental harm, rather than on reductions in spill frequency. And although UUW has been compliant with these previous regulatory frameworks, and this work has prevented environmental harm from storm overflows, it has not resulted in a significant reduction in total spill frequency.

In addition, the document also sets out in detail why the higher-than-average rainfall in the Northwest has such a significant impact on storm volume and how this is further compounded by the Northwest having the largest proportion of combined sewers (combined sewers are sewers, which convey both rainfall and wastewater). The document also demonstrates why we would expect the application of those same rules in different regions to have yielded the differences in spill frequency that can be observed between the different companies and why it is reasonable to expect that the Northwest would currently have the highest number of storm overflow discharges.

Please note that the Environment Act and the Government's Storm Overflow discharge Reduction Plan (SODRP) have now changed these regulatory standards, so that the standards and our current programmes of work, also focus on spill frequency, in addition to potential environmental harm. With it also worth noting that the conclusions about different spill frequencies and investment requirements, between companies, was also highlighted within the independent work of the Storm Overflow Evidence Project that was undertaken by Defra to help it to consider the options, costs and benefits for reducing storm sewage discharges, as part of the development of the SODRP.

EIR Response
9. 2024 Environment Agency pollution performance
Please explain the reasons for United Utilities recording 347 sewerage pollution incidents in 2024, resulting in a red Environmental Performance Assessment status for that metric and an overall 2-star "requires improvement" environmental rating.
Please identify what failed operationally and what corrective action was taken.

As outlined in our Annual Performance Report (APR), There are three main factors which explain the increase in pollution incidents that we experienced in 2024, each of these is set out below.

Impact of severe weather
Severe weather can cause assets to become overloaded and unable to cope with the volume of storm water that they are processing resulting in pollution incidents and the wet and windy weather seen in 2024 was a major factor in the number of incidents that were reported. At times in the year rainfall was intense in the North West with some of the wettest on record with several months recording 200%of average monthly rainfall. Through the year there were nine Met Office named storm events (a weather event that is expected to cause significant disruption or damage), three more than in 2021 and 2022 and we saw a spike in pollution incidents associated with these named and significant storms.

Power outages
We are increasingly seeing poor energy resilience impacting on the performance of our assets, with power outages materially increasing the risk of pollution incidents. In 2024, around one third of all our pollution incidents were caused by or linked to power outages. Severe weather

can also cause disruptions to power supply either through intermittent interruptions or total loss of supply to our assets. This is particularly a problem in rural areas of Cumbria and Cheshire that are served by overhead power cables which are suspectable to storm damage. Damage and flooding from storm events can also restrict safe access to assets, limiting our ability to prevent or reduce the impact of an incident until it is safe to do so. In the past these types of incidents were considered beyond the control of wastewater companies and therefore excluded from the total number of pollution (when confirmed with the Environment Agency). However, from 2024 these incidents are included and have therefore contributed to the increase in pollution incidents.

Situational awareness
Situational awareness has significantly increased through complete monitoring of storm overflows and the progressive installation of new technology for accurate flow and network monitoring, meaning even the shortest duration, low impact incidents being detected and reported. This is reflected in the level of self-reporting of pollutions at 93 per cent self-reported and one of the highest self-reporting levels in the industry.

We have been publishing details of our ongoing plans to tackle these issues and reduce pollution since 2020. Details of these plans can be found at the following location:

United Utilities - Reducing pollution

10. Ofwat pollution performance and £25.126 million underperformance payment
Please explain why United Utilities' pollution performance was recorded by Ofwat at 44.87 incidents per 10,000 km of sewer against a performance commitment of 19.50.
Please also explain the circumstances giving rise to Ofwat's final £25.126 million pollution-incidents underperformance payment and state what consequences this has for United Utilities and its shareholders.
Please confirm specifically whether any part of that underperformance cost can be recovered directly or indirectly from customers through current or future bills.

As confirmed in our opening paragraph this question falls under the United Utilities standard complaints procedure and not EIR. Please refer to the document *responses to 10.13.14.15* for a response to this question.

EIR Response
11. 2025 pollution incidents
United Utilities' Pollution Incident Reduction Plan 2026 reported 311 category 1–3 pollution incidents for 2025, based upon data extracted on 15 January 2026 and subject to reconciliation. Please provide the current final reconciled 2025 figure, including a breakdown by:
a. category 1;
b. category 2;
c. category 3;
d. asset type;
e. cause; and
f. whether self-reported by United Utilities or first reported by a third party.
Please explain any difference between the final figure and the provisional figure of 311.

Following final reconciliation of the figures, United Utilities reported 389 category 1-3 pollution incidents in 2025. 331 of these incidents were associated with our Wastewater assets and 58

with our Water assets.

The table below show the breakdown of these incidents by category:

Category 1 incidents	0
Category 2 incidents	2
Category 3 incidents	387
	389

The following table then provides a summary of the asset types associated with the pollution incident totals.

Wastewater	331	Foul sewers	72
		Combined Sewer overflows (CSOs)	21
		Rising mains	18
		Wastewater pumping stations	113
		Storm Tanks (Treatment works)	107
		Service water sewers	0
		Storm Tanks (Network)	0
Water	58	Water distribution network	52
		Water treatment works	6
	389		**389**

The root causes associated with the pollution incident totals are then shown below:

Deterioration of Asset	118
Power Failure - third party	55
Sewer misuse (Fats, Oils, Rags)	59
Weather/Increased demand	43
Electrical failure	56
Mechanical failure	31
Soft blockage/silt	17
Defect	0
Tree roots	6
Generator failure	2
Third party damage	2
	389

Finally, we can confirm that 93% of these incidents were self-reported by United Utilities.

EIR Response

12. Current Ofwat enforcement investigation

Please provide United Utilities' current position regarding Ofwat's open enforcement investigation into the management of its sewage treatment works and sewerage network. Without asking you to disclose legally privileged material, please state:

a. what information Ofwat has required from United Utilities;

b. what alleged or potential areas of non-compliance remain under investigation;

c. what remedial steps United Utilities has taken as a direct result of that investigation; and
d. whether United Utilities has made any financial provision for potential enforcement consequences.

The Ofwat enforcement investigation is currently still open and subject to legal privilege. The confidentiality of this investigation is required by law, and as such we are unable to disclose any information relating to this; including that of the requests being made by the Regulator and financial provision. This approach is in line with Regulation 12(5)(d) of the EIR which states that a public authority may refuse to disclose information to the extent that its disclosure would adversely affect the confidentiality of the proceedings of that or any other public authority where such confidentiality is provided by law.

13. Ofwat's PR24 findings and base expenditure
Ofwat's PR24 final determination records United Utilities as stating that it would "not deliver any permanent performance improvement from base expenditure across the 2025–30 period", with initial short-term interventions subsequently being replaced by permanent benefits from enhancement schemes.
Please explain in plain English:
a. why ordinary/base expenditure was not expected to deliver permanent improvement in storm-overflow performance;
b. what the "short term interventions" are;
c. when each temporary intervention is expected to cease;
d. what permanent enhancement replaces each intervention;
e. the cost of those enhancement schemes; and
f. the expected reduction in spill numbers and durations attributable to them.

As confirmed in our opening paragraph this question falls under the United Utilities standard complaints procedure and not EIR. Please refer to the attached document *responses to 10.13.14.15* for a response to this question.

14. Performance commitment of 26.35 spills per overflow
Ofwat set United Utilities a 2025–26 performance commitment level of 26.35 average spills per overflow.
Please explain what United Utilities considers to be an environmentally acceptable long-term average number of storm-overflow spills per overflow.
If United Utilities considers 26.35 acceptable other than as an interim regulatory performance level, please explain the environmental basis for that position.
If it does not consider 26.35 acceptable in the long term, please provide the annual trajectory by which this figure will be reduced through to 2030.

As confirmed in our opening paragraph this question falls under the United Utilities standard complaints procedure and not EIR. Please refer to the attached document *responses to 10.13.14.15* for a response to this question.

15. Expenditure and measurable outcomes
Please provide, for the 2025–30 investment period:
a. total expenditure specifically allocated to reducing storm-overflow operation;
b. total expenditure specifically allocated to reducing pollution incidents;
c. the amount funded through base expenditure;
d. the amount funded through enhancement expenditure;

e. the amount ultimately funded through customer bills;
f. the anticipated reduction in the number of spills;
g. the anticipated reduction in total spill duration; and
h. the anticipated reduction in dry-day pollution incidents.
I require measurable outputs rather than simply an overall headline investment figure.

As confirmed in our opening paragraph this question falls under the United Utilities standard complaints procedure and not EIR. Please refer to the attached document *responses to 10.13.14.15* for a response to this question.

EIR Response
16. Position affecting my local area
As my supply address is:
37 Norfolk St, Wigan, WN6 7BH
please identify the wastewater treatment works, pumping stations, storm overflows and principal receiving water bodies serving or materially affecting my local sewerage catchment.
For those relevant storm overflows, please provide their individual 2024 and 2025 spill counts and total spill durations, together with any suspected dry-day events during 2025 and 2026 to date. Where available, please also identify planned improvement works, their anticipated completion dates and the expected reduction in spill frequency.

Appendix 3 - Local Wastewater Sites shows the Wastewater sites operated by United Utilities within your local sewerage catchment and the corresponding waterbody they discharge in to.

This data also highlights which of these sites has a capital scheme taking place in AMP8, which is the period 2025 to 2030. All these environmental improvement schemes are outlined in the Water Industry National Environment Programme (WINEP). The WINEP is developed jointly by the Environment Agency and Natural England and translated into a programme of work for water companies to deliver within the AMP. For each scheme, the table shows the corresponding WINEP ID, the primary environmental driver code, a brief description of the driver code requirement and anticipated delivery date.

Please note anything with an associated 'EnvAct_INV' code is an investigation to determine what future schemes we would need to undertake, and anything with an 'EnvAct_IMP' code is an improvement scheme. Those with an 'EnvAct_IMP4' have a specified target to reduce storm overflows spills so that they do not discharge above an average of 10 rainfall events per year by 2050.

We provided the 2024 and 2025 spill counts and total spill durations linked to these assets as part of our response to your previous request (EIR-911) which was sent to you on 14 August 2026 at 16:14. Please refer to this data in answer to this question. Please see our response to questions 1, 2, and 5 for additional information on dry day spills. The underlying data for this can also be found in *Appendix 1 - Dry Day Spills Jan to May 2026* and *Appendix 2 - Dry Day Spills 2025*. This data runs from January 2025 to May 2026.

For further information on spill frequency for the above assets please refer directly to the Water UK National Storm Overflow Plan Dashboard here: Microsoft Power BI. This dashboard will allow you to filter to your area and identify the planned works and improvements for each asset listed, and all others across United Utilities region.

EIR Response

17. Compliance and permit breaches

Please state the total number of confirmed environmental permit breaches relating to United Utilities wastewater assets during 2024, 2025 and 2026 to date, broken down by year and asset type.

Please identify separately how many arose from storm overflows and how many involved operation during dry weather.

We classify environmental permit breaches as Wastewater Treatment works (WwTW) that have failed to meet their legal, environmental or operational performance standards. These are known in the water industry as 'failing works'.

We also include CAR forms, that have been received from the Environment Agency with a Compliance Classification score (CCS) of C1 or C2, as environmental permit breaches. These indicate where the Environment Agency inspection has identified a potential non-compliance which could have either a "major" or "significant" environmental effect.

Year	Failing works	CAR Forms - CCS Cat 1	CAR Forms - CCS Cat 2
2024	7	0	0
2025	7	0	39
2026 to date	1	0	5

Typically, Pollution incidents (Category 1-3) are also classified as environmental permit breaches. The table below shows the asset type attributed to the Category 1-3 totals for each year.

		2024	2025	2026 to date	Asset types
Wastewater	Network	102	161	200	Sewers, rising mains, CSOs, Pumping stations, Network storm tanks
	Process	245	170	121	WwTWs storm tanks (and pumping stations)
Water	Network	25	52	61	Water distribution network
	Process	5	6	15	Water treatment works
		377	**389**	**397**	

EIR Response

18. Enforcement action

Please identify all Environment Agency enforcement action arising from wastewater pollution incidents or permit breaches during 2024, 2025 and 2026 to date, including:

a. prosecutions;

b. cautions;

c. enforcement undertakings;

d. civil penalties;

e. formal warnings; and

f. other regulatory action.

Please state the amount of any financial penalty, undertaking or payment and the incident to which it related.
For wastewater pollution incidents or permit breaches occurring during 2024, 2025 and 2026 to date:

a. We have received no prosecutions from the Environment Agency (EA).
b. We have received no cautions from the Environment Agency (EA).
c. There are no enforcement undertakings occurring.
d. We have received no civil penalties from the Environment Agency (EA).
e. The number of formal warnings received by United Utilities over the 2024 to 2026 period is shown in the table below. These include warning letters and site warning CAR forms, sent by the Environment Agency.

Year	Warning letters	Site warning CAR forms
2024	101	209
2025	161	294
2026 to date	126	28

f. All relevant regulatory action is covered by the various topics outlined in sections 'a' to 'e' above.

EIR Response
19. Data quality and monitoring
Please state how many United Utilities storm-overflow EDM monitors during 2025 and 2026 to date:
a. achieved at least 90% operability;
b. achieved less than 90% operability;
c. recorded no usable data;
d. were known to have produced inaccurate or questionable readings; and
e. required retrospective correction of submitted data.
Please explain the quality-assurance process used before EDM and dry-day information is submitted to the Environment Agency.

United Utilities operated 2,270 EDM sites during 2025 and 2,268 in 2026. Please see below for a table summary of operability statistics in answer to your questions.

	2025	2026
Total sites	2,270	2,268
Achieved at least 90% operability	2,076	2,185
Achieved less than 90% operability	194	83
Recorded no usable data	0	0
Number of EDMs producing inaccurate readings	0	0
Retrospective correction of submitted data	0	0

We have a quality assurance process in place before any submissions are made to the Environment Agency. The following steps that we follow are listed below:

1. Data is downloaded from our regulatory data system. This is in line with Environment Agency requirements.
2. Spill data is reviewed by our Data and Analytics team before being sent to and reviewed by our operational teams on site.
3. The data is then shared with relevant stakeholders within United Utilities for further quality assurance checks and any commentary.
4. The data is then reviewed and signed.
5. The data is then sent to our regulators in line with the Environment Agency's deadline.

The above processes are internally and externally assured.

EIR Response
20. Accountability
Given the pollution performance described above, please state what financial consequences have been imposed upon United Utilities' executive directors and senior management specifically as a consequence of wastewater pollution and storm-overflow underperformance during 2024 and 2025.
Please identify any relevant reduction, withholding or clawback of bonuses or other variable remuneration.

As a publicly listed company, we publish an Annual Report on our website every year – these can be found here Annual reports | United Utilities - Corporate.

This document (starting on p146 for the 2024-25 report) includes full details of executive remuneration. It also explains the performance measures used in calculating bonuses, which comprise of:

- **Basket of customer and environmental measures** - this comprises operational, service, resilience and environmental measures to capture the delivery of performance for customers and the environment. Customer priorities are reflected in the measures selected, to ensure that customers will benefit from improvements in key performance areas of importance to them, and from long-term reliability in the quality of their water supplies, and ways of working that protect and improve the environment.
- **Return on Regulated Equity (RoRE)** - RoRE is the return that the company is expected to earn relative to the equity portion of its Regulatory Capital Value. It is important to note that this value includes the impact of any rewards (or penalties) for good (or poor) performance by the company in delivering its services to customers and the environment.

Ofwat also assesses executive bonuses by examining whether performance-related pay (PRP) is genuinely linked to environmental performance, customer service, and financial resilience. Since 2025, new rules enabled by the Water (Special Measures) Act 2025 allows Ofwat to prohibit bonuses if companies fail certain environmental standards, commit serious pollution incidents, or breach statutory duties. This ensures that customers do not fund bonuses for poor performance.

Ofwat publishes its annual assessment of how companies have complied with its Performance related executive pay (PRP) Prohibition Rule and met its broader expectations on its website. The 2024/25 assessment can be found here: Performance-related-executive-pay-–-2024-25-assessment.pdf.

As can be seen from this report, in 2024/25 six water companies (including United Utilities)

triggered the PRP Prohibition Rule.

As a result of Ofwat's ruling, our Remuneration Committee reviewed its application (as set out in the Annual Report) and concluded that the executive directors' annual bonuses (which they would otherwise have been due to receive in relation to 2024/25) would **not** be paid. Following this, we issued a further update to our 2024/25 executive remuneration, including a revised single figure table covering the executive directors on our website here: 2024-25-remuneration-update.

We hope that this response answers your request. However, if you're not satisfied with how we've handled it, you can request an internal review. To do this, please write to us at Environmental Information Office, Haweswater House, Lingley Mere, Warrington, WA5 3LP or email us at EIRRequests@uuplc.co.uk, addressing your request to [redacted], and explaining why you're unhappy with our response. We'll be very happy to review your request and ensure we've done everything we can to assist you.

Any request for an internal review should be made within 40 working days of receipt of this response, and we will reply within 40 working days from receipt of the request for internal review.

Many thanks,

[redacted]
Environmental Information Office

We'd love to hear your feedback on how we handled your request! If you have a moment, please complete our short survey here – your input helps us improve our service.