

## **Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control**

PG6/02 &

Name of permitted activity: Anglo ERI Limited PG Note: PG6/33

Discussed with: Peter Moore LA Reference: B11/06

Inspector's Name: Dave Bass Date: 29/07/2010

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible S	cores	es Score Awarded	
(A) Category 1	<del>10</del>			
(B) Category 2	20		20	
(C) Category 3	30			
Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading				
Status of Upgrading	Possible Scores		Score Awarded	
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note deadline has passed	10			
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BAT Requirements	0			0
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements	-10			
Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors				
	Sensitivity of Receptors			
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Mediun	1	Low
(A) < 100m <sup>*</sup>	20	<del>12</del>		5
(B) 100 - 250m <sup>*</sup>	<del>12</del>	<del>10</del>		3
(C) 250 - 500m°	5	3		1
(D) >500m*	Đ	0		0

All distances should be multiplied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & lime processes and by a factor of 4 for combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal processes.

Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site boundary.

## **Component 4 - Other Targets**

	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a potential contributor	<del>10</del>	
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0
Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	40

**Operator Performance Appraisal** 

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment				
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possi	ble Score	es	Scores Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit condition or of general/residual BAT condition	0 points		0	
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint	5 per incident			
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action	10 per incident		t	
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident		t	
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident		t	
Total	(Max. 50)			0
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unrulinked to an incident at the process.	easonable	e or which	cannot	be clearly
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	d Operati	ng Levels	3	
(f) Failure to notify the regulator or restart or increase in level of operation to above the threshold requiring a permit at the installation in accordance with the acceptance letter	25			
Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)	(1	Max 75)		
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Re	ecords			
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores
one ion	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	<del>10</del>	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	<del>-5</del>	0	0	0
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	5	0	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	<del>5</del>	0	0
(E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?	0	5	0	0
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	0	0
Total score	(-5 to 30)		•	0
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
0 % to 1	Possible Scores		Scores	
Criterion	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	5	θ	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	5	0	0
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	0	0
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	0	0
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	<del>5</del>	0	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	-5
Total		(-5 to 25)		-5
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal		-10 to 10 (130)	)5	-5

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	20
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	20
Other Targets	0
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	35

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	35
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

## **Comments**

Complaints received regarding odour from paint booths. PM & DB witnessed odour at site boundary when 2 spraybooths were using the pre-cat although DB did not consider it offensive at that time. Brief checking of times odour noticed and product sprayed indicated that pre-cat is the likely source of odour. The filters had all been changed in both spraybooths and records were checked showing filters changed every 2-3 days. Training is undertaken by external company (Syntema) who undertake refresher training as well. Syntema also maintain spraybooths with Anglo employees changing filters/cleaning walls (records kept). Solvent reduction plan shows increase in solvent use due to more work being processed. Procedures on use of equipment available and translated if necessary. Company own EMS system which looks into reducing environmental impact.