

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Encocam Ltd	PG Note:	N/A
Discussed with:	Malcom Byers	LA Reference:	B09/14
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	Date:	17/07/2014
Environmental Impact Ap	praisal		
Component 1 - Inherent Environ	mental Impact Potential		
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible Score	es Score Awarded
(A) Category 1		10	
(B) Category 2		20	20
(C) Category 3		30	
Component 2 - Progress with Up	grading		
Status of Upgrading		Possible Score	es Score Awarded
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG	Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	

(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		0
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements	-10		
Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors			
	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Medium	Low
(A) < 100m [*]	20	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m	5	3	4
(D) >500m*	θ	θ	θ

^{*} 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.

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	10	
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0
Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	25

Operator Performance Appraisal

Scale of Non-Compliance (A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit	Possi				
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit		Possible Scores		Scores Awarded	
condition or of general/residual BAT condition	0 points				
(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 p	er inciden	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 unrelinked to an incident at the process.	easonable	e or which	cannot l	be clearly	
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	l Operati	ng Levels	5		
(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)		Max 75)			
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Red					
Criterion	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded		
	Yes	No	N/A		
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	10	θ	0	
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	θ	0	0	
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	θ	5	0	0	
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	5	θ	0	
(E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site?	0	5	θ	0	
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	θ	5	0	0	
Total score	(-5 to 30) 0		0		
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				- -	
Criterion -	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	θ	0	
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	5	θ	0	
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	θ	0	
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	θ	0	
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	θ	θ	-5	
Total	(-5 to 25) -5				
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal		e -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	5
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	20

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	20
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Operator is looking at continuous monitoring the emissions from the scrubber and likely to

implement it if/when they change the bulk storage system. The idea is to take out the old bulk silos

and plug in all the IBC's to automatically replenish the stock with the only time the IBC's are

"manually" moved is when replacing the empty ones. At the moment they are individually moved.

The operator undertakes regular PH checks of the scrubber water and is changed when required.

They also have portable HF detectors which they are looking at using for the scrubber exit. The

operators have daily/weekly check sheets which have been modified to include the relevant permit

requirements. Maintenance is undertaken on the scrubber with alarms set up to show any failures.

Employees are trained on the procedures required for their functions.