

# FICHTNER



Consulting Engineers Limited



## Northacre Renewable Energy Limited

Environmental risk assessment

## Document approval

	Name	Signature	Position	Date
Prepared by:	James Bernays		Project Engineer	15/07/2020
Checked by:	James Sturman		Lead Consultant	22/07/2020

## Document revision record

Revision no	Date	Details of revisions	Prepared by	Checked by
0	22/07/2020	First draft for client issue	JB2	JRS

© 2020 Fichtner Consulting Engineers. All rights reserved.

This document and its accompanying documents contain information which is confidential and is intended only for the use of Northacre Renewable Energy Limited. If you are not one of the intended recipients any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken in reliance on the contents of the information is strictly prohibited.

Unless expressly agreed, any reproduction of material from this document must be requested and authorised in writing from Fichtner Consulting Engineers. Authorised reproduction of material must include all copyright and proprietary notices in the same form and manner as the original and must not be modified in any way. Acknowledgement of the source of the material must also be included in all references.

# Contents

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	The risk assessment process .....	4
1.2	Step 1 – Identify risks .....	4
1.3	Step 2 – Assess the risk .....	4
1.4	Step 3 – Justify appropriate measures.....	5
1.5	Step 4 – Present the assessment .....	5
2	Table A1: Odour risk assessment and management plan .....	6
3	Table A2: Noise risk assessment and management plan .....	8
4	Table A3: Fugitive emissions risk assessment and management plan.....	10
5	Table A4: Accidents risk assessment and management plan.....	15
6	Detailed assessment.....	21
6.1	Emissions to air .....	21
6.2	Habitats assessment .....	21
6.3	Emissions to water and sewer .....	22
6.4	Noise .....	22
6.5	Visual impact.....	22
6.6	Odour .....	22
6.7	Photochemical Ozone Creation .....	22
6.8	Global warming.....	23
6.9	Disposal of waste .....	23
7	Assessment of Dioxins and Dioxin-like PCBs .....	24
7.1	Introduction .....	24
7.2	Background .....	24
7.2.1	Derivation of new TWI.....	24
7.2.2	Applicability of new TWI.....	24
7.3	Assessment against TWI.....	25
7.3.1	Assessment methodology.....	25
7.3.2	Results – at the point of maximum impact .....	26
7.3.3	Results – maximum impact at a receptor.....	26
7.3.4	Summary.....	27
8	Conclusions.....	28
	Appendices .....	29
A	H1 assessment tool .....	30

# 1 Introduction

Northacre Renewable Energy Limited (NRE) are proposing to build the Northacre Renewable Energy facility (the Facility) on land off Stephenson Road, Westbury, Wiltshire.

The aim of this report is to assess the environmental risks associated with the activities undertaken at the Facility and demonstrate that the necessary measures are in place to protect the environment and ensure that the operation of the Facility, throughout its life, will not pose an unacceptable risk to the environment.

This report will:

1. identify potential risks that the activity may present to the environment;
2. screen out those that are insignificant and don't require detailed assessment;
3. identify potentially significant risks, where appropriate;
4. choose the right control measures, where appropriate; and
5. report the findings of the assessment.

This document has been developed to consider the requirements of Environment Agency Guidance Notes H1 Annexes A, C, H and F. While it is acknowledged that these guidance documents have been withdrawn, it is understood that the requirements of the guidance are still applicable under Environment Agency Guidance '*Risk assessments for specific activities: environmental permits*', which replaced H1 and H2 with alternate guidance in February 2016.

## 1.1 The risk assessment process

This assessment has been developed in accordance with the Environment Agency Guidance titled '*Risk assessments for your environmental permit*'. This guidance promotes a number of steps for undertaking the risk assessments. The following four steps are considered to be key for appropriately assessing the environmental risks associated with the operation of the Facility:

1. identify risks from the activity;
2. assess the risks and check that they are acceptable;
3. justify appropriate measures to control the risks; and
4. present the assessment.

## 1.2 Step 1 – Identify risks

The following report will identify the activities that present different types of risk to the environment associated with the operation of the Installation, including:

1. odour;
2. noise;
3. fugitive emissions; and
4. accidents.

## 1.3 Step 2 – Assess the risk

The report will include an assessment of risks associated with the operation of the Installation, and will identify the:

1. hazard;

2. receptor; and
3. pathway.

## 1.4 Step 3 – Justify appropriate measures

This report will demonstrate that the risks associated with the operation of the Installation have been considered, and identify the control measures which will be in place to demonstrate that the risks are being appropriately managed.

## 1.5 Step 4 – Present the assessment

The assessment will conclude by presenting the following:

- a. possibility of exposure;
- b. consequence; and
- c. the overall risk.

The report will present the Overall Risk applying the Environment Agency's H1 criteria, defined as:

- a. insignificant;
- b. not significant; and
- c. significant.

## 2 Table A1: Odour risk assessment and management plan

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
Hazard	Receptor	Pathway	Risk management	Possibility of exposure	Consequence	What is the overall risk?
What has the potential to cause harm?	What is at risk? What do I wish to protect?	How can the hazard get to the receptor?	What measures will you take to reduce the risk? If it occurs who is responsible for what?	How likely is this contact?	What is the harm that can be caused?	What is the risk that still remains? The balance and probability and consequence.
Odorous emissions may occur during the delivery of waste, reception of waste and the storage and handling of waste prior to processing in the Facility.	The nearest residential properties are two dwellings on Brook Lane to the east, Brook Farm and Orchard House to the south west, and a small number of semi-detached houses on Storridge Road to the northeast.	Air - Winds generally blow from a south westerly direction.	All wastes received at the Facility will be unloaded inside an enclosed waste reception hall. The waste bunker area will be retained at negative pressure. Air from waste bunker area will be combusted within the Facility, as detailed in the supporting information. Replacement air to the bunker area will be taken from the reception hall to minimize the odorous emissions and to retain negative pressure as far as reasonably possible.	Minimal	Odour annoyance. This will have more impact in the summer, when temperatures are higher and people are outdoors.	Not significant if managed well.

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
Odorous emissions may occur during periods of shutdown.	The nearest residential properties are two dwellings on Brook Lane to the east, Brook Farm and Orchard House to the south west, and a small number of semi-detached houses on Storridge Road to the north-east.	Air - Winds generally blow from a south westerly direction.	Measures will be in place to minimise odorous emissions during periods of shutdown, as part of the Environmental Management System (EMS) for the Facility. Doors to the waste reception hall will be kept shut. Regular olfactory checks will be undertaken. An odour abatement system utilising carbon filters will be used to extract potentially odorous air from waste storage areas during periods of shutdown.	Low	Odour annoyance, which will have greater impact in the summer when temperatures are higher and people are outdoors and more likely to be exposed to odour.	Not significant if managed well.

### 3 Table A2: Noise risk assessment and management plan

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
Hazard	Receptor	Pathway	Risk management	Possibility of exposure	Consequence	What is the overall risk?
What has the potential to cause harm?	What is at risk? What do I wish to protect?	How can the hazard get to the receptor?	What measures will you take to reduce the risk? If it occurs who is responsible for what?	How likely is this contact?	What is the harm that can be caused?	What is the risk that still remains? The balance and probability and consequence.
Noise from plant items such as the waste treatment processes, heat recovery boiler, exhaust air fans, stack exhaust, steam turbine, cooling condensers and noise radiation from the building envelope itself, etc.	Immediate area. The nearest residential receptor to the Facility is located approximately 75 m from the Installation Boundary.	Sound propagation through air and the ground.	Noisy plant items, where practicable, will be installed inside buildings rather than outside and, where appropriate, they will be fitted with noise insulation. The Facility will be designed to reduce noise and tonal components. Regular maintenance of plant items will be undertaken. Roads will be maintained to minimise rattle of loads during transport of materials.	Minimal	Annoyance.	Not significant. Refer to Appendix C – Noise Assessment for further information on the impact of noise from the operation of the Facility.
Noise from vehicle movements.	Immediate area. The nearest residential receptor to the Facility is located approximately	Sound propagation through air and the ground.	The majority of waste deliveries to the Facility will be via road during set delivery hours. This will	Minimal.	Annoyance.	Not significant. Refer to Appendix C – Noise Assessment for further



What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?		Managing the risk	Assessing the risk	
	75 m from the Installation Boundary.	minimise the impacts of noise associated with the delivery of waste to the Facility.		information on the impact of noise from the operation of the Facility.

## 4 Table A3: Fugitive emissions risk assessment and management plan

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
Hazard	Receptor	Pathway	Risk management	Possibility of exposure	Consequence	What is the overall risk?
What has the potential to cause harm?	What is at risk? What do I wish to protect?	How can the hazard get to the receptor?	What measures will you take to reduce the risk? If it occurs who is responsible for what?	How likely is this contact?	What is the harm that can be caused?	What is the risk that still remains? The balance and probability and consequence.
Emission releases from the main building when opening and closing doors.	Immediate area – air	Air, surface runoff, direct contact.	All waste handling activities will be undertaken within enclosed buildings. The waste bunker area will be held under negative pressure.	Low	Nuisance, dust on clothing and cars.	Insignificant
Spillage of waste during delivery and offloading.	Immediate area – air, land, water	Air, surface runoff.	All waste unloading activities will be undertaken within enclosed buildings. The waste bunker area will be held under negative pressure. Spillages would be cleaned up in accordance with documented management systems for the Facility. Waste unloading areas will have contained drainage to minimise the risk	Low	Nuisance, dust and litter.	Insignificant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			of emissions of contaminated water.			
Dust from waste deliveries being blown off-site.	Immediate area – air, land.	Air, surface runoff.	All waste unloading activities will be undertaken within enclosed buildings. The waste bunker area will be held under negative pressure. Good housekeeping will be employed to minimise the build-up of dust.	Low.	Nuisance and dust.	Insignificant.
Bottom ash discharge from the Facility.	Immediate area – air.	Air, surface runoff, direct contact.	Once removed from the combustion chamber by the bottom ash extractors, the bottom ash is then discharged to an ash quench system, prior to storage in a bottom ash storage area. The ash quench will minimise the potential of fugitive dust emissions from all ash handling activities. All ash handling activities will be undertaken in enclosed areas with contained drainage.	Low.	Nuisance.	Insignificant.
Reagent and chemical discharges when filling silos.	Immediate area – air	Air, surface runoff, direct contact.	Reagents will be delivered in sealed tankers and off-loaded via a standard hose connection. Air displaced	Low	Nuisance	Insignificant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			<p>from the silo will be discharged through fabric filters on the top of the silo in the case of solid reagents. Regular inspections and maintenance will be undertaken of abatement equipment.</p> <p>Unloading activities will only be undertaken in areas of hardstanding with contained drainage.</p>			
Discharge of Air Pollution Control residues (APCr) when emptying the APCr silo.	Immediate area– air, land	Air, surface runoff, direct contact.	When unloading the APCr silo, the displaced air from the tanker will be recirculated into the silo to prevent releases into the atmosphere. A fabric filter will minimise the risk of fugitive emissions of dust.	Low	Nuisance, release of hazardous dust	Insignificant
Lime leak during injection into APC system.	Immediate area – air	Air, surface runoff, direct contact.	Systems will be enclosed, and regular inspections and maintenance will be carried out. Lime will be injected via a completely enclosed dosing and conveying system. Process areas will have contained drainage.	Low	Nuisance	Insignificant
Spillage of APCr when capping or	Immediate area –air, land	Air, surface runoff, direct contact.	Enclosed system. Kept under suction by the ID fan. The	Low	Nuisance, release of hazardous dust	Insignificant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
changing filter bags.			fabric filter will have a number of cells. When capping or changing bags, the relevant cell will be shut down for a sufficient time to enable the dust to settle.			
Spillage/leak of liquid chemicals when tanker off-loading.	Immediate area – air, land	Air, direct contact.	Deliveries will be from sealed tankers and off-loaded via a hose. Spillage will be prevented by good operating procedures, high tank level alarm/trips etc. Tanks will be located within suitably designed secondary containment. Unloading of liquid chemicals will be undertaken on areas of contained drainage in order to prevent the release of contaminated effluent off-site through any spillages.	Low	Liquid or vapour release	Insignificant
Spillage/leak when unloading from delivery vehicles and chemical containers (IBCs, FIBCs, drums etc).	Immediate area – air, land	Air, direct contact.	Deliveries will be from road vehicles and off-loaded via mobile plant. Potential leaks/spills will be prevented by experienced mobile equipment operators undertaking unloading activities. Unloading activities will only be	Low	Hazardous liquid or vapour release	Insignificant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			undertaken in areas of hard standing with contained drainage. Chemical containers will be stored within suitably designed secondary containment.			
Release off-site of litter.	Immediate area – air, land.	Air, direct contact.	Loading/unloading of all waste vehicles will be within enclosed building.	Low.	Nuisance, dust on cars and road.	Insignificant.
Release of dusts from the transfer off-site of bottom ash.	Immediate area – air, land.	Air, direct contact.	Loading of bottom ash into vehicles will be undertaken within enclosed building. Bottom ash will be transferred off-site in covered road vehicles. The bottom ash will be maintained dust-free by quenching.	Low.	Nuisance, dust on cars and road.	Insignificant.
Re-suspension of dust from road surface when site vehicles arrive/leave.	Immediate area – air, land, water	Air, surface runoff.	Control speeds, maintain the condition of the road, and take due care and attention of trafficking conditions. A good standard of housekeeping will be maintained on the roads.	Low	Nuisance, dust on cars and road	Insignificant

## 5 Table A4: Accidents risk assessment and management plan

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
Hazard	Receptor	Pathway	Risk management	Possibility of exposure	Consequence	What is the overall risk?
What has the potential to cause harm?	What is at risk? What do I wish to protect?	How can the hazard get to the receptor?	What measures will you take to reduce the risk? If it occurs who is responsible for what?	How likely it this contact?	What is the harm that can be caused?	What is the risk that still remains? The balance and probability and consequence.
Spill during unloading of chemicals.	Immediate area – air, land, water.	Direct contact.	Training in unloading practices. Supervision of chemical unloading activities by competent staff. Impervious surfaces outdoors. Containment of drainage from chemical handling areas. Management procedures in place to deal with spillages.	Unlikely	Low	Not significant
Overfilling of vessels.	Local environment air, land, water.	Surface runoff, wind.	Training in unloading practices. Supervision of chemical unloading activities by competent staff. Impervious surfaces outdoors. High level alarms. Secondary containment for storage vessels.	Unlikely	Low	Not significant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			Management procedures in place to deal with spillages.			
Leak of water from treatment plant, and leak of boiler water treatment chemicals.	Immediate area - water	Surface runoff	Secondary containment for storage of water treatment chemicals such as bunding. Routine inspection and maintenance. Impervious surface indoors, separate drains for process water. Regular preventative maintenance of storage vessels to confirm the integrity of the storage vessel.	Unlikely	Pollution of surface water	Not significant
Flue gas leak.	Local environment - air	Air	Design standards. Inspection and maintenance programme. Controls and alarms for pressure. Most of the systems are retained at negative pressure. Emissions monitoring systems to detect exceedances.	Very unlikely	Pollution of atmosphere, health impacts	Not significant
Fuel storage failure	Immediate area - litter	Direct contact	Storage of waste in a dedicated waste storage bunker. The waste bunker will be constructed of reinforced concrete, with integrity checks undertaken during the construction and	Unlikely	Litter	Not significant



What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			commissioning phase of the Facility.			
Control failure leading to combustion control upset	Local environment - air	Air - Winds generally blow from a south westerly direction.	Design of control system. Monitoring of gasification and combustion conditions. Maintenance of combustion air systems.	Unlikely	Pollution of atmosphere (short term), human health	Not significant
Failure of emission abatement equipment	Local environment - air	Air - Winds generally blow from a south westerly direction.	Regular maintenance, inspections. Redundancy of critical equipment or spares on stock.	Unlikely	Pollution of atmosphere, human health	Not significant
Failure of emission monitoring systems	Immediate area - air	Air - Winds generally blow from a south westerly direction.	Regular maintenance, inspections. Back-up CEMS system.	Unlikely	Lack of data, public concern.	Not significant
Failure of containment systems (e.g. bund)	Immediate area – water, land	Surface runoff, wind, leaching.	Regular inspections of bunds. Preventative maintenance will be employed through a documented management system.	Unlikely	Pollution of surface water	Not significant
Making the wrong connections to drains	Local environment – water	Direct contact, leaching.	Detailed site drainage plan, which will be available to all staff. Drains will be labelled accordingly.	Low	Pollution of surface water	Not significant
Preventing incompatible substances from coming into contact	Immediate area	Surface runoff, wind, direct contact.	Due care and attention. Retention of Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) to identify hazards of	Low	Low	Not significant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			substances to be used on site.			
Unwanted reactions	Immediate area	Surface runoff, wind, direct contact.	Due care and attention. Retention of MSDS to identify hazards of substances to be used on site.	Unlikely	Low	Not significant
Loss of power	None	N/A	A back-up generation system to provide safe shutdown of the Facility in the event of loss of power.	Low	None	Not significant
Loss of compressed air	None	N/A	Multiple compressors.	Low	None	Not significant
Loss of boiler water	None	N/A	Automatic shutdown of the Facility, back-up diesel pump to provide feedwater to the boiler.	Low	None	Not significant
Steam leak to plant building / atmosphere	Noise, Visual	Air	Statutory design, fabrication and inspection standards for steam systems. Controls and alarms for pressure. Routine operator checks.	Low	Nuisance from noise and visual impact	Not significant
APC residues handling failure	Immediate area – air, land, water	Direct contact	Training in transfer practices. Contained transfer systems. Impervious surfaces outdoors. Controlled drainage in areas where residues are stored.	Unlikely	Pollution of surface waters	Not significant

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
Fires in FGT bag filter	Local environment.	Air - Winds generally blow from a south westerly direction.	Temperature measurement and level control in filter hopper, inert gas fire-fighting systems.	Low.	Dust, pollution of air.	Not significant.
Fire in furnace feed system	Immediate area – air.	Air.	Furnace charging procedures / training. Level indicator in chute. Fire-fighting system.	Low.	Pollution of air.	Not significant.
Over pressurisation of the boiler	Immediate area – air.	Direct contact.	In case of over pressure, the pressure will be released through the waste hopper and ash quench system preventing the risk of an explosion within the boiler.	Low.	Pollution of air.	Not significant.
Fires in all waste reception storage and handling areas	Immediate area – air.	Direct contact.	Fire detection and suppression systems.	Low.	Visual impact, pollution of air.	Not significant.
Fire from ignition of lube oil leak	Immediate area – air.	Wind, direct contact.	Fire detection and protection systems.	Low.	Visual.	Not significant.
Contaminated fire water	Immediate area – water, land.	Surface runoff, leaching.	Site drainage for external areas will be fitted with an isolation valve which is activated by the fire detection systems. Additional storage will be available from kerbing and roadways. The primary source of firewater containment will be the	Low.	Pollution of surface water.	Not significant.

What do you do that can harm and what could be harmed?			Managing the risk	Assessing the risk		
			waste bunker, which is designed as a water-retaining structure.			
Failure to contain firewater	Land.	Land, water, groundwater.	Maintenance of the shut-off valve and/or pumping system within the drainage system. Inspection and maintenance of roadways and areas of hardstanding.	Unlikely.	Release of chemicals to water.	Not significant.
Vandalism	Immediate area.	Land, air, water.	Security fences, controlled entrance to the site.	Low.	Release of substances to any environment.	Not significant.

## 6 Detailed assessment

The environmental impact of the Installation has been evaluated using the H1 software tool as described in Part 2 of Technical Guidance Note EPR-H1, presented in Appendix A. This assessment has been expanded by a more comprehensive Air Quality Assessment (Appendix E of the Supporting Information) and a Noise Assessment (Appendix C of the Supporting Information).

### 6.1 Emissions to air

The detailed air quality assessment is presented in Annex 4 of the application. The primary conclusions of the assessment are presented below:

In relation to the impact on human health:

1. emissions from the operation of the Facility will not cause a breach of any AQAL.
2. the overall impact of long-term process emissions associated with the operation of the Facility can be considered 'not significant' in accordance with Environment Agency screening criteria at the point of maximum impact and at all identified human sensitive receptors.
3. the overall impact of short-term process emissions associated with the operation of the Facility can be screened out as 'not significant' in accordance with Environment Agency screening criteria at the point of maximum impact and at all identified human sensitive receptors.
4. the Environment Agency's approach to assessing the impact of metals has been used which considers the risk of exceeding the AQAL based on the existing background levels and contribution from the Facility. The PEC is only predicted to exceed the long term AQAL for chromium (VI) and this is due to the high background concentrations. The PC remains less than 1%. Other heavy metal contributions do not exceed the AQALs.

An assessment of emissions to air has been undertaken using the Environment Agency's assessment tool H1. The H1 assessment is presented in Appendix A of this report.

### 6.2 Habitats assessment

The following habitat features have been considered within the air quality assessment.

- European designated sites (within 10 km):
  - Salisbury SAC
- UK designated sites (SSSIs) (within 2 km):
  - Picket and Clanger Wood SSSI<sup>1</sup>; and
  - Westbury Ironstone Quarry.
- National Nature Reserves (NNR), Local Nature Reserves (LNRs, local wildlife sites and ancient woodlands (within 2 km of the site):
  - High Wood/Hazel Wood; and

---

<sup>1</sup> Picket and Clanger Wood SSSI is in fact outside the 2 km screening threshold. However, because it is in the direction of prevailing winds and has been included in previous Air Quality Assessments, it has been included within the Air Quality Assessment.

- Round Wood.

The impact of process emissions at the local ecological sites can be screened out as insignificant for all sites with the exception of Picket and Clanger Wood SSSI. Further analysis has been undertaken by the ecology consultant for the project, provided in the ecological interpretation of the AQA in Chapter 6 of the ES Chapter for the planning application and contained within appendix D of the Dispersion modelling assessment (within appendix E of the EP application). The ecological interpretation of the AQA concluded that the predicted process contribution would not cause significant harm to the SSSI or inhibit its recovery to favourable conservation status.

### 6.3 Emissions to water and sewer

The Facility will include separate drainage systems for foul and surface water.

Surface water run-off will be collected from areas of hardstanding and building roofs and discharged into the surface water drainage systems. All surface run-off will pass through a petrol interceptor prior to discharge into the Northacre Trading Estate drainage system.

All process effluents will be discharged to foul sewer in accordance with a Trade Effluent Consent which will be issued by Wessex Water prior to commencement of operation. Domestic effluents will be discharged to the foul sewer system.

### 6.4 Noise

The impact of noise from the Installation is considered in the noise assessment contained in Appendix C of the Supporting Information.

### 6.5 Visual impact

The visual impact of the Installation has not been considered within the EP application, as this is primarily a matter for the planning authorities.

### 6.6 Odour

The proposed mitigation measures for the abatement of odour are presented in section 2.4.4 of the Supporting Information.

### 6.7 Photochemical Ozone Creation

Releases of CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, SO<sub>2</sub> and benzene contribute to the generation of excess tropospheric ozone, while releases of NO remove ozone from the atmosphere. The annual releases of these substances can be ascribed a photochemical ozone creation potential (POCP). Annual values for the POCP are stated in Annex (f) of Technical Guidance Note EPR-H1, for the pollutants included within the air quality assessment, as:

1. NO <sub>2</sub>	544
2. SO <sub>2</sub>	233
3. Benzene	353
4. 1,3 Butadiene	1378
5. Benzo-a-pyrene	0.02
6. CO	219

The total POCP for the Installation is calculated in the H1 Software Tool as approximately 3,193 tonnes. This assessment is based on the assumption that all NO<sub>x</sub> is released as NO<sub>2</sub>.

## 6.8 Global warming

The assessment of the contribution of the Facility to global warming is complex. On the one hand, the Facility releases carbon dioxide to the atmosphere by the combustion of waste and auxiliary fuel. On the other hand, the Installation generates electricity, which displaces other forms of electricity generation, which would release carbon dioxide from the combustion of fossil fuels.

In accordance with the Environment Agency requirements, a Greenhouse Gas Assessment which considers the direct and indirect emissions from the incineration of waste within the Installation and compares this with the emissions produced if the electricity were produced by conventional fossil fuel power station has been presented in Annex 5 of the Supporting Information.

## 6.9 Disposal of waste

Methods for reducing the impact from waste disposal are considered in section 2.10 of the Supporting Information.

## 7 Assessment of Dioxins and Dioxin-like PCBs

### 7.1 Introduction

A Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) has been undertaken for the Facility – refer to Appendix E of the Application. The information presented within this section should be read in conjunction with the HHRA.

The HHRA assessed the intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs against the Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) of 2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/day. It is understood that the EA require an assessment is undertaken against a Tolerable Weekly Intake (TWI) of 2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/week, which is equivalent to 0.286 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/day.

### 7.2 Background

The HHRA was undertaken against a TDI for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs of 2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/day. This value was set by the Committee on Toxicity (CoT) and has been taken from the 2009 EA Science Report “Human health toxicological assessment of contaminants in soil<sup>2</sup>”. The TDI of 2 pg WHO-TEQ/kg bw/day has subsequently been used as the assessment criteria in HHRAs in the UK.

#### 7.2.1 Derivation of new TWI

The European Food Standards Agency (EFSA)’s expert panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM) carried out a review of the risk to human and animal health from dioxins and furans in food and feed, publishing a Scientific Opinion in June 2018 which was published in the European Journal on 18 November 2018. CONTAM recommended a tolerable weekly intake of 2 pg TEQ/kg bw/week.

The justification for the new TWI is that this is protective against effects on semen quality, based on a single scientific study – the Russian Children’s Study<sup>3</sup>. This study enrolled 516 boys aged 8-9 years. Ten years later, when the participants were aged 18-19, semen samples were obtained and analysed. A total of 133 of the 516 boys originally enrolled completed the study. The study concluded that “*Higher peripubertal serum TCDD concentrations and PCDD TEQs were associated with poorer semen parameters*”, but that “*Serum PCBs, furans, and total TEQs were not associated with semen parameters.*” Based on the study, the EFSA concluded that exposure to dioxins at the levels found in the study can affect reproductive development. The EFSA derived the new TWI from the critical level in this study by modelling the build-up and decline of dioxins in children through their life, assuming (amongst other assumptions) 12 months of breastfeeding and an intake of 800 ml per day of breast milk.

#### 7.2.2 Applicability of new TWI

The Scientific Opinion recommending the new TWI was discussed at an Information Session on 13 November 2018. UK representatives participated in this session and submitted comments in

---

<sup>2</sup> Human health toxicological assessment of contaminants in soil - dioxins, Science Report - Final SC050021/SR2, Environment Agency, 2009

<sup>3</sup> A Longitudinal Study of Peripubertal Serum Organochlorine Concentrations and Semen Parameters in Young Men: The Russian Children’s Study, Minguez-Alarcon et al, 2017, Environmental Health Perspectives



advance which had been prepared by the CoT following a meeting on 23 October 2018. The CoT made a number of criticisms of the EFSA approach, including:

- the study did not contain a discussion on the possible explanation for the observed effect;
- while human data should be used to establish an HBGV (health-based guidance value), the CoT was unable to conclude that basing the HBGV on a single study was robust; and
- the applicability of the TWI to the whole population was questioned by the CoT.

Furthermore, the commentary on the Russian Children's Study from German representatives at the Information Session stated that the study was undertaken *"in the vicinity of a chemical manufacturing plant which has led to an extensive contamination of the environment with special pattern of dioxins, but also with organochlorine pesticides, lead and probably other compounds with shorter half-lives not detected in the study."* This has implications for the validity of applying the results of the study to the wider population.

The CoT discussed the Opinion again in its meeting on 17 September 2019. The discussion paper for the meeting stated *"A significant reduction in the TWI for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs would mean that a significant portion of the population would exceed the safe exposure levels and some may therefore be experiencing adverse effects related to these compounds. Significant efforts would be required in order to reduce current exposures."* The CoT was asked *"Do the Committee agree that the TWI established by EFSA is justified given the available data?"* The minutes of the meeting state that the Committee neither endorses nor dismissed the Opinion.

The EFSA's statement on the Opinion concludes *"The European Commission and EU Member States will discuss risk management measures following EFSA's scientific advice to ensure a high level of consumer protection."* Fichtner is not aware of any records which confirm that these discussions have taken place. Furthermore, the UK government has not published guidance on whether this standard should be applied.

Based on the above, the new TWI remains a recommendation by the EFSA's CONTAM and has not been adopted as an assessment criterion for the protection of human health by either the EU or the UK government. As such, the most recent published guidance on the tolerable intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs remains the EA Science Report published in 2009.

However, an assessment of the impact of the Facility against the new TWI has been undertaken.

## 7.3 Assessment against TWI

### 7.3.1 Assessment methodology

As the TWI is the same as the current TDI, assessing the results of the HHRA against the TWI will increase the predicted impacts sevenfold as a percentage of the assessment criterion.

The HHRA considered the impact of emissions from the Facility at 32 sensitive receptor locations which were categorised as either 'residential', 'agricultural' or 'allotment' Residential receptors represent a known place of residence that is occupied within the study area. Agricultural receptors represent a farm holding or area land of horticultural interest. Allotment receptors represents land designated for non-commercial growing of food plants. An allotment type receptor has been applied for schools to allow for the consumption of any produce as a very conservative approach. In addition, a receptor has been assessed at the point of maximum impact to assess the theoretical maximum impact of the Facility. This point lies upon a railway track adjacent to shrubland and residential land.

As a conservative assessment, it has been assumed that agricultural receptors ingest dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs from home-grown produce, eggs, poultry, pork, beef, and milk, regardless of whether the farm is arable, pastoral or mixed.

The assessment has added the contribution from the Facility to the Mean Daily Intake (MDI). If the overall intake is below the TDI or TWI (as applicable), then no significant health effects are expected and the impact of emissions from the Facility can be described as not significant.

### 7.3.2 Results – at the point of maximum impact

The results of the assessment at the point of maximum impact using the TDI and the TWI are presented in Table 7-1. Any exceedances of the TDI/TWI are highlighted.

Table 7-1: Intake of Dioxins and Dioxin-like PCBs - Point of maximum impact

Receptor Type	MDI		Process Contribution		Overall	
	% of TDI	% of TWI	% of TDI	% of TWI	% of TDI	% of TWI
<b>Adult</b>						
Agricultural	35.00%	<b>245.00%</b>	2.93%	20.52%	37.93%	<b>265.52%</b>
Allotment	35.00%	<b>245.00%</b>	0.11%	0.78%	35.11%	<b>245.78%</b>
Residential	35.00%	<b>245.00%</b>	0.08%	0.57%	35.08%	<b>245.57%</b>
<b>Child</b>						
Agricultural	90.65%	<b>634.55%</b>	4.06%	28.42%	94.71%	<b>662.97%</b>
Allotment	90.65%	<b>634.55%</b>	0.35%	2.46%	91.00%	<b>637.01%</b>
Residential	90.65%	<b>634.55%</b>	0.30%	2.13%	90.95%	<b>636.68%</b>

As shown, the MDI (i.e. existing intake) is significantly in excess of the TWI for both adult and child receptors. In all cases, the contribution from the Facility is well below the TWI, so the exceedance of the TWI is due to the existing intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in typical diets.

In addition to the above, the ingestion of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs by an infant resulting from emissions from the Facility, considering the breast milk pathway and based on an adult agricultural receptor at the point of maximum impact of emissions from the Facility feeding an infant, is 0.386 pg TEQ/kg bw/day which is 12.86% of the TDI and 90.05% of the TWI.

As shown, the intake by an infant resulting from emissions from the Facility is less than the TWI, based on an adult agricultural receptor at the point of maximum impact feeding an infant. This is a very worst-case assessment. However, for completeness, further assessment of the likely impact of emissions from the Facility has also been given to the maximum impact at an identified receptor location.

### 7.3.3 Results – maximum impact at a receptor

The following table outlines the impact of emissions from the Facility at the most affected receptor (i.e. the receptor with the greatest impact from ingestion and inhalation of emissions from the Facility) (R16 – Brook Drove 1). This receptor has been classified as an agricultural receptor, which is conservative as it assumes that a significant proportion of the diet of the receptor is sourced from the receptor point assessed, including meat and milk products. In reality, people in the UK tend to source their diet from a wide geographical area.

Table 7-2: Intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs - Maximum Impacted Receptor

Receptor Type	MDI		Process Contribution		Overall	
	% of TDI	% of TWI	% of TDI	% of TWI	% of TDI	% of TWI
<b>Adult</b>						
Agricultural	35.00%	<b>245.00%</b>	0.55%	3.87%	35.55%	<b>248.87%</b>
<b>Child</b>						
Agricultural	90.65%	<b>634.55%</b>	0.77%	5.36%	91.42%	<b>639.91%</b>

As shown, the contribution from the Facility at the maximum impacted Facility is lower than at the theoretical maximum impacted receptor for an agricultural receptor presented in Section 7.3.2. In addition, the intake resulting from emissions from the Facility is a small percentage of the existing intake.

The ingestion of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs, by an infant, resulting from emissions from the Facility, considering the breast milk pathway and based on an adult agricultural receptor at the maximum impacted receptor feeding an infant, is 0.073 pg TEQ/kg bw/day which is 2.43% of the TDI and 16.99% of the TWI. Therefore, as the process contribution is less than the TDI and TWI, it is considered that the Facility will not increase the health risks from the accumulation of dioxins in infants significantly.

### 7.3.4 Summary

Fichtner has reviewed the background and applicability of the new TWI and concluded that the evidence underpinning the TWI is not conclusive, and neither the EU nor the UK government has adopted the TWI as an assessment criterion. Nonetheless, Fichtner has undertaken an assessment of the likely maximum impact of emissions of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs from the Facility against the new TWI. This has shown that, at the maximum impacted receptor, the contribution from the Facility to the intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs is small for child and adult receptors, at 3.87% and 5.36% of the TWI respectively. The reported exceedance of the TWI is due to the existing intake exceeding the TWI.

The contribution from the Facility to the intake of dioxins by an infant being fed by an adult at the maximum impacted receptor (agricultural receptor) is 16.99% of the TWI.

In conclusion, the results of the assessment against the new TWI show that the Facility will not have a significant effect on human health due to the intake of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs.

## 8 Conclusions

As presented in this report, the Facility is considered to contain appropriate control measures and management systems to ensure that the operation of the Facility will not have any significant impacts upon the local environment.

# Appendices

## A H1 assessment tool

ENGINEERING  CONSULTING

**FICHTNER**

Consulting Engineers Limited

Kingsgate (Floor 3), Wellington Road North,  
Stockport, Cheshire, SK4 1LW,  
United Kingdom

t: +44 (0)161 476 0032

f: +44 (0)161 474 0618

[www.fichtner.co.uk](http://www.fichtner.co.uk)