

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

PG6/26 &

Name of permitted activity: Sundown Products Ltd PG Note: PG6/27

Discussed with: Mr Marc Duncan LA Reference: B03/94

Inspector's Name: D Bass/ J Brettall Date: 23/11/2010

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores		Score Awarded	
(A) Category 1	10			
(B) Category 2	20		20	
(C) Category 3	30			
Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading		<u>.</u>		
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 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*	0	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	10	
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0
Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	32

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment				
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores Scores Awarded			
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit condition or of general/residual BAT condition	0 points			Awaraca
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint	5 pe	er incident	t	
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action	10 p	er inciden	it	
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 p	er inciden	it	
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident		it	
Total	(N	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	be clearly
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	d Operati	ng Levels	S	
(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 Re	ecords			1
Criterion	Possible Scores		Scores	
	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	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	5	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				
Criterion	Possible Scores Sco		Scores	
ontenon	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	5	0	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	5	0	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	0	0
Total		(-5 to 25)) 	0
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	_	e -10 to 10 (130))5	0

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	20
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	12
Other Targets	0
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	0
Total score	32

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	32
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

Emissions monitoring still required, daily check to be included with checks for other permit.
Following previous emissions test a secondary cyclone has been installed. No recent justified
complaints of straw process. Maintenance work dictated by schedule which is on a computer
package. Staff sign off procedures to show their understanding of them and is kept on training
record.