

10

0

Range 0 to 70

0

32

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Sundown Products Ltd	PG Note:	PG6/26
Discussed with:	Marc Duncan	LA Reference:	B03/94
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass/ Katherine Domingo	Date:	25/10/2012

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible S	Possible Scores		Score warded
(A) Category 1	10	10		
(B) Category 2	20	20 20		20
(C) Category 3	30			
Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading				
Status of Upgrading	Possible S	Possible Scores Score Awarde		Score warded
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5	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	-10		
Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors				
	Sensit	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Mediu	ım	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 combustion, incineration (not cremation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal p Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the steel and non-ferromatic structures and the steel and the steel and non-ferromatic structures and the steel and the stee	rocesses.	s and by	a fac	tor of 4
Component 4 - Other Targets				
	Possible S	cores		Score warded

(A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a

potential contributor

(B) No such air pollution problems

Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment					
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores		es	Scores Awarded	
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit 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 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 unrelinked to an incident at the process.	easonabl	e or which	cannot k	be clearly	
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	d 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 Re				1	
Criterion	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded		
	Yes	No	N/A		
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show	θ	10	0	0	
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	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

Changes are planned to the process which should make it more efficient and less dust emissions.

No variation required but a new process description, site plant layout plan and list of equipment will

be necessary. Emissions testing due by 31 March 2013. Procedures and training in place and

reviewed when changes have been undertaken. No environmental management system in place

but considering producing one.