

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

| Darex UK Ltd | PG Note: | 6/28(04) & 6/44(04) |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Glen Draper, Tony Norman & Iain | _ | |
| Downie | LA Reference: | B19/93 |
| | | |
| Dave Bass | Date: _ | 25/09/08 |
| | Glen Draper, Tony Norman & Iain Downie | Glen Draper, Tony Norman & Iain Downie LA Reference: |

Environmental Impact Appraisal

| Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential | | |
|---|-----------------|------------------|
| APRR Risk Rating Category | Possible Scores | Score Awarded |
| (A) Category 1 | 10 | |
| (B) Category 2 | 20 | |
| (C) Category 3 | 30 | 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 | |
| | | |

| (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 Medium Lov | | |
| (A) < 100m [*] | 20 | 12 | 5 |
| (B) 100 - 250m° | 12 | 10 | 3 |
| (C) 250 - 500m [*] | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| (D) >500m* | θ | θ | 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 | 50 |

Total Score for 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 | | | |
| (B) Incident leading to a justified complaint | 5 per incident | | | |
| (C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action | 10 pe | er incident | | |
| (D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution | 15 pe | 15 per incident | | |
| (E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice | 20 pe | 20 per incident | | |
| Total | (M | lax. 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 b | e clearly |
| Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Re | cords | | | |
| Criterion | Pos | ssible Sco | ores | Scores |
| Citetion | Yes | No | N/A | Awarded |
| (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 | 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 | θ | 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 | | 0 | |
| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | | | | |
| Cuitavian | Possible Scores S | | Scores | |
| Criterion | 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 | -5 |
| | | | | |

-5

Range -10 to 105

| Overall scores | Score given |
|---|-------------|
| Environmental Impact Appraisal | |
| Inherent Environmental Impact Potential | 30 |
| 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 | 45 |

| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS | Range -10 to 175 | 45 |
|---|------------------|--------|
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY | | MEDIUM |
| * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40 | LOW, MED, HIGH | |

Comments

| Site was undertaking emissions monitoring but data logger was not working and one line exceeding |
|---|
| limits so site will investigate/repair line and retest in approx 4 weeks. All maintenance, procedures |
| and training records are kept. Site has been credited with a company EMS system based on |
| ISO14001 which involved formal assessments. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |