

## **Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control**

Name of permitted activity	: Boardcraft Ltd	_ PG Not	e: <u>PG</u>	6/02	2
Discussed with:	Bill Chambers	_LA Referenc	e: <u>B0</u>	6/92	
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	Dat	e: 09/	03/2	2011
Environmental Impact A	nnraical	_			
Environmental Impact A Component 1 - Inherent Enviro					
Component 1 - Innerent Enviro	illientai illipact r otentiai		T		Casus
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible So	Possible Scores Score Awarded		
(A) Category 1		10 10		10	
(B) Category 2		<del>20</del>			
(C) Category 3		30	30		
Component 2 - Progress with U	lpgrading				
Status of Upgrading		Possible Scores		Score warded	
(A) Upgrading not complete but F	PG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete a	nd PG Note deadline has passed	10			
(C) Upgrading complete and mee	ets BAT Requirements	0 0		0	
(D) Emissions control exceeds Ba	AT Requirements	-10			
Component 3 - Sensitivity and	Proximity of Receptors				
		Sensiti	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source		High	Mediu	m	Low
(A) < 100m <sup>*</sup>		20	<del>12</del>		5
(B) 100 - 250m <sup>*</sup>		<del>12</del>	10		3
(C) 250 - 500m <sup>*</sup>		5	3		4
(D) >500m*		θ	0		θ
combustion, incineration (not creation	ed by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement mation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal p ured from the process itself, rather than the	rocesses.	and by	a fac	etor of 4 for
Component 4 - Other Targets					

	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process is a potential contributor	<del>10</del>	
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0
Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal	Range 0 to 70	30

**Operator Performance Appraisal** 

Component 5 - Compliance Assessment				
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores Awarded		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		t	
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action	10 per incident		it	
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident		it	
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident		ıt	
Total	(Max. 50)		0	
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unr linked to an incident at the process.	easonable	e or which	canno	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 Ro				
Criterion	Possible Scores		Scores Awarded	
	Yes	No	N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	<del>10</del>	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	<del>-5</del>	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) <b>0</b>		0	
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores		Scores	
Citerion	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the permit?	0	<del>5</del>	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?	<del>-5</del>	0	0	0
Total	(-5 to 25) <b>0</b>		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	10
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	0
Total score	30

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	30
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

## **Comments**

The edge bander has been removed but the extraction system is still on site but not being used.
Extraction of the different machines still being directed to enclosed units at the end of the buildings.
There is some damage to one of the enclosures. Checks are made and recorded when the
machines are in use. The extraction units are checked for efficiency on a yearly basis, which then
results in maintenance as and when required. There was a release of dust as a result of
vandalism. No dedicated EMS system but company do look at savings.