

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Mick George Limited	PG	PG Note: PG		G3/16(12)	
Discussed with:	Mick Prestidge	LA Refe	rence:	B04/96	6	
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass		Date:	16/10/2	6/10/2014	
Operator Performance An	praical					
Operator Performance Ap Component 1 - Compliance Assess						
Scale of Non-Compliance			ble Score	e	Scores Awarded	
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of specific permit condition or of general/residual BAT condition			points			
B) Incident leading to a justified complaint		5 pe	r incident			
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action			er incident			
(D) Incident leading to formal caution	ng to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution 15 per incident					
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition N	lotice	20 pe	er incident			
Total		(Max. 50)			0	
Unjustified complaints may be e.g. t Uniustified complaints may be e.g. t	hose considered by the inspector to be unrea	asonable c	r which ca	annot be o	clearly	
Where facility has been on Reduce	d Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	Operating	Levels			
Failure to notify the regulator or restart or increase in level of operation to pove the threshold requiring a permit at the installation in accordance with the acceptance letter						
Total (applies only when condition		(Max 75)				
Scoring for Component 2 - Assess	ment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Rec	ords			T	
Criterion		Possible Scores		res	Scores	
		Yes	No	N/A	I/A Awarded	
(A) Are emissions monitored as requi Are emissions and emissions monitor	red in the permit? ring recorded as required in the permit?	0	10	0	0	
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced compliance?	because results over time show consistent	0	0	0	0	
(C) Is an appropriate maintenance sc	hedule in place and available on request?	0	5	0	0	
(D) Fully documented and adhered permit?	to maintenance programme, in line with	0	5	Ф	0	
(E) Full documented records as requi	red in permit available on-site?	0	5	0	0	
(F) Has the operator notified the regu	lator promptly of all relocations of all plant?	-5	10	0	-5	
Total score		(-5 to 35)			-5	

Component 3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion		Possible Scores		
		No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Are procedures in place to ensure proper management, supervision and training for process operations, proper use of equipment and effective preventative maintenance on all plant and equipment concerned with the control of emissions to air?	0	5	0	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?		5	0	0
(C) Does the operator maintain, and make available on request, a statement of training requirements for each operational post?	0	5	0	0
(D) Are all staff with responsibility for operating the process sufficiently trained to be aware of their responsibilities under the permit, minimising emissions on start up and shut down and taking action to minimise emissions during abnormal conditions?		5	0	0
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?		5	θ	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	θ	-5
Total	(-5 to 25) -5			
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal		Range -10 to 110 (135)		-10

Overall scores	Score given
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	-5
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	-10

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 110 (135)	-10
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >55, medium 30-55 and low <30	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

No issues with the plant and no complaints received. Different departments undertake their
specific roles (e.g. maintenance, transport) but all appears to be running smoothly. Plant operators
hasn't changed.