

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

Name of permitted activity:	Clements Engineering	PG Not	e: <u>PG</u>	62/4( <sup>~</sup>	13)
Discussed with:	Tracey Robins	LA Referenc	e: <u>B0</u>	4/09	
Inspector's Name:	Paula Croskell	Date: <u>10/07/2014</u>		014	
Environmental Impact Ap	praisal				
Component 1 - Inherent Environ	mental Impact Potential				
APRR Risk Rating Category		Possible Scores			Score warded
(A) Category 1		<del>10</del>			
(B) Category 2		<del>20</del>			
(C) Category 3		30			30
Component 2 - Progress with Up	ograding				
Status of Upgrading		Possible So	Decemble Scores		Score warded
(A) Upgrading not complete but PG	S Note deadline has yet to be reached	5			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete an	d PG Note deadline has passed	10			
(C) Upgrading complete and meets	C) Upgrading complete and meets BAT Requirements		0		0
(D) Emissions control exceeds BA	Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements		-10		
Component 3 - Sensitivity and P	roximity of Receptors				
		Sensiti	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source	n Source High Medium		ım	Low	
(A) < 100m <sup>*</sup>		<del>20</del>	<del>12</del>		5
(B) 100 - 250m <sup>*</sup>		<del>12</del>	<del>12</del> <del>10</del>		3
(C) 250 - 500m <sup>*</sup>		5	3		1
(D) >500m*		θ	θθ		θ
combustion, incineration (not crem	d by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement ation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal pr red from the process itself, rather than the s	ocesses.	and by	a fact	tor of 4 for
Component 4 - Other Targets					
		Possible Sc	Possible Scores Score Awarded		
(A) Other air pollution problems potential contributor	in the local area to which process is a	<sup>1</sup> <del>10</del>	<del>10</del>		
(B) No such air pollution problems		0	0 0		0
Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal		Range 0 to 70		35	

## Operator Performance Appraisal

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					
(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 unre linked to an incident at the process.	easonable	e or which	cannot b	e clearly	
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	l 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	Yes	sible Sco	N/A	Scores Awarded	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	10		0	
<ul><li>(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?</li></ul>	-5	<del>ι</del> .	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?	Ð	5	0	0	
Total score	(-5 to 30)		0		
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility					
	Possible Scores		ores	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	0	θ	0	
Total	(-5 to 25) 0		0		
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 105 (130) 0				

Overall scores	Score given
Environmental Impact Appraisal	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	30
Progress with Upgrading	0
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	5
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	35

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 175 (200)	35
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

## Comments

New foundry foreman and H&S/environmental consultant since previous visit. They are trying to

get all the records up-to-date. No environmental management system but company do look at

ways of reducing their environmental footprint (e.g. recycling of sand). All staff have been working

there for a considerable time so no formal training records but company do try to train them of the

procedures. The waste skip had recently been cleared so a build-up of sand was noticed but

wasn't escaping off site.