

0

Range 0 to 70

0

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity	y: Clements Engineering	PG No	te: <u>PC</u>	32/4 ((13)
Discussed with:	Adrian Gibbons	LA Referenc	ce: <u>B0</u>)4/09)
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	Da	Date: 27/07/2017		2017
Environmental Impact A	Appraisal				
Component 1 - Inherent Enviro	onmental 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 warded	
(A) Upgrading not complete but	PG Note deadline has yet to be reached	5			
(B) Upgrading not yet complete a	and PG Note deadline has passed	10			
(C) Upgrading complete and me	ets BAT Requirements	0 0		0	
(D) Emissions control exceeds B	BAT Requirements	-10			
Component 3 - Sensitivity and	Proximity of Receptors				
		Sensitivity of Receptors		itors	
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*		0	0		0
combustion, incineration (not cre	lied by a factor of 2 for mineral and cement & emation), iron & steel and non-ferrous metal pro sured from the process itself, rather than the si	ocesses.	s and by	a fac	tor of 4 for
Component 4 - Other Targets					
		Possible S	ole Scores Score Awarded		
(A) Other air pollution problen	ns in the local area to which process is a	10			

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		10 per incident			
C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action 10 per incident		t			
) 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. 55)			0	
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unrulinked to an incident at the process.	easonable	e or which	cannot	be clearly	
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced	d Operati	ng Levels	3		
(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					
Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)		Max 80)			
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Re					
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores	
	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	10	0	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	10	0	0	
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	10	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	10	0	0	
Total score	(-5 to 45)		0		
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility					
		Possible Scores			
Criterion	Yes	No	N/A	Scores 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	θ	0	-5	
Total	(-5 to 25)		-5		
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal		-10 to 10 (150))5	-5	

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	-5	
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 site, while does have sand around, is obviously cleaned up on a regular basis so very little
sand can escape off site. The site reclaims as much sand as they can. There have been no
serious breakdowns on the plant since the last inspection and they have regular checks of
maintenance and site in general. No changes to personnel. There are procedures for the site
which all employees are trained in. While the operator doesn't have an official Environmental
Management System they do have a policy to reduce their environmental footprint but could do
with a bit more recording.