

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

| Name of permitted activity: | Linx Printing Technologies Ltd | PG Note: | PG6/44 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|------------|
| Discussed with: | Mr Andy Mee | _LA Reference: | B04/94 |
| Inspector's Name: | Dave Bass | Date: | 03/11/2015 |

| Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|
| APRR Risk Rating Category | Possible Scores | | | core arded |
| (A) Category 1 | 10 | | • | 10 |
| (B) Category 2 | 20 | | | |
| (C) Category 3 | 30 | | | |
| Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading | | | | |
| Status of Upgrading | Possible Scores | | _ | core arded |
| (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 | <u>.</u> | | | |
| | Sensitivity of Receptors | | | |
| Proximity to Emission Source | High | Mediur | n | Low |
| (A) < 100m ⁻ | 20 | 12 | | 5 |
| (B) 100 - 250m [*] | 12 | 10 | | 3 |
| (C) 250 - 500m ⁻ | 5 | 3 | | 4 |
| (D) >500m* | 0 | 0 | | 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 | 22 |

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 | | | Mulucu | |
| (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 unr linked 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 | 25 | | | | |
| Total (applies only when condition F has been breached) | | Max 75) | | | |
| Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Ro | 1 | | | | |
| Criterion | Possible Score | | ores | Scores Awarded | |
| | 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 | 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) | | 0 | |
| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | | | | | |
| Critarian | Possible Scores | | 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 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 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 | 0 | -5 | |
| Total | | (-5 to 25) | | -5 | |
| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal | Range | -10 to 10 |)5 | -5 | |

| Overall scores | Score given |
|---|-------------|
| Environmental Impact Appraisal | |
| Inherent Environmental Impact Potential | 10 |
| Progress with Upgrading | 0 |
| Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors | 12 |
| 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 | 17 |

| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS | Range -10 to 175 (200) | 17 |
|---|------------------------|-----|
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY | | LOW |
| * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40 | LOW, MED, HIGH | |

Comments

| Emission testing being undertaken during inspection. Some work needed on fugitive |
|---|
| emissions/solvent consumption. No changes to plant layout, employees, procedures etc. since last |
| inspection but permit review due early 2016 to ensure permit and plant is still representing BAT. |
| Company has ISO14001. |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |