

## Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity: David Smith St Ives Ltd PG Note: PG6/02 & PG1/12

Discussed with: Simon Wadsworth LA Reference: B09/94

Inspector's Name: Claire Braybrook Date: 31/10/19

### Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential			
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores	Score Awarded	
(A) Category 1	40		
(B) Category 2	20	20	
(C) Category 3	0		
Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading			
Status of Upgrading	Possible Scores	Score Awarded	
(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	40		
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BAT Requirements	0	0	
(D) Emissions control exceeds BAT Requirements	-40		
Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors			
	Sensitivity of Receptors		
Proximity to Emission Source	High	Medium	Low
(A) < 100m*	20	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(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	40		
(B) No such air pollution problems	0	0	
<b>Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal</b>	<b>Range 0 to 70</b>	<b>40</b>	

## 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			
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	10 per incident			
(C) Breach of permit not leading to formal action	10 per incident			
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident			
(E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice	20 per incident			
<b>Total</b>	<b>(Max. 55)</b>			<b>0</b>
* Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unreasonable or which cannot be clearly linked to an incident at the process.				
Where facility has been on Reduced Charge due to Mothballing or Reduced Operating Levels				
(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			
<b>Total (applies only when condition F has been breached)</b>	<b>(Max 80)</b>			
Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the permit?	0	40	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	40	0	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with permit?	0	40	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	40	0	0
<b>Total score</b>	<b>(-5 to 45)</b>			<b>0</b>
Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores Awarded
	Yes	No	N/A	
(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	0	0	-5
<b>Total</b>	<b>(-5 to 25)</b>			<b>-5</b>
<b>Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal</b>	<b>Range -10 to 105 (150)</b>			<b>-5</b>

<b>Overall scores</b>	<b>Score given</b>
<i>Environmental Impact Appraisal</i>	
Inherent Environmental Impact Potential	<b>20</b>
Progress with Upgrading	<b>0</b>
Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors	<b>20</b>
Other Targets	<b>0</b>
<i>Operator Performance Appraisal</i>	
Compliance Assessment	<b>0</b>
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	<b>0</b>
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	<b>-5</b>
<b>Total score</b>	<b>35</b>

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

## Comments

---

Maintenance and checks seen. CCTV of silos and containers observed.

Condition 16 regarding the recording of the activation of alarms – not currently completed. The system is covered by CCTV and if the alarm sounds the material automatically moves to the other silo. The alarm will not deactivate until manually completed so an operator has to check the system and take action if necessary.

Condition 15 – At present there aren't any interlocks as they have CCTV. The annual LEV testing continues to check the pressure differential and indicate any problems with the bag filters. Any issues would also be flagged up by staff as the system would not operate as efficiently to remove dust and (as it is often used as a sealed system) dust would come back in via the return air. No issues noted during site inspection, operational area was tidy and well maintained. All documentation present as required. Company still has ISO14001.

---