

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Terres PL656	PG	Note:	PG3/1	16(12)	
Discussed with:	Mick & Ann	LA Refe	rence:	B15/1	4	
Inspector's Name:	Dave Bass	_	Date: 02/08		3/2014	
Operator Performance Ap	praisal					
Component 1 - Compliance Assess						
Scale of Non-Compliance		Possil	ole Score	es	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			r incident			
C) Breach of permit not leading to fo	rmal action	10 pe	er incident	t		
D) Incident leading to formal caution	, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 pe	er incident	t		
E) Incident leading to a Prohibition N	lotice	20 pe	20 per incident			
otal	otal				0	
Unjustified complaints may be e.g. tinked to an incident at the process.	hose considered by the inspector to be unre	easonable o	r which ca	annot be	clearly	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d 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			
	otal (applies only when condition F has been breached)					
Scoring for Component 2 - Assess	ment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Re	cords			T	
riterion		Pos	sible Sco	ores	Scores	
		Yes	No	N/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 so	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	0	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	
otal score			(-5 to 35)		-5	

Component 3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Outtonio u	Possible Scores			Scores
Criterion		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?	0	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?	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		-5	
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 110 (135) -10		-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

The operators keep a daily record and submit it weekly to the head office for filing. Before each job the plant is checked for correct functioning and maintenance is undertaken in accordance with manufactures recommendations. Operatives are trained for the use of the plant which includes scenarios for malfunction. All plant notifications are sent to HDC. Mick George Ltd has ISO14001.