

Risk Assessment Method for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet

Name of authorised process Burgess & Walker PG Note 1/1(95)

Name of person with whom score sheet discussed Not discussed LA Reference 1/92

Inspector's Name Aaron Morley Date 5/1/04

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact Potential		
APRR Risk Rating Category	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Category 1	10	10
(B) Category 2	20	
(C) Category 3	30	

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	10	
(C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC Requirements	0	0
(D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC Requirements	-10	

Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Receptors (circle appropriate score)			
Proximity to Emission Source	Sensitivity of Receptors		
	(x) High	(y) Medium	(z) Low
(A) < 100m*	20	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	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 authorisation condition or of general/residual BATNEEC condition	0 points	0
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	5 per incident	
(C) Breach of authorisation 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	
Total	(Max. 50)	0

* *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.*

Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Score Awarded
	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation?	■	10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	-5	0	■	0
(C) Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	5	■	0
(D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation?	■	5	0	0
(E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site?	0	■	0	5
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required?	0	5	■	0
Total score	(-5 to 30)			5

Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores Awarded
	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	
(A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation?	■	5	0	0
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for these procedures?	0	■	0	5
(C) Completion of individual responsibilities checked and recorded by the company?	0	■	0	5
(D) Documented training records for all staff with air pollution control responsibilities?	0	5	■	0
(E) Trained staff on site throughout periods where potentially air-polluting activities take place?	0	5	■	0
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place?	-5	0	■	0
Total	(-5 to 25)			10
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 105			15
OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS	Range -10 to 175			37
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY * high=score of >80, medium 40-80 and low <40	LOW, MED, HIGH			LOW