

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

| Name of permitted activity: | Burgess & Walker Transport | PG Note: | 1/1 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|----------|
| Discussed with: | Bret Bills | LA Reference: | B01/92 |
| Inspector's Name: | Dave Bass | Date: | 16/02/09 |

Operator Performance Appraisal

| Component 1 - 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 | 5 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 | | |
| 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 2 - Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|-----|---------|
| Criterion | Possible Scores | | | Scores |
| | Yes | No | N/A | Awarded |
| (A) Are emissions monitored as required in the permit? Are emissions and emissions monitoring recorded as required in the permit? | θ | 10 | θ | 10 |
| (B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance? | Ð | θ | 0 | 0 |
| (C) Does the operator have records showing that each appliance has been services regularly in accordance with manufacturer's instructions? | Φ | 5 | θ | 5 |
| (D) Are there records of servicing for a minimum of two years prior to inspection? | θ | 5 | θ | 5 |
| (E) Full documented records as required in permit available on-site? | θ | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| (F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required? | -5 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Total score | | (-5 to 35) | | 25 |

| Component 3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | | | | |
|--|------------------|----|--------|---------|
| Criterion | Possible Scores | | Scores | |
| | Yes | No | N/A | Awarded |
| (A) Are clear instructions available at all times on or near the appliance detailing the correct operation and maintenance of the equipment? | θ | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| (B) Are nominated members of staff exclusively permitted to operate the appliance? | 0 | 5 | θ | 0 |
| (C) Is the list of staff permitted to operate the appliance available? | θ | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| (D) Are all nominated SWOB operating staff trained in, and conversant with, its operation? (Staff operating vapourising burners should be particularly conversant with the correct procedure for lighting from cold) | 0 | 5 | θ | 0 |
| (E) Are staff nominated to operate the alliance on site while the appliance is in use? | 0 | 5 | θ | 0 |
| (F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental management system in place? | - 5 | θ | 0 | 0 |
| Total | (-5 to 25) 0 | | 0 | |
| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal | Range -10 to 110 | | 10 | 0 |

| Overall scores | Score given |
|---|-------------|
| Operator Performance Appraisal | |
| Compliance Assessment | 0 |
| Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records | 25 |
| Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility | 0 |
| Total score | 25 |

| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROECSS | Range -10 to 110 | 25 |
|---|------------------|-----|
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY | | |
| * high=score of >55, medium 30-55 and low <30 | LOW, MED, HIGH | LOW |

Comments

No records are kept of smoke check and maintenance. Maintenance undertaken approximately 4

times a year.