

Date: 31/08/2011

Risk Assessment for Local Air Pollution Control

Name of permitted activity:	Murketts Accident Repair Centre	PG Note:	PG6/34
Discussed with:	Peter Murkett	LA Reference:	B03/97

Operator Performance Appraisal

Inspector's Name:

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

Dave Bass

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?	0	10	0	0
(B) Monitoring requirements reduced because results over time show consistent compliance?	0	0	0	0
(C) Is an appropriate maintenance schedule in place and available on request?	0	5	0	0
(D) Does the operator keep records of inspections, tests and monitoring in relation to the provisions of the permit and make them available to the regulator on request?	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?	-5	10	0	0
Total score	(-5 to 35)		0	

Component 3 - Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
Criterion	Possible Scores			Scores
	Yes	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) Does the operator maintain a record of staff training and instruction and make it available to regulator on request?	0	5	θ	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
Total	(-5 to 25) -5		-5	
Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to 110 -5		-5	

Overall scores	Score given
Operator Performance Appraisal	
Compliance Assessment	0
Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records	0
Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility	-5
Total score	-5

OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS	Range -10 to 110	-5
REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY		
* high=score of >55, medium 30-55 and low <30	LOW, MED, HIGH	LOW

Comments

The spraybooths have new control systems installed but no other changes have been made or proposed. Spraybooths maintained by STL on a 6 monthly basis and all records kept. No new staff but training still undertaken on new products. No formal EMS but site looks at reducing it's waste and recycles where they can.