Risk Assessment Method for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet

| Name of Process ABP Ipswich Port Ltd | | | | PG Note | PG3/5 |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Whom score sheet discussed with | | | L | A Reference | • 3.5/RJD/3/05 |
| Inspector's Name LK | | | | Date | 26/07/2007 |
| Environmental Impact Appraisal | | | | | |
| Component 1 - Inherent Environmental Impact | Potential | | | | Comments |
| APRR Risk Rating Category | | | Possible Scores | Score Awarded | |
| (A) Category 1 | | | | 7111011010 | |
| B) Category 2 | | | | 20 | |
| (C) Category 3 | | | | | |
| Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading | | | | | Comments |
| Component 2 - 1 rogress with opgrading | | | Possible | Score | Comments |
| Status of Upgrading | | | Scores | Awarded | |
| (A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline | has yet to be read | ched | 5 | 0 | |
| (B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note dead | | | 10 | | |
| (C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC Re | | | 0 | 0 | |
| (D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC Require | ements | | -10 | | |
| Component 3 - Sensitivity and Proximity of Re | ceptors (circle ap | propriate sco | ore) | | Comments |
| | Sen | sitivity of Rec | eptors | | |
| Proximity to Emission Source | (x) High | (y) Medium | (z) Low | Score Awarded | |
| (A) <100m* | 20 | 12 | 5 | 12 | |
| (B) 100 - 250m* | 12 | 10 | 3 | | |
| (C) 250 - 500m* | 5 | 3 | 1 | | |
| (D) >500m* | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Component 4 - Other Targets | | | | | Comments |
| <u> </u> | | | Possible | Score | |
| | | | | Awarded | |
| (A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process in a potential | | | | | |
| contributor | | | | 0 | |
| (B) No such air pollution problems | (B) No such air pollution problems | | | | |
| Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal | | | | | |

Operator Performance Appraisal

| Component 5 - Compliance Assessment | Comments | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Scale of Non-Compliance | | Score | | | | | |
| i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i | Scores | Awarded | | | | | |
| (A) Incident leading to justified compliant 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 | | | | | | |
| | incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| (C) Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action | 10 per | | | | | | |
| | incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| (D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution | 15 per | | | | | | |
| | incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| (E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice | 20 per | | | | | | |
| | incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| Total | (Max. 50) | 0 | | | | | |
| * Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unrea | 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 | Comments | | | | |
|---|----------|---------------|---------|---------|--|
| Criterion | | Possible Scor | res | Score | |
| | (x) Yes | (y) No | (z) N/A | Awarded | |
| (A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation? | 0 | 10 | 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| (D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| (E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| (F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total score | | (-5 to 30) | • | 0 | |

| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training | | Comments | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------|---------|---------|--|
| Critorian | | Possible Sc | ores | Score | |
| Criterion | (x) Yes | (y) No | (z) N/A | Awarded | |
| (A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for hese 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 | 0 | |
| Total | | (-5 to 25 | 5) | 0 | |
| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal | Range -10 to 105 | | | 0 | |
| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS | | Range -10 to | 475 | 32 | |

| - | | |
|---|---------------------|------|
| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS | Range -10 to 175 | 32 |
| | | |
| MINIMUM ACHEIVABLE SCORE FOR PROCESS | Range -10 to 175 | 25 |
| | | |
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY | LOW, MED, HIGH | LOW |
| *high=score of>80, medium 40-80 and low <40 | 2011, 11125, 111011 | 2011 |

Risk Assessment Method for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet

| | TOTAL TOUGHT OF THE PARTY OF TH | notinoa ioi | | manon oon | 0. 000.0 . | Silout |
|--|--|-------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Name of Process | ABP Ipswich Port Ltd | | | | PG Note | PG3/5 |
| Whom score sheet discussed with | | | | L | A Reference | 3.5/RJD/3/05 |
| Inspector's Name | VPA | | | | Date | 04.04.11 |
| Environmental Im | pact Appraisal | | | | | |
| Component 1 - Inhere | ent Environmental Impact Potentia | al | | | | Comments |
| APRR Risk Rating Category (A) Category 1 | | | | Possible Scores | Score Awarded | |
| | | | | 10 | | |
| APRR Risk Rating Category (A) Category 1 (B) Category 2 (C) Category 3 Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading Status of Upgrading (A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached (B) Upgrading not yet complete and PG Note deadline has passed (C) Upgrading complete and meets BATNEEC Requirements (D) Emissions control exceeds BATNEEC Requirements | | | | | 20 | |
| C) Category 3 Component 2 - Progress with Upgrading Status of Upgrading (A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached | | | | | | |
| Component 2 - Progr | ess with Upgrading | | | | | Comments |
| Component 2 - Progress with opgraumy | | | | Possible | Score | |
| Status of Upgrading | | | | Scores | Awarded | |
| (A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached | | | | 5 | 0 | |
| (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 - Sensi | tivity and Proximity of Receptors | | | | | Comments |
| | | Sens | itivity of Rec | eptors | | |
| Proximity to Emissio | n Source | ., . | (y) Medium | ` , | Score Awarded | |
| (A) <100m* | | 20 | 12 | 5 | | |
| (B) 100 - 250m* | | 12 | 10 | 3 | 10 | |
| (C) 250 - 500m* (D) >500m* | | 5 | 0 | 0 | | |
| (D) >500m" | | U | Ü | U | | |
| Component 4 - Other | Targets | | | | | Comments |
| • | | | | Possible | Score | |
| | | | | Scores | Awarded | |
| (A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process in a potential contributor | | | | 10 | | |
| (B) No such air pollution problems | | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal | | | | Range 0 to 70 | 30 | |

Operator Performance Appraisal (not assessed as process has not operated for a number of years)

| Component 5 - Compliance Assessment | Comments | | |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--|
| Scale of Non-Compliance | Possible Scores | Score Awarded | |
| (A) Incident leading to justified compliant 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 incidents | 0 | |
| (C) Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action | 10 per incidents | 0 | |
| (D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution | 15 per incidents | 0 | |
| (E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice | 20 per incidents | 0 | |
| Total | (Max. 50) | 0 | |
| * <u>Unj</u> ustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unreable clearly linked to an incident at the process. | , | _ | |

| Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring | Comments | | | | |
|---|----------|--------------|---------|---------|--|
| Criterion | Р | ossible Scor | es | Score | |
| | (x) Yes | (y) No | (z) N/A | Awarded | |
| (A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation? | 0 | 10 | 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| (D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| (E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| (F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total score | | (-5 to 30) | | 0 | |

| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training a | Comments | | | | |
|---|----------|---------------|---------|---------|--|
| Criterion | | Possible Scor | res | Score | |
| Criterion | (x) Yes | (y) No | (z) N/A | Awarded | |
| (A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation? | 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 | 0 | |
| Total | | (-5 to 25) | • | 0 | |

| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal | Range -10 to 105 | 0 |
|--|------------------|-----|
| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS | Range -10 to 175 | 30 |
| | | |
| REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY *high=score of>80, medium 40-80 and low <40 | LOW, MED, HIGH | LOW |

Risk Assessment Method for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet

| Name of Process | ABP Ipswich Port Ltd | | | | PG Note | PG3/5 |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------|----------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Whom score sheet discussed with | | | | L | A Reference | • 3.5/RJD/3/05 |
| Inspector's Name | AO | | | | Date | 07/01/2009 |
| Environmental Im | pact Appraisal | | | | | |
| Component 1 - Inhere | ent Environmental Impact Potenti | ial | | | | Comments |
| APRR Risk Rating Ca | ategory | | | Possible | Score | |
| | | | | Scores | Awarded | |
| (A) Category 1 (B) Category 2 | | | | 10 20 | 20 | |
| (C) Category 3 | | | | 30 | 20 | |
| (O) Category 5 | | | | 00 | | |
| Component 2 - Progr | ess with Upgrading | | | | | Comments |
| | | | | Possible | Score | |
| Status of Upgrading (A) Upgrading not complete but PG Note deadline has yet to be reached | | | | Scores | Awarded | |
| | omplete and PG Note deadline has yet | | nea | 5 10 | 0 | |
| | te and meets BATNEEC Requireme | | | 0 | 0 | |
| | exceeds BATNEEC Requirements | 1115 | | -10 | U | |
| , | · · | | | | | |
| Component 3 - Sensi | tivity and Proximity of Receptors | | | | | Comments |
| | | Sens | itivity of Rec | eptors | 0 | |
| Proximity to Emissio | n Source | (x) High | (y) Medium | ` ' | Score Awarded | |
| (A) <100m* | | 20 | 12 | 5 | 12 | |
| (B) 100 - 250m* | | 12 | 10 | 3 | | |
| (C) 250 - 500m* | | 5 | 3 | 1 | | |
| (D) >500m* | | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Component 4 - Other | Targets | | | | | Comments |
| | | | | Possible | Score | |
| | | | | Scores | Awarded | |
| (A) Other air pollution problems in the local area to which process in a potential | | | | 10 | | |
| contributor | | | | | • | |
| (B) No such air pollution | on problems | | | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Score for Environmental Impact Appraisal | | | | Range 0 to 70 | 32 | |

Operator Performance Appraisal

| Component 5 - Compliance Assessment | omponent 5 - Compliance Assessment | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Scale of Non-Compliance | Possible Scores | Score Awarded | | | | | |
| (A) Incident leading to justified compliant 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 incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| (C) Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action | 10 per incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| (D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution | 15 per incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| (E) Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice | 20 per incidents | 0 | | | | | |
| Total | (Max. 50) | 0 | | | | | |
| * <u>Unjustified complaints may be e.g. those considered by the inspector to be unreable clearly linked to an incident at the process.</u> | | | | | | | |

| Scoring for Component 6 - Assessment of Monitoring | Assessment of Monitoring, Maintenance and Records Comments | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|---------|---------|--|--|
| Criterion | ı | Possible Sco | res | Score | | |
| Interion | (x) Yes | (y) No | (z) N/A | Awarded | | |
| (A) All monitoring undertaken to the degree required in the authorisation? | 0 | 10 | 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 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | |
| (D) Fully documented and adhered to maintenance programme, in line with authorisation? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | |
| (E) Full documented records as required in authorisation available on-site? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | |
| (F) All relevant documents forwarded to the authority by date required? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Total score | | (-5 to 30) | | 0 | | |

| Component 7 - Assessment of Management, Training | | Comments | | | |
|---|------------------|--------------|---------|---------|--|
| Criterion | Possible Scores | | | Score | |
| | (x) Yes | (y) No | (z) N/A | Awarded | |
| (A) Documented procedures in place for implementing all aspects of the authorisation? | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | |
| B) Specific responsibilities assigned to individual staff for hese 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 n place? | -5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total | (-5 to 25) | | | 0 | |
| Total Score for Operator Performance Appraisal | Range -10 to 105 | | | 0 | |
| OVERALL SCORE FOR THE PROCESS | l F | Range -10 to | 175 | 32 | |

Range -10 to 175

LOW, MED, HIGH

25

LOW

MINIMUM ACHEIVABLE SCORE FOR PROCESS

*high=score of>80, medium 40-80 and low <40

REGULATORY EFFORT CATEGORY