Risk Assessment Method for Local Air Pollution Control Score Sheet Revised July 2013

Name of authorised	Tarmac Trading Ltd, Cliff Quay, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP3
process/installation	0BS
Name of person with	Simon Fowler
whom sheet discussed	
Process Guidance Note	03/15
Local Authority Reference	EP/00000045
Inspector's Name	Ben Atkinson
Date	Friday 22 nd September 2017

Environmental Impact Appraisal

Component 1 – Inherent Environmental Impact Potential					
APRR Risk Rating Category Possible Score					
	Scores	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			

	Sensit	ivity of Rec	eptors
Proximity to Emission Source	(x) High	(y) Med	(z) Low
(A) < 100m*	20	12	5
(B) 100 - 250m*	12	10	3
(C) 250 - 500m*	5	3	1
(D) >500m*	0	0	0

steel and non-ferrous metal processes.

Note: Distances should be measured from the process itself, rather than the site boundary.

Component 3 – 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		

Operator Performance Appraisal

Component 5 – Compliance Assessment		
Scale of Non-Compliance	Possible Scores	Score Awarded
(A) Incident leading to justified complaint but no breach of any specific authorisation condition or of the general/residual BATNEEC condition	0	0
(B) Incident leading to a justified complaint*	10 per incident	
€ Breach of authorisation not leading to formal action	10 per incident	
(D) Incident leading to formal caution, Enforcement Notice or prosecution	15 per incident	
€ Incident leading to a Prohibition Notice or Suspension Notice	20 per incident	
Total	(Max 55)	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.

	Possible Scores			
Criterion	(x) Yes	(y) No	(z) N/A	Score 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
E Process operation modified where any problems indicated by monitoring?	0	10	0	0

(D) Fully documented and adhered to	0	10	0	0
maintenance programme, in line with				
authorisation?				
€ Full documented records as required in	0	5	0	0
authorisation available on-site?				
(F) All relevant documents forwarded to	0	10	0	0
the authority by date required?				
Total Score		(-5 to 45))	0

Component 7 – Assessment of Management, Training and Responsibility				
	Possible Scores			
Criterion	(x)	(y)	(z)	Score
	Yes	No	N/A	Awarded
(A) Documented procedures in place for	0	5	0	0
implementing all aspects of the				
authorisation?				
(B) Specific responsibilities assigned to	0	5	0	0
individual staff for these procedures?				
€ Completion of individual responsibilities	0	5	0	0
checked and recorded by the company?				
(D) Documented training records for all	0	5	0	0
staff with air pollution control				
responsibilities?				
€ Trained staff on site throughout periods	0	5	0	0
where potentially air-polluting activities				
take place?				
(F) Is an 'appropriate' environmental	-5	0	0	-5
management system in place?				
Total Score		(-5 to 25))	

Total for Operator Performance Appraisal	Range -10 to	-5
	105	

Overall Score for the Process	Range -10 to 195	17
Regulatory Effort Category High =>80, med = 40 - 80, low = <40	Low/Med/High	Low