

NO Is inspection needed due to on-going or recently completed enforcement?

NO Is there an on-going compliance problem? If yes, describe: _____

NO Are there compliance problems involving more than one control or process system?

____ Are all compliance problems indicated above minor?

____ If yes, are all compliance problems identified above now resolved?

NO Is a follow-up inspection needed?

Rate control equipment/process vulnerability to upset:

Very High _____ High _____ Average X Low _____

Rate O & M practices at the site:

Very High _____ High _____ Average X Low _____

4 Rank the source from 1 (lowest priority) to 4 (highest priority) for an inspection next year based on your overall evaluation of the source:

II. INSPECTION COMMENTS

This inspection was conducted to evaluate control of particulate emissions during coal transfer operations.

I checked the wet suppression systems at both the railcar dumping ramp and at the "S-1" silo transfer points. The "S" silo was not on line. I found both suppression systems to be functioning effectively.

I took a visible emissions evaluation record from the S-1 silo baghouse during charging.

I reviewed the required maintenance records for air pollution control equipment and a record of monthly coal throughput. Copies are included in this report.

Yard dust did not appear to be a problem. I noted that a sweeper-vac was operating on the coal loading pier. I saw no visible emissions from conveyors.

I found no compliance problems during this inspection.

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

H. F. Huns

DATE: November 9, 1995

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE

R. L. Craft

DATE

11/13/95

OCR

The following pages contain the Optical Character Recognition text of the preceding scanned images.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
SOURCE INSPECTION REPORT FORM

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

SOURCE NAME NORFOLK & WESTERN REGISTRATION NO.: 60180

PLANT LOCATION Lambert's Point INSPECTION DATE : 11Z8Z95

COUNTY NUMBER 710 PLANT ID: 00048 TGTD POLLUTANT : PM

SOURCE CONTACT Wayne Henley WEATHER COND. : Wind-y/cool

SOURCE CLASS (CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) TOXI_C_@A2 B NSPS PSD NESHAP SIP

TYPE OF INSPECTION

X SCHEDULED INSPECTION PERMIT COMPLETION

FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

OTHER (EXPLAIN)

ANNOUNCED INSPECTION NO

INSPECTION LEVEL PERFORMED : 2 COMPLIANCE CODE 3

VEE PERFORMED : -YES INDICATES COMPLIANCE : YES

OPERATING RATE 5,500 TONS/HOUR

INSPECTOR Williams, W. STAFF CODE : 932

CODING INFORMATION FOR COMPLIANCE STATUS

0 - UNKNOWN 4 - IN COMPLIANCE BY CERTIFICATION 8 - NO APPLICABLE REGULATION
1 - IN VIOLATION - NO SCHEDULE 5 - IN VIOLATION, MEETING SCHEDULE 9 - IN COMPLIANCE, CLOSED
2 - IN COMPLIANCE BY SOURCE TEST 6 - IN VIOLATION, NOT MEETING SCHEDULE
3 - IN COMPLIANCE BY INSPECTION 7 - IN VIOLATION, UNKNOWN WITH RESPECT TO SCHEDULE

11. INSPECTION SUMMARY

NO Were actual or potential compliance problems identified during this inspection?

NO COMPLAINTS: Are compliance problems indicated?

NO- Does source experience excessive malfunctions? If yes, describe:

NO Has any enforcement action been initiated during the past two years?

NO_ Is inspection needed due to on-going or recently completed enforcement?

NQ_ Is there an on-going compliance problem? If yes, describe:

NO Are there compliance problems involving more than one control or process system?

Are all compliance problems indicated above minor?

If yes, are all compliance problems identified above now resolved?

NQ_ Is a follow-up inspection needed?

Rate control equipment/process vulnerability to upset:
Very High High Average x Low

Rate O & M practices at the site:
Very High High Average x Low

4 Rank the source from 1 (lowest priority) to 4 (highest priority) for an inspection next year based on your overall evaluation of the source:

11. INSPECTION COMMENTS

This inspection was conducted to evaluate control of particulate emissions during coal transfer operations.

I checked the wet suppression systems at both the railcar dumping ramp and at the IIS-1" silo transfer points. The "IS" silo was not on line. I found both suppression systems to be functioning effectively.

I took a visible emissions evaluation record from the S-1 silo baghouse during charging.

I reviewed the required maintenance records for air pollution control equipment and a record of monthly coal throughput. Copies are included in this report.

Yard dust did not appear to be a problem. I noted that a sweeper-vac was operating on the coal loading pier. I saw no visible emissions from conveyors.

I found no compliance problems during this inspection.

INSPECTOR'S SI DATE: November 9, 1995

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE -DATE