

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
SOURCE INSPECTION REPORT FORM**

**I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

SOURCE NAME : N&W (Norfolk & Southern Corp.) REGISTRATION NO.: 60180  
PLANT LOCATION : Lamberts Point Yard INSPECTION DATE : Jun 24, '96  
COUNTY NUMBER : 710 PLANT ID: 00048 TGTD POLLUTANTS : PM  
SOURCE CONTACT : Wayne Henley WEATHER COND. : Warm; Clear  
SOURCE CLASS (CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) A SM B NSPS PSD NESHAP SIP

**TYPE OF INSPECTION :**

☐ SCHEDULED INSPECTION ☐ PERMIT COMPLETION ☐ FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION  
☐ COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION ☒ OTHER (EXPLAIN) Surveillance

ANNOUNCE INSPECTN : NO

INSPECTION LEVEL : 2

COMPLIANCE CODE : 3

VEE PERFORMED : YES \*

INDICATES COMPLIANCE : NO

OPERATING RATE : Max Capacity

STAFF CODE : 932

INSPECTOR : Williams, W.

**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 |                              |

**II. INSPECTION SUMMARY**

YES Were actual or potential compliance problems identified during this inspection?

YES 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?

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

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

YES Are all compliance problems indicated above minor?

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

YES Is a follow-up inspection needed?

Rate control equipment/process vulnerability to upset:

Very High \_\_\_\_\_ High \_\_\_\_\_ Average ✓ Low \_\_\_\_\_

Rate O & M practices at the site:

Very High \_\_\_\_\_ High ✓ Average \_\_\_\_\_ 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

I have been surveilling the Lamberts Point coal yard for several weeks after receiving coal dust complaints.

Coal dust from two automated railcar dumpers appear to have the most impact with regard to fugitive emissions.

Today, both North and South dumper units operated at maximum capacity. The VEE mentioned above was not recorded.

I met with the general forman, W. F. Henley, after noting a significant amount of coal dust from both dumpers (dust plumes ~55 - 70% opacity).

Henley voluntarily shut sown the South unit for 50 minutes while maintenance crews unclogged a row of spray nozzles. The North dumper also had a few clogged spray nozzles but continued on line with increased water pressure -- which eliminated visible emissions.

JUNE 26, 1996

Follow-up inspection: All spray nozzles functioning properly and operating with maximum water pressure. I noted no visible emissions today.

I am drafting a letter of admonition requesting Henley to submit a written plan for a control program to prevent future malfuntions of the dust control systems.

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

W. F. Henley

DATE: June 27, 1996

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE

[Signature]

DATE

June 27, 1996

\*\*\*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

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

SOURCE NAME N&W (Norfolk & Southern Corp.) REGISTRATION NO.: 60180

PLANT LOCATION Lamberts Point Yard INSPECTION DATE : Jun 24,'96

COUNTY NUMBER 710 PLANT ID: 00048 TGTD POLLUTANTS : PM

SOURCE CONTACT Wayne Henley WEATHER COND. : Warm;Clear

SOURCE CLASS (CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) -" A sm B NSPS PSD NESHAP SIP

TYPE OF INSPECTION :

SCHEDULED INSPECTION PERMIT COMPLETION FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION OTHER (EXPLAIN) Surveillance

ANNOUNCE INSPECTN NO

INSPECTION LEVEL 2 COMPLIANCE CODE 3

VEE PERFORMED YES INDICATES COMPLIANCE NO

OPERATING RATE Max Capacity STAFF CODE 932

INSPECTOR Williams, W.

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

II. INSPECTION SUMMARY

YES\_ Were actual or potential compliance problems identified during this inspection?

YES\_ 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?

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

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

YES- Are all compliance problems indicated above minor?

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

YES- Is a follow-up inspection needed?

Rate control equipment/process vulnerabil't to upset:  
Very High High Average 17 Low

Rate 0 & M practices at the site:  
Very High High N/ Average 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

I have been surveilling the Lamberts Point coal yard for several weeks after receiving coal dust complaints.

Coal dust from two automated railcar dumpers appear to have the most impact with regard to fugitive emissions.

Today, both North and South dumper units operated at maximum capacity. The VE E mentioned above was not recorded.

I met with the general forman, W. F. Henley, after noting a significant amount of coal dust from both dumpers (dust plumes -55 - 70% opacity).

Henley voluntarily shut sown the South unit for 50 minutes while maintenance c rews unclogged a row of spray nozzles. The North dumper also had a few clogged spr ay nozzles but continued on line with increased water pressure -- which eliminate d visible emissions.

JUNE 26, 1996

Follow-up inspection: All spray nozzles functioning properly and operating wit h maximum water pressure. I noted no visible emissions today.

I am drafting a letter of admonition requesting Henley to submit a written pla n for a control program to prevent future malfuntions of the dust control systems.

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATU DATE: June 27, 1996

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE DATE

