

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
DEPARTMENT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL  
SOURCE INSPECTION REPORT FORM

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

SOURCE NAME PIER 9 REGISTRATION NO. 60979  
LOCATION TERMINAL AVE NPK INSPECTION DATE 06/4/95  
COUNTY NO. 700 PLANT ID 00071 SOURCE TYPE COAL TERMINAL  
SOURCE CLASS (CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) A1 (A2) B NSPS PSD NESHAP TOXIC  
SOURCE CONTACT MR. WOLFINGTON WEATHER CONDITIONS FAIR/WARM

TYPE OF INSPECTION

☒ SCHEDULED INSPECTION ☐ PERMIT COMPLETION  
☐ FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION ☐ COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION  
☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) \_\_\_\_\_ ANNOUNCED INSPECTION (CIRCLE ONE) YES (NO)

INSPECTION LEVEL PERFORMED (CIRCLE ONE) 0 1 (2) 3 4 COMPLIANCE CODE 3  
VEE PERFORMED (CIRCLE ONE) YES (NO) INDICATES COMPLIANCE (CIRCLE ONE) YES (NO)  
OPERATING RATE SHIP LOAD OUT - @ CAPACITY.  
INSPECTOR J.E. STEWART STAFF CODE 737

CODING INFORMATION FOR COMPLIANCE STATUS

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

II. INSPECTION SUMMARY

Were actual or potential compliance problems identified during this inspection? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO ✓ (If yes explain in comments section.)

Complaints: Are compliance problems indicated? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO ✓ (If yes, explain in the comment section.)

Does source experience excessive malfunctions? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO ✓ If yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

Has any enforcement action been initiated during the past two years? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO ✓

Is inspection needed due to on-going or recently completed enforcement? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO ✓



## II. INSPECTION SUMMARY (CONTINUED)

PAGE 2

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

Are there compliance problems involving more than one control or process system?

YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Are all compliance problems indicated above minor? YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

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

YES ☐ NO ☒ N/A

Is a follow-up inspection needed? YES ☐ NO ☒

Rate control equipment/process vulnerability to upset:

Very High ☐ High ☐ Average ☒ Low ☐

Rate O & M practices at the site:

Very High ☐ High ☐ Average ☒ Low ☐

Rank the source from 1 (lowest priority) to 4 (highest priority) for an inspection next year based on your overall evaluation of the source: 3

## III. INSPECTION COMMENTS:

Source was unloading coal ship @ capacity. Recovery transfer and ship loader were operating without visual emissions. Cement loadout of trucks was also witnessed - no visual emissions. Pressure drop across baghouse 4.5" Wg. Off loading of cement to rail cars via trucks (Temporary arrangement) had previously been observed on 2/14/95 (original start) and on many subsequent occasions with visual emissions. Permit to construct permanent loadout has been issued. PASS & PASS SYSTEM verified on 2/15

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS? YES ☐ (See Page(s) ☐) NO ☐

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE:   1  /  1  /  

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

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE   e  

DATE:   1  /  1  /



SOURCE NAME: PIER IX

REGISTRATION NO 60979

LOCATION: TARAMITAL AVE NPN

INSPECTION DATE 06/14/95

COMMENTS (CONTINUED): 16/17/95 for accuracy and correct watering during pre and post freeze conditions. The area of concern was to insure data from one 24 hour period was being correctly carried over (brought forward) to the next day. This concern was generated by Dominion who during this same time period had some consistently missing hourly data. Fault due to model of display gate by Simpson Weather Associates. Dominion was corrected and Pier IX has been reviewed and found to be correct. During this review a problem of cycle credit was unearthed that has been or will be corrected prior to next fall and winter freeze conditions.

Dominion has the capability to administer 3 consecutive cycles in one clock hour. Pier IX does not. In the pre and post freeze mod, 3 consecutive cycles are required. In Pier IX case credit due to clock hours was recording 2 on one hour and the next 1 hour or 2 or 1 or mod. This did not generate the correct "rain sequence" and gave invalid readings.

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE

DATE: 06/14/95

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE

DATE: 6/22/95



\*\*\*OCR\*\*\*

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

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
DEPARTMENT OF AIR POLLUTION CONTROL  
SOURCE INSPECTION REPORT FORM

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

SOURCE NAME REGISTRATION NO.

LOCATION INSPECTION DATE 10116741E@@

COUNTY NO. PLANT ID SOURCE TYPE Ow 4 //,- L

SOURCE CLASS (CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) A1 (g) B NSPS PSD NESHAP TOXIC

SOURCE CONTACT WEATHER CONDITIONS

TYPE OF INSPECTION

It i' SCHEDULED INSPECTION PERMIT COMPLETION

F] FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION

OTHER (EXPLAIN) ANNOUNCED INSPECTION (CIRCLE ONE) YES 4CO

INSPECTION LEVEL PERFORMED (CIRCLE ONE) 0 1 (n2 3 4 COMPLIANCE CODE

VEE PERFORMED (CIRCLE ONE) YES INDICATES COMPLIANCE (CIRCLE ONE) YES  
Ng

OPERATING RATE s5A-  
.Z2

INSPECTOR STAFF CODE

CODING INFORMATION FOR COMPLIANCE STATUS ..J

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

II. INSPECTION SUMMARY

Were actual or potential compliance problems identified during this inspection? YES NO  
@@ (If yes explain in comments section.)

Complaints: Are compliance problems indicated? YES NO (If yes, explain in the comment section.)

Does source experience excessive malfunctions? YES NO yes, describe:

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

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

C'  
:I

II. INSPECTION SUMMARY (CONTINUED) PAGE 2

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

Are there compliance problems involving more than one control or process system?

YES NO 1-1,4-- -

Are all compliance problems indicated above minor? YES NO eZ14

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

YES NO

Is a follow-up inspection needed? YES NO

Rate control equipment/process vulnerability to upset:

Very High High Average Low

Rate O & M practices at the site:

Very High High Average Low

Rank the source from 1 (lowest priority) to 4 (highest priority) for an inspection

next year based on your overall evaluation of the source: '@3

III. INSPECTION COMMENTS:

,0V

r7

IL

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS? YES (See Page(s)) NO

INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE DATE:

SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

17

SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE DATE:

i (CONTINUED) PAGE  
I.I. -INSPECTION COMMENT!

SOURCE NAME: REGISTRATION NO

LOCATION: INSPECTION DATE

CONNENTS (CONTINUED): od

0001,  
!0,00,@

Iz  
C

imik,CTOR'S SIGNATURE DATE:  
SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE DATE: EL