38/

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

I. GENERAL INFO	ORMA I 1 UN	
SOURCE NAME	: NORFOLK & SOUTHERN RAILROAD	REGISTRATION NO.: 60180
PLANT LOCATION	:Lamberts Point Yard	INSPECTION DATE: Aug 23, '96
COUNTY NUMBER	:710	TGTD POLLUTANTS : PM
	: Wayne Henley	
SOURCE CLASS (CI	RCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) (A)	SM B NSPS PSD NESHAP SIP
TYPE OF INSPECTION	N:	
SCHDULED INSPI	ECTION PERMIT COMPLETION	✓ FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION
COMPLAINT INV	ESTIGATION <u>1</u> OTHER (EXPLAIN)	SURVEILLANCE
	: 0 1 2 3 4  : NO  : Normal  : Will Williams  CODING INFORMATION FOR COMPLIAN  4 - IN COMPLIANCE BY CERTIFICATION  HEDULE  5 - IN VIOLATION, MEETING SCHEDU  6 - IN VIOLATION, NOT MEETING SCHEDU	ION 8 - NO APPLICABLE REGULATION ULE 9 - IN COMPLIANCE, CLOSED CHEDULE
N COMPLATE NOTES Notes and Notes and Notes	ctual or potential compliance problem INTS: Are compliance problems indicource experience excessive malfunction been initiated	ons? If yes, describe: during the past two years?
<u> </u>	pection needed due to on-going or re	centry compreted emforcement!

	Y Is therean on-goingcomplianceroblem?If yes, describe: Fug coaldust
	$\underline{\mathbf{N}}$ Are therecompliance roblems involving nore than one controlor process system?
	N Are all compliance roblems indicated boveminor?
	If yes, are all complianceroblemsidentifiedbovenow resolved?
	Y_ Is a follow-upinspectiomeeded?
	Ratecontrolequipment/proce <b>ss</b> lnerabilityo upset: VeryHigh High <u>V</u> Average Low
	Rate O & M practices at the site: Very High High Average Low
	$\underline{3}$ 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 surveilled the coal yard today to check the dust suppression system on the railcar dumpers.
	I also met with Henley while there.
	I noted minimal dust from the operation $\overset{\circ}{\mathcal{C}}$ ceptable).
	N&S (Roanoke) environmental engineer, Gibson Barbee III, is currently conducting an environmental impact study for coal dust emissions at the Norfolk yard, according to Henley.
	Barbee was in town yesterday and expressed an interest in the D.E.Q. air inspection proceedures.
•	
TNCD	DATE: 8/23/96
CHDE	RVISOR'S COMMENTS:
JUFL	-IVVIOUN
<u> </u>	
SUPE	ERVISOR'S SIGNATUREDATE \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{2} \frac{1}{2}

JRANDUM FROM TILL: NOFICIK # LILSTETIN D. E.Q. (MF DIVISION) HIII MIIIAME, IMETICAR 110-11 710 00048 SUBJECT DATE JUNE 24, 1995 PORTS ON METACLES AT AITOMATED JAILTAR DUNATING DAIT. WILL SUITALESIAN ECHTREL SYSTEMS MALTHETION & NOT GILKATLD AT LIFECTIVE AMOUNT OF 7-7-1. L. =5 =51-11. L. FOLLOW-UP ON 6/26: PROBLEMS CORRECTED

Memorandum

PLEASE REPLY BY\_

Adams

NO REPLY NECESSARY\_

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

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

CO'ffONWEAL TH OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY SOURCE INSPECTION REPORT FORM

## I. GENERAL INFORMATION

SOURCE NAME NORFOLK & SOUTHERN RAILROAD REGISTRATION NO.: 60180

PLANT LOCATION Lamberts Point Yard INSPECTION DATE Aug 23,'96

COUNTY NUMBER 710 PLANT ID: 000048 TGTD POLLUTANTS PM

SOURCE CONTACT Wayne Henley WEATHER COND. Hot/humd.

SOURCE CLASS (CIRCLE ALL APPLICABLE CLASSES) '- C; SM B NSPS PSD NESHAP SIP

TYPE OF INSPECTION:

SCHDULED INSPECTION PERMIT COMPLETION FOLLOW-UP INSPECTION

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION V OTHER (EXPLAIN) SURVEILLANCE

ANNOUNCED INSPECTN NO

INSPECTION LEVEL 2 3 4 COMPLIANCE CODE 3

VEE PERFORMED NO INDICATES COMPLIANCE

OPERATING RATE Normal STAFF CODE 932

INSPECTOR Will Williams

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

- N Were actual or potential compliance problems identified during this inspection?
- N COMPLAINTS: Are compliance problems indicated?
- N Does source experience excessive malfunctions? If yes, describe:
- Y Has any enforcement action been initiated during the past two years?
- Y Is inspection needed due to on-going or recently completed enforcement?

- \* Is therean on-goinTompliancproblem';, If yes, describe: Fug coal dust
- \* AretherecompliancproblemsLnvolvingiorethanonecontrolorprocess system?
- \* Are all compliancproblem, -, @ndicateckboveminor?

If yes, are all complianceroblemsidentif iedbovenow resolved?

\* Is a follow-ulinspectioneeded?

Ratecontrolequipment/procevalnerabilitt@o upset: VeryHigh High I/ Average Low

Rate 0 & M practices at the site: Very High High Average V Low

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

## II. INSPECTION COMMENTS

I surveilled the coal yard today to check the dust suppression system on the railcar dumpers.

I also met with Henley while there.

I noted minimal dust from the operation (;;ceptable).

N&S (Roanoke) environmental engineer, Gibson Barbee III, is currently conducting an environmental impact study for coal dust emissions at the Norfolk yard, according to

Henley.

Barbee was in town yesterday and expressed 6n interest in the D.E.Q. air inspection proceedures.

INSPECTOR'S SIGN DATE-SUPERVISOR'S COMMENTS:

AO, SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE DATE

```
-jRANDUM

16 (PROM
I 1- L cl F;; I C, L K L-:S'-T C- F@ D. L. C@ V I 'n
I A t, - L c:@

BJECT

i) t-I F-1 L
r 1"I <, v., A UD A -1

L CD I-A c_@ C) F,@ LL- ZS 0 T-1 L@<_--7_L_ L)
```

Т,

L:

A 1: k',

PLEASE REPLY BY NO HEPLY NECESSARY 4Q Adams Memorandum