Environmental
Protection Agency
Governor
Lt. Governor
Director

October 31, 2011

RE: NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION
ASHTABULA COAL DOCK
OHIO EPA PERMIT NO 3IT00011
ASHTABULA CITY, ASHTABULA COUNTY
COPI GENERAL PLAN REVISION 01-24-11

Mr. C. Russell McDaniel, P.E.
Director of Environmental Engineering, Remediation and Compliance
Norfolk Southern Corporation
1200 Peachtree Street NE, Box 13
Atlanta, GA 30309

Dear Mr. McDaniel:

Ohio EPA has completed its review of a January 2011 document titled *General Plan, Ashtabula Coal Dock and Transloading Facility, Ashtabula, Ohio*. The document was received on January 24, 2011. The plan was prepared by Norfolk Southern Railway Company (NS) for the coal dock facility, located at 645 East 6th Street, City of Ashtabula, Ashtabula County. The facility is currently owned and operated by NS. The document was prepared in response to an October 26, 2010, Consent Order for Preliminary Injunction (COPI) addressing alleged violations of Ohio's water pollution control laws. The COPI, which was incorporated into Order No 6 of the August 11, 2011, Consent Order, was executed by the State of Ohio, Norfolk Southern Railway Co., and the City of Ashtabula, and entered as a judgment of the Court of Common Pleas for the County of Ashtabula, State of Ohio

The January 24, 2001, General Plan was reviewed for compliance with Order Nos. 11 and 12 of the October 26, 2010, COPI and applicable portions of ORC Chapter 6111 and the regulations adopted thereunder

Order No. 11 of the October 26, 2010, COPI states:

11. *At the time of entry of this COPI, Defendant washes the bridge approximately every ten (10) days to prevent the buildup of coal dust for safety and fire suppression. The washing frequently results in the unpermitted discharge of wash water to waters of the state. In order to address discharges from the Bridge, Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined, within ninety (90) days of the effective date of this COPI, to submit to Ohio EPA for approval a General Plan that identifies options for elimination of the discharge of wash water from the Bridge in accordance with (i) through (iv), below. Such options shall be evaluated, and the option(s) to be implemented shall be chosen, in accordance with R.C. Chapter 6111.*

    i. *The General Plan shall identify options and recommend improvements and/or options requiring further evaluation for achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the Bridge, including structural modifications and/or improvements to the Bridge, changes in maintenance procedures and practices for operation and cleaning of the Bridge and implementation of any other best management practices ("BMP"). The Plan shall include a schedule for implementing the recommended improvements If the schedule is longer than set forth in*

Northeast District Office
2110 East Aurora Road
Twinsburg, OH 44087-1924

330 | 963 1200
330 | 487 0769 (fax)
www.epa.ohio.gov

Paragraph 12, Defendant shall provide justification for a longer schedule. The Plan shall include recommendations as to what BMP(s) should be included into future renewals and/or modifications of the NPDES permit for this facility concerning the operation and maintenance of the Bridge. In addition, the General Plan shall identify how the Bridge will be monitored for any discharges from the Bridge, including but not limited to wash water, during the implementation of the General Plan and subsequently during any Bridge operation and maintenance activities.

ii. After review of the General Plan, or any submission required under this paragraph of the COPI, Ohio EPA shall in writing (a) approve, in whole or in part, the General Plan and its recommendations or any submission; (b) approve the General Plan or submission with specified modifications and/or identifying any option requiring further evaluation; (c) disapprove, in whole or in part, the General Plan or submission directing defendant to modify the disapproved portion of the General Plan or submission; or (d) any combination of the above. Action of the Ohio EPA approving or disapproving the General Plan shall not constitute an action of the Director of Ohio EPA approving or disapproving an application for any NPDES permit or application for a permit-to-install (PTI).

(a) In the event of Ohio EPA approval of the General Plan and/or submissions required under this paragraph, Defendant shall proceed to take any action required by the approved General Plan or submission.

(b) In the event Ohio EPA disapproves of or modifies all or any portion of the General Plan or submission, Defendant shall have the opportunity to meet or confer with Ohio EPA within twenty (20) days of receipt of such written notification of disapproval or modification, or such longer time as may be agreed to by the Ohio EPA and Defendant in writing, to discuss and reach agreement concerning the modifications, deficiencies or conditions identified by Ohio EPA. The City of Ashtabula may participate in any such meeting or conference. Based on this meeting or conference, Ohio EPA may, after reasonable opportunity for review and comment by the City of Ashtabula, either decide to revise any such modification, deficiency, or condition or decide that its originally proposed modification, deficiency, or condition is appropriate. Ohio EPA shall provide Defendant and City of Ashtabula with written notice of its decision.

(c) If Defendant does not exercise the opportunity to meet or confer with Ohio EPA or if Defendant accepts Ohio EPA's final decision, Defendant shall take any action required by the modifications, notice of deficiencies, or conditions identified by Ohio EPA in its disapproval or its final decision, whichever is applicable.

iii. If the Director determines the General Plan or submission is incomplete, insufficient, or not approvable, then Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to submit to the Director a revised version of the document that addresses the deficiencies noted

within fourteen (14) business days of receipt of a deficiency notification from the Ohio EPA.

iv. *Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to implement the approved General Plan in accordance with the schedule set forth in Paragraph 12.*

Order No. 12 of the October 26, 2010, COPI states:

12. *The General Plan shall be implemented as follows:*

i. *Within ninety (90) days of the approval of the General Plan, or as otherwise provided in the approved schedule contained in the General Plan as submitted or modified pursuant to Paragraph 11, Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to submit complete and approvable PTI applications and detailed plans, as appropriate, for applicable improvements contained in the General Plan to both the Division of Surface Water and the Division of Air Pollution Control of Ohio EPA as appropriate. Such PTI shall include a proposed schedule for initiation of a bid process for such improvements, initiation of construction, and completion of construction. If the Director determines the PTI applications and detailed plans are incomplete, insufficient, or not approvable, then Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to submit to the Director a revised version of the documents that addresses the deficiencies noted within fourteen (14) business days of receipt of a deficiency notification from the Ohio EPA.*

ii. *Defendant shall complete construction of improvements to the Bridge in accordance with the approved PTIs and detailed plans.*

iii *Three (3) months after completing construction of all Bridge improvements, Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to submit a report evaluating the effectiveness of the Bridge improvements in eliminating discharges of wash water from the Bridge into waters of the state.*

iv *If the Bridge improvements have not resulted in the elimination of the discharge of wash water from the Bridge into waters of the state and compliance with all NPDES permits terms and conditions for this facility, Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to include in its report recommendations for additional improvements to the Bridge to eliminate discharges into waters of the state and to comply with the NPDES permit and a schedule for implementation of the recommendations based on the study of additional items as identified in the General Plan. Defendant is hereby ordered and enjoined to implement the recommendations for improvements to the Bridge in accordance with the schedule as set forth in the General Plan upon approval by Ohio EPA.*

We have completed this review and offer the following

Comments – These general comments are applicable to the entire General Plan and should be considered incorporated into all the deficiencies noted.

1. The General Plan speaks throughout the document about "reduction" or "elimination, if possible" of the discharges of pollutants from the Facility. Also, the executive summary in the Procedure and Maintenance Recommendations report compiled by NS's consulting firm SAFE lists the goals of the report. Elimination of the leakage from the bridge was not listed as one of the goals, but rather reduction only. Orders Nos. 11 and 12 of the COPI specifically require NS to "identify options and recommend improvements and/or options requiring further evaluation for achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the Bridge" Therefore, it does not appear that the issue of elimination of the discharge has fully been addressed in this report or accurately conveyed to the consulting firm(s). Several options appear to have been either eliminated from further consideration, or never considered, such as installation of a gutter system beneath the bridge, installing a spray-on liner, construction of a new bridge, etc. Per Order 12(iv) of the October 26, 2010, COPI, NS is to thoroughly evaluate all alternatives. NS should have its consulting firm(s) readdress each option with this in mind and make all appropriate changes to this General Plan as necessary. The General Plan must be rewritten to evaluate alternatives with the objective of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the bridge, not simply a reduction or possible elimination. Ohio EPA can accept a combination of individual alternatives, each of which will reduce or possibly eliminate discharge of wash water from the bridge, as part of a General Plan which has the overall objective of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the bridge.

2. The General Plan needs to be rewritten because it currently has a lot of extraneous or repeated information that is making the document confusing to follow. There is too much reiteration of what has been done, what will be done, what maintenance schedule to follow, etc. The General Plan should be a clear and concise document.

3. The plan needs to be updated to reflect activities that have already been completed and activities yet to be completed.

Deficiencies

1. *I.B. Summary of Source of Recommendations for Discharge of Pollutants from Coal Bridge.*

   a. *Overall Comment (pg 2):* The last paragraph of this heading section and paragraphs (1) – (6) should be removed or included in different sections of the General Plan, if not already incorporated, because these items are not part of a summary or the "source of recommendations". See also Comment 1, page 4.

   b. *(1) Operations / Conveyor 2 Belt Loading (pg 2):* This should be moved to another section. Also, this section identifies a number of improvements made and proposed. The section should offer specifics of what has been completed to-date, and a

,specific schedule for implementation of improvements not yet completed. Terms like "routine" and "periodic" must be avoided. Inspection frequencies should specify a minimum interval, with additional inspections as needed

c. *(2) Dust Suppression and Control (pg 3):* It is unclear to Ohio EPA why this paragraph is included in the General Plan, as it has nothing to do with the general plan requirements to eliminate wash water discharges from the Bridge.

d. *(3) Wash Water Management (pg 3):* This should be moved to another section and be updated to reference that this activity has already been completed and the date it became operational.

e. *(4) Coal Bridge Gallery Sealing and Structural Controls (page 3):* This should be moved to another section. The section states that a series of structural modifications were proposed without providing any detail on those modifications. The section should identify all modifications proposed in the assessment, which ones are being considered and will be implemented by NS, and which ones have already been completed. The paragraph states that the partial floor replacement resulted in the elimination of some sources of leakage. The paragraph should specify what improvements will be made and a schedule for their implementation for eliminating all sources of leakage associated with the floor.

f. *(5) Coal Bridge Washing Best Management Practices (pg 3):* This should be moved to another section. The section speaks to alternative Bridge washing methods and developed management practices which reduce and minimize the escape of wash water from the Bridge and controls that will achieve significant level of reduction and minimization of discharges. See Comment 1, page 4. The section must be re-written to reflect the object of the General Plan to eliminate the discharge of wash water from the Bridge.

g. *(6) Operation and Maintenance (pg 3):* This should be moved to another section. The section states that facility operation and maintenance procedures have been modified to include enhanced and periodic inspection and maintenance of key Facility structures. Such procedures must specify minimum inspection frequencies with additional inspections as warranted

h. The first paragraph on Page 4 should be moved to another section.

i. The second paragraph on Page 4 references the Environmental Management System (EMS). This paragraph is mostly air emissions related and not related to the General Plan requirements prescribed by Order nos. 11 and 12 of the October 26, 2010 COPI. Also, Ohio EPA disagrees with the uniqueness of the Bridge as many power plants have similar conveyors for movement of both coal and coal ash This paragraph should be removed.

j.

2. *III.B. Options and Recommendations Considered, but Not Pursued, to Decrease Coal Particulate from the Coal Bridge Due to Cleaning:*

   a. *Overall Comment (pg 9):* This heading is inappropriate. All options considered should be for *achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the bridge*, so the heading should be revised and the section adjusted to include all options. Currently, at least one option has been omitted:

      Maintaining Separate Coal Loading/Unloading Operations on Each Side of the River: Ohio EPA notes that, historically, rail loading on the east and west sides of the Ashtabula River were separate operations prior to 1968 with rail lines located on both the east and west sides of the river. Therefore, there was no need for a coal conveyor across the Ashtabula River. This alternative should be presented and a rationale of why it was or was not considered for further evaluation, including the costs of such a conversion.

   b. *(2) Install Under Hanging Gutter (pg 9):* It spears that this alternative was not fully evaluated, as it appears that there may be some lightweight systems that could be installed close enough to the existing structure to achieve the objective. It would also appear that a flushing system could be designed at the high point of the bridge to facilitate adequate cleaning without endangering Norfolk Southern employees

   c. *(4) Synthetic Liner for Seams and Joints (pg 9-10):* It is unclear as to why this option was considered but not pursued. Please provide a more thorough explanation as to why this option was considered but not pursued.

   d. *(5) New Bridge (pg 10):* The section states that bridge replacement is not practical when compared to other methods identified under selected options. As noted in Comment 1, the goal of the options is elimination of the discharge of wash water from the bridge. Therefore, a new bridge is an option which must be considered. Any new bridge alternative must be designed to convey all wash waters to a collection and treatment system prior to discharge to waters of the state. It does not appear that this option was fully investigated and evaluated.

   e. *(6) Transfer Chute Sealing (pg 11):* The plan states that the installation of dust tight access doors would not significantly reduce dust at the transfer point. The purpose of the plan is to eliminate unauthorized discharges to waters of the state. The alternative must be examined from the standpoint of eliminating unauthorized discharges of untreated wash waters and precipitation mixed with coal dust from reaching waters of the state without proper treatment.

3. *III.C. Structural Modifications and Improvements Options and Recommendations to Pursue to Decrease Coal Particulate Discharge from the Coal Bridge Due to Cleaning:*

   a. *Overall Comment (pg 11).* The title and the narrative of this section suggests that particulate discharge, and the inferred wash water, can only be reduced and not

eliminated, the goal stipulated by the October 26, 2010, COPI. The section must be revised to reflect the criteria specified by the October 26, 2010, COPI, which is to "recommend improvements and/or options for achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the Bridge." See Comment 1, page 4

b. *Overall Comment (entire section):* Per Ohio EPA's inspection of October 20, 2011, it appears that most, if not all of this work has already been completed. Please revise the section to reflect work already completed and work remaining. If additional work must be scheduled when the conveyor is not in operation, it should be underway when the conveyor is down for the season. The anticipated completion dates for work which remains of July 15, 2012, is unacceptable, unless specific technical justification is provided as to why the work cannot be completed at the conclusion of the annual shut down period which should be no later than March 31, 2012.

c. *(1) Seal Openings in Floor, Walls, and Ceiling of C2 conveyor Bridge (pp 11-12).* This option is identified as reducing or eliminating some sources of discharge of pollutants. See Comment 1, page 4 and Comment 3b, above

d. *(2) Install New Flashing Panels to Direct Washdown Effluent Away from Ventilation Openings (pg 12).* This option is identified as reducing or eliminating some sources of discharge of pollutants. See Comment 1, page 4 and Comment 3b, above

e. *(3) Rotate Drain Grating 90 degrees (pg 12):* See Comment 3b, above

f. *(4) Additional Floor Panel Replacement (pg 12):* This option is identified as eliminating nearly 100% of floor related discharges. See Comment 1, page 4 and Comment 3b, above

4. *IV.A. Changes in Maintenance Procedures and Practices for Operation and Cleaning, Options and Recommendations Already Implemented (pg 13):*

a. *Overall Comment (page 13):* These options are identified as having been implemented to reduce discharges from the Bridge. See Comment 1, page 4

b. *(1) Coal Loading (pg 13):* Periodic inspection should be defined as a specified minimum with additional inspections as warranted.

c. *(2) Coal Bridge Washing Procedures (pg 13):* The procedure states that there will be a minimum of three employees to conduct the task, and identifies what each person does. It is unclear to Ohio EPA how an employee will be able to both operate the water system pressure and observe any discharge from the bridge. The procedure describes detecting the potential for "excessive" leakage, which is not the goal of the General Plan. The General Plan was to "identify options and recommend improvements and/or options requiring further evaluation for achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the Bridge." All leakage and discharges should be recorded, not just "excessive" or "extraordinary" leakage or

discharge. Please note that your NPDES renewal will contain language about reporting all discharges, and Ohio EPA may require that you report any complaints received regarding leakage to Ohio EPA.

d. *(3) Coal Fine Cleaning (page 14):* The section states that periodic cleaning of coal fines from the eastern part of the Facility is conducted. As an enforceable general plan, a minimum cleaning frequency must be specified, and state that more frequent cleaning will be conducted as warranted.

e. *(4) Periodic Inspection of the Drainage Area Below the Coal Bridge (pg 14):* The section states that periodic inspections of the drainage area below the coal bridge have been conducted since July 2008. As an enforceable general plan, a minimum inspection frequency must be specified and state that more frequent inspections will be conducted as warranted. It should be noted that an inspection of the area beneath the bridge from the ODNR facility following a January 18, 2011, inspection of the NS facility indicated coal dust stained snow beneath the Bridge on the east bank of the Ashtabula River and a layer of coal dust on new windows installed on December 23, 2010, at the ODNR building. Another incident involving a motorcycle becoming covered in wash water with coal fines was noted by ODNR staff in August 2011 .

5. *IV.C. Changes in Maintenance Procedures and Practices for Operation and Cleaning, Options and Recommendations to Pursue to Decrease Coal Particulate Discharge from the Coal Bridge Due to Cleaning – Operations and Maintenance Plan (pg 15):*

a. *Overall Comment (pg 15):* The title and the narrative of this section suggest that particulate discharge, and the inferred wash water, can only be reduced and not eliminated. The section must be revised to reflect the criteria specified by the October 26, 2010, COPI, which is to "recommend improvements and/or options for achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the Bridge." See Comment 1, page 4.

b. *Accompanying Schedule for Implementation (pg 15):* The section identifies items that Norfolk Southern envisions to conduct, with the document citing or implying schedules throughout. The section must summarize a schedule for implementation, preferably in tabular form, of ongoing inspection, maintenance, and equipment replacement schedules, we well as identify all milestones of uncompleted work referenced in this plan.

c. *BMPs for inclusion into the General Plan (pg 16):* The first sentence on page 16 states that the operations plans include the recommended BMPs which are required for inclusion in this General Plan pursuant to the COPI at Paragraph 11. The sentence should reference both paragraphs 11 and 12 of the COPI.

d. *(1) Regular Inspection of Conveyor Belt (pg 16):* The plan states that the conveyor belt will be inspected annually for damage and wear. It appears prudent to inspect

the belt for damage and wear more frequently, considering that the system will be washed every 10 days. The section should also include a schedule for routine replacement of the conveyor belt, specifying a minimum frequency

e. *(2) Regular Inspection of the Coal Bridge Drainage System (pg 16):* The section states that periodic inspections of the drainage system will be made, and specifies a minimum inspection frequency of annually. This inspection should be conducted during all wash events. With the description of the crew who will perform the coal bridge washing, it is unclear to Ohio EPA how a crew member will remain on the ground to observe washing and identify sources of leakage while operating water system pressure. The section should also specify what specific actions will be performed if a leak is detected.

f. *(3) Inspection and Routine Replacement of Skirt Rubber (pg 17):* The section states that "regular" inspections of the skirt rubber for assessment of damage and to ensure proper function are recommended. As an enforceable general plan, a minimum inspection frequency must be specified and state that more frequent inspections will be conducted as warranted. The section should also include a schedule for routine replacement of skirt rubber, specifying a minimum frequency.

g. *(4) Inspection and Periodic Repair or Replacement of Scrapers (pg 17).* The section states that "regular" inspections of the scrapers will be made, and specifies a minimum inspection frequency of annually. The section should also include a schedule for routine replacement of scrapers, specifying a minimum frequency.

h. *(5) Inspection of Flooring for Corrosion or Leakage (pg 17):* The section states that periodic inspections of the flooring will be made, and specifies a minimum inspection frequency of annually. This inspection should be conducted during all wash events. However, with the description of the crew who will perform the coal bridge washing, it is unclear to Ohio EPA how a crew member will remain on the ground to observe washing and identify sources of leakage from the flooring while operating water system pressure. The section should also specify what specific actions will be performed if a leak is detected.

i. *(6) Inspection and Repair or Replacement of Wear Plates (pg 17):* The section states that periodic inspections of the wear plates will be made, and specifies a minimum inspection frequency of annually. Wear plate inspection should be performed more frequently than annually, perhaps monthly. The section should also include a schedule for routine replacement of wear plates, specifying a minimum frequency.

6. *V. Recommended BMPs for Operation and Maintenance of the Coal Bridge for Future Renewal and/or Modifications of the NPDES Permit for this Facility.*

a. *General Comment (pg 18):* Paragraph 11.i. of the COPI provides in part:

The General Plan shall identify options and recommend improvements and/or options requiring further evaluation for achieving the purpose of eliminating the discharge of wash water from the Bridge, including structural modifications and/or improvements to the Bridge, changes in maintenance procedures and practices for operation and cleaning of the Bridge and implementation of any other best management practices ("BMP")..... The Plan shall include recommendations as to what BMP(s) should be included into future renewals and/or modifications of the NPDES permit for this facility concerning the operation and maintenance of the Bridge.

The BMPs in the General Plan should be addressed to these purposes. The legal arguments concerning effluent limitations and BMPs, etc., in the paragraph on page 17-18 and the second full paragraph on page 18 do not belong in the General Plan and should be removed.

b. *General Comment (pg 18):* It is unclear to Ohio EPA what the purpose of the first three paragraphs in Section V. on pages 17-18 serve. The paragraphs should be removed from the General Plan.

c. *BMP 1 – Coal Bridge Washing Procedures (pp 18-19):* It appears that the size of the crew assigned to do the coal bridge washing is inadequate to perform the necessary tasks. It appears that one person cannot effectively watch the gauges and effectively observe potential leakage from the bridge. It appears that there needs to be additional personnel specifically assigned to watch for any leakage, not just "excessive" leakage, from the bridge. The words "excessive leakage", "extraordinary leakage" and "discharge out of the ordinary" must be stricken from the section as any leakage or discharges must be recorded, reported and assessed.

d. *BMP2 – Inspection During Coal Bridge Washing and Repair/Maintenance (pg 19):* It is unclear to Ohio EPA how a crew member can remain both on the ground and able to observe any cracks, breakages, or blockage within the drainage system and monitor water system pressure at the same time. The section should address that design changes may be warranted as well as that procedure changes may be implemented based upon the leak assessment. If repairs or maintenance to address cracks, breakages, or blockages cannot be completed prior to the next bridge washing event, the section should speak to what temporary measures would be implemented until permanent actions could be taken.

e. *BMP3 – Periodic Inspection of the Drainage Area Below the Coal Bridge (pg 19):* This section states variously that "[p]eriodic inspections of the drainage area below the Coal Bridge will be conducted during bridge washing events . . .," "visual observations of bridge discharges and areas below the bridge will be conducted during wash events . . .," and "[a]dditional inspections of the ground area below the Coal Bridge . . . will take place once per month. . ." Clarification of whether these are referring to the same or different kinds of inspections is necessary. The section should be clear as to the minimum inspection frequency, as in during each and every

wash event and during certain precipitation events. Any discharge must be recorded, not just "significant" discharge.

f. *BMP4 – Inspection and Maintenance:* The section states that the Facility shall develop an inspection and maintenance program, and schedule to ensure that general maintenance is performed. A schedule should be developed now and incorporated into the plan, with provisions for a minimum of annual review and revision as required. As stated elsewhere, conveyor belt inspections, scraper inspections, skirt rubber inspections, wear plate inspections, and floor inspections should be performed more frequently than once annually. These activities should be performed as a part of the belt washing operations. Additionally, a schedule for routine replacement of each of these pieces of equipment, specifying a minimum frequency for each, should be included.

g. *BMP5 – Coal Bridge Housekeeping:* Regarding the items specified in the section, Norfolk Southern states that they will address these items immediately. The section should clarify that these items will be addressed immediately and prior to washing the bridge again.

7. *VI. A. Schedule for Implementing Recommended Improvements – Structural Modifications and Improvements*

a. *General Comment:* Per Ohio EPA's inspection of October 20, 2011, it appears that most, if not all of this work has already been completed. Please revise the section to reflect work already completed and work remaining. If additional work must be scheduled when the conveyor is not in operation, it should be underway when the conveyor is down for the season. The anticipated completion dates for work which remains of July 15, 2012, is unacceptable, unless specific technical justification is provided as to why the work cannot be completed at the conclusion of the annual shut down period which should be no later than March 31, 2012.

b. *(1) Floor Joints, Floor Escape Doors, Ceiling and Wall Joint Sealing (pp 20-21):* See Comment 1, page 4 and 7a, above.

c. *(2) Installation of flashing Panels (pg 21):* See Comment 1, page 4 and 7a, above.

d. *(3) Rotation of Drain Grating 90 Degrees (pg 21).* See Comment 1, page 4 and 7a, above.

e. *Technical Justification for Alternate Schedule (pg 22):* Norfolk Southern provides a technical justification stating that these items require specialized contractor assistance and must be conducted when there is a significantly reduced coal conveyance. These identified items have been known for a while, and Norfolk Southern should have scheduled these items during the Bridge shutdown in the winter of 2010-2011 or during times of significantly reduced coal conveyance prior in the fall of 2011.

8. *VII. Conclusion*

   a. *General Comment (pp 22-23):* The conclusion of items to do will change based upon the comments listed above.

   b. *Closing Paragraph of the Section (pg 23):* See Comment 1, page 4.

If you have any questions or comments regarding this review, please feel free to contact me at (330) 963-1175.

Respectively,

John M. Schmidt P.E., R.S.
Environmental Engineer
Division of Surface Water

JMS/cs

pc: Paul Zottola, Norfolk Southern
Charlie Jones, Norfolk Southern
Martha Horvitz, Ohio EPA Legal
David Dokko, AGO-EES

File: Industrial/Norfolk Southern Railway (Ashtabula)/PC

2011 NOV -2 PM 1:55
LEGAL OFFICE