

Mr. Tim Ross
New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
50 Wolf Road
Albany, New York 12233

Dear Mr. Ross:

This is in response to Leon Sedefian's September 30, 1992 memorandum to you regarding the Impact Evaluation Approach proposed in Part 231-3.6. We received a carbon copy of this memorandum where we were asked for comments. In particular, Leon requested clarifications on 1) the emissions which should be used for modeling the source providing the offsets and 2) the definition of the proposed source's "affected" area.

With respect to the emissions which should be used to model the offset source, the memorandum stated that the actual annual emissions should be used for modeling the annual offsets. For short term impacts, the offset source should be modeled in a similar manner as is defined for PSD increment expansion, i.e., it's maximum actual emissions limit with the highest occurrence of the specific averaging period during the previous two years of operation. Both of these emission limits and averaging times are correct and in conformance with 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix S - Emission Offset Interpretative Ruling.

With respect to the proposed source's "affected" area, the memorandum suggested that this area could be identified in a similar manner as is done in PSD, i.e., the proposed source's affected area is its significant Impact Area (SIA). For those sources that do not have a significant impact or a larger area than the SIA is desired, the net air quality benefit should be demonstrated over a receptor grid contained in an acceptable modeling protocol.

We agree with this concept as a general rule. However, the offsetting source's SIA may not exactly overlap the proposed source's SIA. We believe that the attempt to accomplish this should be the goal, but may not be feasible in all cases. Thus, the criteria of a net air quality benefit does not mean that the applicant must show an air quality improvement in every location affected by the proposed source but must show reasonable further progress towards attainment in the nonattainment area. This is properly defined in your Part 231-3.6 as "...the net impact of the proposed emissions increase and the emission offsets will 1) provide for a net benefit in the proposed source's affected area, on balance and 2) not exceed the significant impact levels."

If you have any questions regarding this letter, you may call Annamaria Colecchia at (212) 264-4939.

Sincerely yours,
Kenneth Eng, Chief
Air Compliance Branch