



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

STATE OFFICE BUILDING HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06115



*Copies to: V. Stott using
SAP
Linda Murphy*

January 5, 1983

RECEIVED

JAN 12 1983

AIR MGMT. DIVISION

The Honorable Lester A. Sutton
Regional Administrator
U.S. EPA
Region I
John F. Kennedy Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts 02203

Dear Mr. Sutton:

This letter is to inform you of an error detected in the December 17, 1982 SIP revision submittal approving Lydall & Foulds Division, Manchester, Connecticut application under the State Air Pollution Control/Energy Trade Option Program.

The applicant's normal operating conditions maximum modeled SO₂ impacts were stated as 388 ug/m³ (24-hour) and 697 ug/m³ (3-hour) at the top of page 2 in the submittal. These numbers are representative of burning 2.2% sulfur oil. Lydall & Foulds Division was approved for 1.9% sulfur oil and the modeling impacts in the December 17th letter were intended to reflect use of the approved oil. The correct normal operating conditions maximum modeled SO₂ impacts (for 1.9% sulfur oil) are 352 ug/m³ (24-hour) and 632 ug/m³ (3-hour).

Please amend our December 17th request for SIP revision by incorporating the correct modeled SO₂ impacts detailed above.

Sincerely yours,

Stanley J. Pac
Stanley J. Pac
Commissioner

SJP/WFS/ml

CC: Paul Grady, Lydall & Foulds
SET File E-4

RECEIVED
JAN 6 1983
REGION I
OFFICE OF THE
REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



December 17, 1982

The Honorable Lester Sutton
Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region I
JFK Federal Building
Boston, Massachusetts 02203

RECEIVED

DEC 28 1982

AIR MGMT. DIVISION

Dear Mr. Sutton:

The Department of Environmental Protection is submitting a revision to our State Implementation Plan (SIP) for your approval. This revision is our approval of Lydall & Foulds Division of Lydall, Inc., Manchester, Connecticut under the State Air Pollution Control/Energy Trade Option Program (SET) and allows the company to use 1.9% sulfur oil under specified conditions.

A 30 day comment period legal notice regarding the proposed action was published in the Hartford Courant and Manchester Evening Herald on August 21, 1982. Several comments were received, and a source specific public hearing was held. I certify that all approved public notice procedures (see 46FR 24601) have been followed.

This revision submittal includes:

1. The source application, the source acceptance letter, the permit cover letter, and the final signed permit.
2. A copy of the proposed decision public notice, copies of the public hearing proposed decision of September 23, 1982 and final decision of October 13, 1982. An unedited taped recording of a hearing is on file.

I certify that the subject application has been reviewed under the procedures of and meets all requirements of the approved SET program, Regulation 19-508-19(a)(3)(i), and the Connecticut Modeling Guideline. This premise has potential to emit SO₂ emissions of greater than 100 tons per year (TPY). There are no sources on this premise that have a maximum rated capacity or a capacity limited by enforceable permit conditions of 250 MBTU/hour or greater.

Our analysis has shown that the revision will not violate the sulfur dioxide NAAQS and will not either cause or exacerbate a violation of the TSP NAAQS. The applicant is located more than 20 kilometers from any PSD baseline area as defined in your letter of October 27, 1982. The applicant's maximum allowable operating conditions modeled SO₂ impacts were 365 ug/m³ (24-hour), 637 ug/m³ (3-hour) and 36 ug/m³ (annual). The applicant's normal operating conditions maximum modeled

Phone:

165 Capitol Avenue • Hartford, Connecticut 06106

An Equal Opportunity Employer

The Honorable Lester Sutton

Page 2

December 17, 1982

corrected; see 1/5 letter
SO₂ impacts were ~~388~~ ug/m³ (24-hour) and ~~697~~ ug/m³ (3-hour). The applicant conforms with EPA regulations and guidance on good engineering practice stack heights.

I am of the opinion that this final, adopted DEP approval for Lydall & Foulds Division of Lydall, Inc. is in conformance with all provisions of State law and the Federal Clean Air Act, and I recommend that you approve it for inclusion in our SIP.

Sincerely yours,



Mr Stanley J. Pac
Commissioner

SJP/ml

Encs.

cc: Mr. Paul G. Grady, Lydall & Foulds
SET FILE E-4