

Attachment to the Environmental Protection Agency Air Quality Comments
On the Proposed Master Plan Update Development Actions
at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport

General Conformity

The conformity provisions of the Clean Air Act mandate that any federal agency proposing to conduct a project in a non-attainment or maintenance area make a determination that the project would not:

- (i) cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area;
- (ii) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or
- (iii) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area.

Through Section 176(c) of the Federal Clean Air Act, Congress established a higher test for federal agencies and the expenditure of federal money than is the case for non-federal public or private entities. The conformity provisions require a federal agency to affirmatively find that its actions will not worsen air quality conditions in areas that have previously violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EPA recognizes that the modeling used to determine carbon monoxide impacts at intersections is for screening purposes to predict worst-case scenarios. However, the conformity provisions require that a federal agency ensure that worst-case pollutant impacts with its project are no worse than the worst-case pollutant impacts without such a project.

The general conformity rules establish certain public notification and comment procedures that a federal agency must follow when making a conformity determination (58 FR 63214, November 30, 1993). The conformity determination contained in the Final EIS is the draft conformity finding, and implies that it may be modified after the public comment period. The FAA has stated that the final conformity determination will be included in the Record of Decision for this EIS. While the draft conformity analysis does not support a conformity determination, the final determination could, based upon a corrected emissions inventory and commitment to appropriate mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measures

Section 93.160 of the general conformity rule sets forth the requirements for enforceable mitigation measures that must be taken when an increase in the frequency or severity of exceedances is modeled. This section states:

- (a) Any measures that are intended to mitigate air quality impacts must be identified and the process for implementation and enforcement of such measures must be described, including an implementation schedule containing explicit timelines for implementation.
- (b) Prior to determining that a Federal action is in conformity, the Federal agency making the conformity determination must obtain written commitments from the appropriate persons or agencies to implement any mitigation measures which are identified as conditions for making conformity determinations.

Des Moines Creek Business Park, the Federal Detention Center, the Seatac Hotel, the City of Seatac improvements to three miles of International Boulevard near Seatac Airport, the proposed CTI campus and the 28/24th Arterial.

We noted several inconsistencies in projected air quality for the same intersections in the EIS's for the aforementioned projects. This variability underscores the need for additional coordination between project leads. The inconsistencies are as follows:

- 1) The modeling results for air quality in the Seatac final EIS conflict with those from the draft EIS for the SR 509/South Access Road Corridor Project at two intersections (both EIS's used the same models). The two EIS's model conflicting results for existing conditions and future action alternatives at South 188th and International Blvd., and South 200th and International Blvd. for the average CO concentrations indicated on page 4-7 in the SR 509 EIS, as compared with the same analyses on page IV.9-11H in the Seatac final EIS. Both analyses model CO violations for existing conditions, but for future action alternatives the Seatac analysis shows modeled CO violations where the SR 509 analysis does not.
- 2) Modeled air quality impacts at South 200th and International Blvd are shown in the South Aviation Support Area Final EIS (pages 4-106 to 109 and 112), the 28/24th Street Arterial Final EIS (page 3.22) and the CTI Final EIS (page 4-7, 8). The results vary for each project ranging from 5.0 to 13.3 parts per million CO.

The ROD should clearly indicate that the FAA has taken all of these local projects into consideration when modeling air impacts. The data from modeling should be available to other agencies so that their analyses will be consistent with FAA's. Data sharing will contribute to a better overall air modeling analysis that will also assure a more comprehensive cumulative impacts presentation.

To: Dennis Ossenkop
FROM EPA Region X
Comments on FEIS dated 4/6/96

**Attachment to the Environmental Protection Agency Air Quality Comments
On the Proposed Master Plan Update Development Actions
at Seattle-Tacoma International Airport**

General Conformity

The conformity provisions of the Clean Air Act mandate that any federal agency proposing to conduct a project in a non-attainment or maintenance area make a determination that its project would not:

- (i) cause or contribute to any new violation of any standard in any area;
- (ii) increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard in any area; or
- (iii) delay timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones in any area.

Through Section 176(c) of the Federal Clean Air Act, Congress established a higher test for federal agencies and the expenditure of federal money than is the case for non-federal public or private entities. The conformity provisions require a federal agency to affirmatively find that its actions will not worsen air quality conditions in areas that have previously violated the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). EPA recognizes that the modeling used to determine carbon monoxide impacts at intersections is for screening purposes to predict worst-case scenarios. However, the conformity provisions require that a federal agency ensure that worst-case pollutant impacts with its project are no worse than the worst-case pollutant impacts without such a project.

The general conformity rules establish certain public notification and comment procedures that a federal agency must follow when making a conformity determination (58 FR 63214, November 30, 1993). The conformity determination contained in the Final EIS is the draft conformity finding, and implies that it may be modified after the public comment period. The FAA has stated that the final conformity determination will be included in the Record of Decision for this EIS. While the draft conformity analysis does not support a conformity determination, the final determination could, based upon a corrected emissions inventory and commitment to appropriate mitigation measures.

Mitigation Measures

Section 93.160 of the general conformity rule sets forth the requirements for enforceable mitigation measures that must be taken when an increase in the frequency or severity of exceedances is modeled. This section states:

- (a) Any measures that are intended to mitigate air quality impacts must be identified and the process for implementation and enforcement of such measures must be described, including an implementation schedule containing explicit timelines for implementation.
- (b) Prior to determining that a Federal action is in conformity, the Federal agency making the conformity determination must obtain written commitments from the appropriate persons or agencies to implement any mitigation measures which are identified as conditions for making conformity determinations.

DesMoines Creek Business Park, the Federal Detention Center, the Seatac Hotel, the City of Seatac improvements to three miles of International Boulevard near Seatac Airport, the proposed CTI campus and the 28/24th Arterial.

We noted several inconsistencies in projected air quality for the same intersections in the EIS's for the aforementioned projects. This variability underscores the need for additional coordination between project leads. The inconsistencies are as follows:

- 1) The modeling results for air quality in the Seatac final EIS conflict with those from the draft EIS for the SR 509/South Access Road Corridor Project at two intersections (both EIS's used the same models). The two EIS's model conflicting results for existing conditions and future action alternatives at South 188th and International Blvd., and South 200th and International Blvd. for the average CO concentrations indicated on page 4-7 in the SR 509 EIS, as compared with the same analyses on page IV.9-11H in the Seatac final EIS. Both analyses model CO violations for existing conditions, but for future action alternatives the Seatac analysis shows modeled CO violations where the SR 509 analysis does not.
- 2) Modeled air quality impacts at South 200th and International Blvd are shown in the South Aviation Support Area Final EIS (pages 4-106 to 109 and 112), the 28/24th Street Arterial Final EIS (page 3.22) and the CTI Final EIS (page 4-7, 8). The results vary for each project ranging from 5.0 to 13.3 parts per million CO.

The ROD should clearly indicate that the FAA has taken all of these local projects into consideration when modeling air impacts. The data from modeling should be available to other agencies so that their analyses will be consistent with FAA's. Data sharing will contribute to a better overall air modeling analysis that will also assure a more comprehensive cumulative impacts presentation.