

area at the time of the violation. Since the state has no control over when a source ceases operating, it is impossible to determine, at this time, how many sources will be affected by a tightening of RACT which may be implemented at some unspecified time in the future. Thus it is impossible to determine beforehand how much of a reduction will be achieved by implementing this measure. See the discussion in the Cuyahoga and Jefferson Counties, Ohio, redesignation for particulate matter (65 FR 77308, December 11, 2000).

The approach taken in the maintenance plan is to conduct a thorough analysis to determine the magnitude of the reductions needed to correct the violation, the types of sources from which reductions must be made (e.g., point, area, or mobile sources), and the mechanisms for achieving the reductions. The list of contingency measures includes a reasonable mix of measures from which to select the measures most suited to address a future violation (a level II trigger), if one occurs, or to alleviate an unanticipated decline in air quality (a level I trigger). EPA finds that this is a reasonable approach which will assure prompt correction of the violation. In addition, consistent with the Calcagni memo, the maintenance plan includes a Level I trigger in which Missouri will evaluate and determine if adverse emissions trends are likely to continue. If so, Missouri will determine what and where emission controls may be required to avoid a violation of the 1-hour ozone NAAQS.

*Comment 30:* The contingency measures in the maintenance plans are vague and open ended. Neither plan identifies any measures to be adopted. No firm schedule for adoption and implementation is included.

*Response 30:* This comment refers to both the Missouri and Illinois portions of the St. Louis area. EPA is hereby providing a response regarding the Missouri portion of the St. Louis area. See the rulemaking in today's **Federal Register** regarding redesignation of the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area for EPA's response to this comment as it pertains to the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area.

EPA disagrees with the commenter's assertion that the contingency measures are vague and open ended. In response to comments 28 and 29 above, EPA addressed the procedures contained in the maintenance plan for evaluating which measures are necessary to promptly correct a violation.

In addition, in response to comment 28 above, EPA identified the list of potential contingency measures

contained in Missouri's maintenance plan along with a schedule of 18 months to adopt and implement selected contingency measures in the event of a violation (a level II trigger) or a decline in air quality (a level I trigger). EPA has concluded that the maintenance plan satisfies statutory requirements and EPA guidance regarding adoption and implementation of contingency measures consistent with EPA guidance and the CAA. The commenter acknowledges this 18-month time period to adopt and implement contingency measures in the comments.

*Comment 31:* Each maintenance plan contains inadequate provisions to respond to anticipated violations of the NAAQS. Anticipated violations are based upon inventories exceeding the 2000 inventory or two exceedances at any monitoring site. There is no commitment to adopt any additional controls to address anticipated violations.

*Response 31:* This comment refers to both the Missouri and Illinois portions of the St. Louis area. EPA is hereby providing a response regarding the Missouri portion of the St. Louis area. See the rulemaking in today's **Federal Register** regarding redesignation of the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area for EPA's response to this comment as it pertains to the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area.

As indicated above, a Level I Trigger will be exceeded if: (1) The monitored ambient ozone levels exceed 124 parts per billion, one-hour average, more than once per year at any monitoring site in the St. Louis maintenance area (the current St. Louis ozone nonattainment area), or more than two exceedances in any two-or three-year period; or (2) the St. Louis maintenance area's VOC or NO<sub>x</sub> emissions for 2005 or 2008 increase more than 5 percent above the 2000 attainment levels. In the event one of these action trigger levels is exceeded, Illinois and Missouri will work together to evaluate the situation and determine if adverse emissions trends are likely to continue. If so, the states will determine what and where emission controls may be required to avoid a violation of the 1-hour ozone NAAQS. The emission controls will be selected from a list of measures included in the contingency plan. A study shall be completed within nine months of the determination of the action trigger exceedance, and Missouri's maintenance plan contains a commitment to adopt and implement the necessary contingency measures within 18 months of a Level I trigger consistent with the discretion afforded EPA by the statute. The contingency

plan meets the requirement of section 175A(d) and the applicable guidance in the Calcagni memo.

*Comment 32:* The maintenance plans contain no commitment to implement measures in the SIP. EPA cannot approve the maintenance plan without this commitment.

*Response 32:* This comment refers to both the Missouri and Illinois portions of the St. Louis area. EPA is hereby providing a response regarding the Missouri portion of the St. Louis area. See the rulemaking in today's **Federal Register** regarding redesignation of the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area for EPA's response to this comment as it pertains to the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area.

The commenter is incorrect in its statement that the maintenance plan does not contain a commitment to implement measures in the SIP. Such a commitment was included in Missouri's maintenance plan. Section 5.4 of Missouri's maintenance plan states the following: "The department provides assurance that all of the control measures adopted by state rules and listed in the ROP plan or this document will be enforced to ensure maintenance of the one-hour ozone NAAQS. Any revisions to the control measures included as part of the maintenance plan will be submitted as a SIP revision to EPA for approval." As described in response to comment 28, Missouri is retaining all of the measures contained in its SIP prior to redesignation.

*Comment 33:* The maintenance plans do not address expected growth in areas adjacent to the nonattainment area such as Ste. Genevieve County. An assessment of this growth should be included. Also, the plan is based on the "irrational assumption" that "if there is no increase in emissions, and no decrease in controls, the standard will be maintained."

*Response 33:* This comment refers to both the Missouri and Illinois portions of the St. Louis area. EPA is hereby providing a response regarding the Missouri portion of the St. Louis area. See the rulemaking in today's **Federal Register** regarding redesignation of the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area for EPA's response to this comment as it pertains to the Illinois portion of the St. Louis area.

The commenter's characterization of the "basic premise" of the maintenance plan is incorrect. The plan does not simplistically assume that there will be no increase in emissions. The plan carefully projects the growth in emissions which will occur in various source sectors, and the reductions which will occur based on emission