

Comment: The air in Canyon County is not polluted because of vehicle emissions. An inspection and maintenance program is not needed in Canyon County.

Response: EPA is approving a maintenance plan for Ada County, not Canyon County. However, to the extent that the State believes that control measures outside the Ada County/Boise, Idaho area support the maintenance plan, EPA is approving, at the State's request, those measures as part of the maintenance plan as well. The federal Clean Air Act does not specify the particular control measures that must be used to demonstrate maintenance of the standards. Under the Act, state and local governments have the primary responsibility to determine which pollution sources to control, figure out how controls will be implemented, and demonstrate the controls result in attainment and maintenance of the NAAQS. In this case, the State has made that demonstration. EPA's role is to ensure that whatever measures are selected produce the emissions reductions needed to meet the standards. Our action here merely approves the maintenance plan and its associated control measures already adopted by the State and imposes no additional requirements.

Comment: Canyon County and Ada County are not one airshed. Canyon County should not be included in the monitoring network for the Ada County area. Canyon County should be its own separate area and treated separately.

Response: For the purpose of air quality management, the boundary of an air shed is determined based on, among other things, the meteorological and topographical parameters, pollution source and impact area, and land use characteristics. Often the airshed boundary does not follow political jurisdiction boundaries such as a county line or city line. Based on the air quality studies and data available to EPA, including the modeling reconciliation in Appendix D of the maintenance plan, it is evident that pollution production and transport in the Treasure Valley area encompass geographical boundaries larger than any specific county border. As both Ada and Canyon County are experiencing rapid growth and expansion, it is logical that the airshed management efforts focus on the larger area. The State selects the monitor locations (including in Ada County and Canyon County) that make up its monitoring network. EPA has approved the State's network as meeting the criteria in 40 CFR 58 appendix D.

Comment: The Middleton monitors do not reflect Canyon County air quality

and should be repositioned. DEQ should not use the Middleton monitors to define Canyon County's ozone reading.

Response: The Middleton monitors measure ozone and PM_{2.5}. This action relates to PM₁₀. We will forward the comments related to ozone and PM_{2.5} to appropriate representatives at IDEQ.

Comment: EPA should emphasize that this action has nothing to do with Canyon County and asks that we refute the statement in the settlement agreement that IDEQ intends to develop an air quality plan for Treasure Valley.

Response: While EPA agrees that IDEQ's efforts to develop an air quality plan for the Treasure Valley are independent of our action on the maintenance plan, EPA has no basis for refuting IDEQ's intentions to develop an air quality plan for the Treasure Valley. It is entirely appropriate for—in fact EPA encourages—the State to take any preventive steps needed to ensure air quality standards are met in the Treasure Valley and all of Idaho.

Comment: The basis for reinstating the PM₁₀ NAAQS is no longer valid due to a decision favorable to EPA in the *American Trucking Association, et al. v. EPA et al.*, and consolidated cases.

Response: As explained in the proposal, the basis for revoking the 1987 PM₁₀ standards in the Ada County/Boise, Idaho nonattainment area was eliminated when the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia vacated the revised 1997 PM₁₀ standards. Since we revoked the 1987 standards and the court vacated the 1997 standards, there are no federal PM₁₀ standards currently applicable in the Ada County/Boise, Idaho area. Therefore, we are rescinding the finding that the 1987 PM₁₀ standards are no longer applicable in Ada County/Boise, Idaho and reinstating the 1987 PM₁₀ standards. The decision in *American Trucking Association* referred to by the commenter addressed the PM_{2.5} standards and not the 1987 or 1997 PM₁₀ standards.

Comment: Control measures are not needed in Canyon County because Ada County has attained the PM₁₀ NAAQS since 1999.

Response: In order for EPA to redesignate the Ada County/Boise, Idaho area, the State must not only show that the area is currently attaining the PM₁₀ NAAQS, but that it will continue to attain the PM₁₀ NAAQS 10 years into the future. In making its demonstration, the State must consider anticipated changes to the area over the next 10 years, including the impacts of surrounding areas. EPA has reviewed the State's 10 year demonstration and finds that the demonstration meets the

review criteria derived from the Act, general preamble (57 FR 13498), and further interpreted by a policy and guidance memorandum from John Calcagni, September 4, 1992, *Procedures for Processing Requests to Redesignate Areas to Attainment* (Calcagni Memorandum). (See also Section III of the Technical Support Document). Based on this review, EPA has no basis for disapproving any control measures in the maintenance plan submitted by the State. The federal Clean Air Act does not specify the particular control measures that the State must use to demonstrate maintenance of the standards. Under the Act, state and local governments have the primary responsibility to determine which pollution sources to control and how those controls will be implemented. EPA's role is to ensure that whatever measures are selected produce the emission reductions needed to meet the standards. In this case, the State has made that demonstration. Our action here merely approves the maintenance plan and its associated control measures already adopted by the state and imposes no additional requirements.

Comment: The commenter requests that all references to Canyon County be omitted in the approval of the Ada County SIP.

Response: As discussed above, the Ada County/Boise, Idaho maintenance plan meets EPA's review criteria. EPA has no basis for omitting references to Canyon County.

Comment: Canyon County and Ada County should not be combined because of geological, geographical, population, and economic activity differences. The plan is only about Ada County, not Canyon County, and the counties should not be combined because they differ in various ways.

Response: EPA agrees that there are differences between Canyon County and Ada County. EPA believes IDEQ has appropriately accounted for those differences in its emissions inventory and modeling demonstration, as indicated in our evaluation of those elements in the Technical Support Document.

Comment: The commenter questions whether The Amalgamated Sugar Company contributes to the Ada County PM₁₀ levels since Canyon County has not exceeded the standards.

Response: The Amalgamated Sugar Company, although located in Canyon County, is along the Ada County's upwind flow which sometimes impacts a portion of the Ada County PM₁₀ nonattainment area. It is appropriate to include in the maintenance demonstration a source that is located in