

an attainment area but impacts or interferes with the air quality of the nonattainment or maintenance area at issue in the SIP or maintenance plan.

Comment: Contingency measures should not apply to Canyon County.

Response: The federal Clean Air Act requires contingency provisions to be an element of a maintenance plan but does not specify which ones to include or where or how they should be applied. Under the federal Clean Air Act, state and local governments have the primary responsibility of determining the location, scope, and timing of particular contingency measures. It is EPA's role is to ensure that whatever measures are selected would promptly correct any violation of the NAAQS that occurs after redesignation of the area. The contingency measures in the plan meet this requirement. Our action here merely approves these contingencies as part of the maintenance plan and imposes no additional requirements.

Comment: The commenter asks about the meaning of the correction made to the PM₁₀ maintenance plan.

Response: EPA assumes the commenter is referring to a revision IDEQ submitted to EPA on July 21, 2003. The revision corrected an error found in the fugitive road dust emissions for future years. While this correction changed the value of future fugitive road dust emissions, it did not change the method for determining fugitive road dust emissions in the submitted maintenance plan. IDEQ reran the model to incorporate the correction and submitted an addendum reflecting the results of the new modeling run.

Comment: The commenter inquires who has authority to withhold Federal Funds.

Response: EPA assumes the commenter is referring to section 176(c)(2) of the Clean Air Act, which prohibits a Federal agency from approving, accepting or funding any transportation plan, program or project in certain circumstances. Under this provision, the Federal Government, not a State or local agency, has the ability to withhold Federal transportation funds.

Comment: The commenter inquires about the criteria EPA uses to approve a submission from COMPASS and IDEQ.

Response: EPA assumes the commenter means a SIP submission. SIP submissions are submitted by the Governor of Idaho or his designee. As discussed in the proposal on July 30, 2003 (68 FR 44715), the State's submission must meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. The review criteria

is derived from the Act, general preamble, 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).

Comment: The monitors in Canyon County show different levels of pollutants than in Ada County and, therefore, approvability of the plan is questionable.

Response: Air quality monitors in an airshed do not record same levels at the same time because windflows or pollution sources impacting two monitors are not same. Unless there is a region or area-wide pollution source that is causing the problem, one expects to see different levels at different monitors.

Comment: More monitors are needed and monitors should be at locations indicating the most air quality problems.

Response: As mentioned above, the State selects the monitors that make up the State monitoring network. EPA has approved the State's network as meeting the criteria in 40 CFR 58 appendix D. EPA, however, will forward this comment to monitoring representatives at IDEQ.

Comment: Dairy operations should have more restrictions.

Response: The State of Idaho has the primary responsibility to determine which sources to control to meet the NAAQS. Our action here merely approves the maintenance plan as meeting Federal requirements and imposes no additional requirements. In this instance, IDEQ has devised an approach that meets and maintains attainment needs by controlling the sources that they have chosen.

Comment: The CMAQ model should be used to compare results with Environ's CAMX model.

Response: CMAQ is a more sophisticated and advanced air quality model. The input parameters (chemistry and meteorology) to run the CMAQ model are not yet fully developed for the Ada County/Boise, Idaho area. IDEQ, EPA, and several other partners are currently working together to develop a CMAQ modeling system for the northwest including the Boise area for use in future applications.

Comment: The objective should be to model the meteorology and the air quality of the valley in real time.

Response: EPA agrees that a real time modeling system would be valuable for the air quality management. EPA Region 10, states, and several other partners

have been collaboratively working to develop a real time air quality simulation system for the northwest including the Boise area. However, for the purpose of an attainment or maintenance demonstration, it is generally adequate to simulate typical historical worst case pollution episodes.

Comment: Air quality impacts from industry are overstated because the potential to emit is used rather than actual emissions. Micron PC.com's projected emissions are over-estimated and requests that IDEQ correct them.

Response: IDEQ appropriately determined industrial emissions based on a source's potential to emit because there are no permanent, enforceable measures to prevent the higher potential emission levels from occurring. If a facility's projected emissions are higher than its potential to emit, the use of those emissions in the State's demonstration would indicate over-control and would have no effect on the approvability of the maintenance plan. We will, however, forward this correction request to IDEQ.

Comment: The commenter emphasizes the importance of enforcing and monitoring facility compliance with the operating permits that the state relied on to demonstrate attainment. The commenter also encourages active enforcement of local laws, permits, regulations and ordinances, specifically the municipal solid waste ban because in order to take credit for reductions from these new laws, they must be successfully implemented. Additionally, the commenter also requests that EPA require IDEQ to certify that all inspections are completed and facilities are in compliance.

Response: EPA agrees that the enforcement of operating permits, laws, regulations, and ordinances is an important component of the State's air quality control program. As discussed in the Technical Support Document, the SIP and its control measures meet the requirements for permanent and enforceable measures. EPA further believes that the state has adequately shown that it has the appropriate personnel, funding and authority to enforce and ensure compliance of its permits, laws, regulations and ordinances. Since we are taking final action on a proposal to approve the State's maintenance plan and request to redesignate the Ada County/Boise, Idaho as an attainment area and since the State's submission meets all the requirements for approval, it is not appropriate in this action to impose additional requirements as requested by the commenter.