

To: Pinal County PM₁₀ Stakeholders *via email* ..\2009\feedlots\anprm.v3
From: Don Gabrielson, Director, Pinal County Air Quality
Date 4/9/09 9:15 am

Notice of Stakeholder Meeting

Meeting Date: April 17, 2009
Meeting Time: 9:30 a.m.
Meeting Location: Pinal County Emergency Operations Center, Building F, 31 North Pinal St.,
Florence, Arizona
Meeting Subject: Initial stakeholder discussion of the accompanying draft of a rule establishing
PM₁₀-related emission standards for commercial feedlots.

Table of Contents

I.	Preamble	4
	A. Summary	4
	B. Explanation; Background & Analysis (ARS §49-471.05.4)	4
	1. County Authority.	4
	2. Procedural Context; Generally	4
	3. Physical Context	5
	a. Local CAFO Operations	5
	b. Location & Geography	5
	4. Summary; The Pinal County Proposal.	6
	a. Characterization of the Inadequacies of Existing Rules	6
	b. Scope of This Proposal	7
	C. Comparative Analysis	7
	1. Maricopa County	7
	2. Imperial County Air Pollution Control District	8
	3. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District	8
	4. South Coast Air Quality Management District	8
	D. Rulemaking Process.	8
	1. Procedure.	8
	2. Access to Copies of Proposal; Communications.	9
	3. Date, time, and location of further proceedings	9
	a. Stakeholder Workshop.	9
	4. Proposed Effective Date.	9
	E. Supporting Studies.	9
	F. Economic, Small Business and Consumer Impact Statement.	9
	G. Other Matters	9
	1. Justification for "More Stringent" Rules; A.R.S. §49-112.	9
	2. Compliance With the Fee-limitations of A.R.S. §49-112 (A) or (B).	9
	3. Prior AAR Notices.	9
II.	List of Sections Affected	9
III.	The full text of the proposed changes	11
4-9-350	Determination of Surface Moisture at Feedlots	11
4-10-400.	General Provisions	11
	A. Intent	11
	B. Relationship to other rules.	11
	C. Geographic Applicability	11
	D. Right of entry and inspection.	11
	E. Violations	11
4-10-410	Definitions	11
4-10-420.	Objective Standards; [New]	12
	A. Cattle Pen Maintenance; Minimum Moisture Standard	12
	B. [Roadway/Alley/Parking Silt Content/Silt Loading Limitations]	13
	C. [Opacity Limitations]	13
	1. 20% Internal Roadway Opacity Limitation.	13

2.	20% Internal Pen Opacity Limitation.	13
3.	0% Property Line Opacity Limitation.	13
D.	Trackout Limitations.	13
4-10-430.	Work Practice Standards [New]	13
A.	Trackout Cleanup Requirement	13
4-10-440.	Compliance Self-Verification [New]	14
4-10-450.	Recordkeeping and Records Retention [New]	14
A.	Requirement to furnish records upon request.	14
B.	Records Retention.	14

PINAL COUNTY

ADVANCED NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE MAKING

April 9, 2009

I. Preamble

A. Summary

This notice pertains to Pinal County's proposed regulation of PM₁₀ emissions from beef cattle feedlots. The proposal does not affect other animal feeding operations, such as dairies or poultry or swine operations.

The purpose of this notice is to afford interested parties the opportunity to assist the County in developing an effective approach to verifiably reducing emissions of PM₁₀ from feedlots.

The proposed rule would apply in all areas subject to the regulatory authority of the County. See A.R.S. §49-479. That authority implicitly excludes Indian Lands. See Laws 2003, Section 238, §4, repealing the State's previous assertion under A.R.S. §49-561 of jurisdiction over such Indian Lands.

B. Explanation; Background & Analysis (ARS §49-471.05.4)

1. County Authority. (ARS §471.05.1)

The District proposes that the Board of Supervisors adopt or amend certain rules under authority of A.R.S. §§49-112 and 49-479, which authorize the board to adopt rules to control air pollution.

2. Procedural Context; Generally

PM₁₀ constitutes a regulated air pollutant, subject to a health-based ambient air quality standard. See Clean Air Act ("CAA") §§ 107(d)(4)(B) and 109. The prevailing PM₁₀ standard sets a limit of 150 micrograms-per-cubic-meter, assessed on the basis of a 24-hour average concentration. The standard allows for three permissible "exceedances" in three years, and the fourth exceedance constitutes a violation of the standard. On average, each monitor is allowed one exceedance per year. See 40 CFR §50.6; A.A.C. R18-2-201, Pinal County Air Quality Code of Regulations ("Code") §2-1-020.

The County already has rules that regulate PM₁₀ emissions from feedlots. Pinal County Air Quality Control District Code of ("Code") Regulations §4-2-040.H. provides that "[n]o person shall operate, maintain, use or permit the use of any commercial feedlot or commercial livestock area for purposes of feeding or displaying animals, or engage in other activity such as racing and exercising, without taking reasonable precautions to effectively prevent fugitive dust from becoming airborne."

A.R.S. §49-479 requires that County rules contain standards at least equal to or more restrictive than those adopted by the ADEQ Director. Existing Code §4-2-040.H reflects the substance of ADEQ's rules. See A.A.C. R18-2-609.

However, in comments specifically directed to Pinal County Code §4-2-040, the EPA has

recently opined that "reasonable precaution" rules fail to establish a meaningfully enforceable standard.

"In our General Preamble for the Implementation of Title I of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 we explain that procedures for determining compliance with a rule must be "sufficiently specific and nonsubjective so that two independent entities applying the procedures would obtain the same result." See 57 FR 13498, 13568 (April 16, 1992). A SIP must also include "clear, unambiguous, and measurable requirements" for ensuring that sources are in compliance with control measures (ibid).

These rules do not meet EPA's enforceability criteria because they do not establish any standards by which to gauge source compliance with implementation of reasonable precautions." 72 Fed. Reg. 41896, 41897 (8/1/2007).

3. Physical Context.

a. Local CAFO Operations

Based on information provided by the Arizona Department of Agriculture, there are 31 dairies and 7 feedlots in Pinal County.

Estimates vary, but the beef cattle in the feedlots can clearly exceed 100,000 in number.

Based on empirical observation, those feedlot facilities can be grouped into four complexes: the "Cowtown" complex, between the Cities of Maricopa and Casa Grande; the Red River complex, west of Stanfield; the Benedict spread, east of Stanfield; and the Red Rock feedlot, south of Picacho Peak.

b. Location & Geography

Pinal county lies in the Sonoran Desert in south-central Arizona. Pinal County sits between the Phoenix and Tucson urban areas.

Hills and mountains occupy much of the eastern portions of the County. Government owns much of the eastern half of the County. The western half of the County has some topography, but also includes broad, flat alluvial areas associated with the Gila and Santa Cruz River basins.

For many decades, agriculture has flourished on those alluvial plains. For the most part, areas amenable to agriculture have found their way into private ownership. Irrigation has been provided by groundwater pumping, as well as gravity irrigation from the Gila River and from the Colorado River by way of the Central Arizona Project.

Although the pace has slowed dramatically, over the last decade rapid residential growth has spilled into many of those agricultural areas in Pinal County. That growth has been most dramatic in two areas, namely the Johnson Ranch/San Tan area, and in the new City of Maricopa.

In the last decade, the City of Maricopa has grown from an unincorporated community of 1,000 or fewer persons, to an incorporated city of roughly 40,000. The

City has annexed a number of areas, including the Cowtown feedlot complex as well as the adjoining Pinal County PM₁₀ monitoring site.

In the City of Maricopa, a subdivision has now been built just west of the Cowtown complex, and a large retail complex with several "big box" stores, including a retail grocery sales operation, is set to open just northwest of the Cowtown complex. Although the Cowtown complex was once relatively isolated, that isolation no longer exists.

Accordingly, a meaningful population is now exposed to the elevated PM₁₀ levels discussed below.

The situation calls for specific, measurable, action-oriented, realistic and time-sensitive action.

4. Summary; The Pinal County Proposal. (ARS §49-112.D.1)

a. Characterization of the Inadequacies of Existing Rules

The requirement to implement "reasonable precautions" offers little guidance to help a source operator determine what efforts are adequate. Similarly, the phrase provides scant guidance to the County in trying to assess whether an operator's efforts are adequate.

To the extent affected sources in Pinal County have complied with those "reasonable precaution" requirements, the results have proven inadequate to limit PM₁₀ levels in the vicinity of feedlots.

Pinal County operates a series of PM₁₀ monitors, including a Federal Equivalent Method monitor at the "Cowtown" monitoring site, lying just north and east of the Cowtown feedlot complex in western Pinal County.

The number of PM₁₀ exceedances at the Cowtown monitor dwarfs the number at any other monitoring site. While other monitors in Pinal County report as many as 25 or 30 exceedances per year, the Cowtown monitor stands alone in consistently reporting more than 200 exceedances per year.

The bulk of exceedances at the Cowtown monitor are not wind-related. Most of the exceedances at PM₁₀ monitors other than the Cowtown monitor can be attributed to wind events, and therefore "explained away" pursuant to the EPA's Exceptional Events rule. See 72 Fed. Reg. 13560 (3/22/07). However, less than twenty-five-percent of the exceedances at Cowtown can be attributed to wind.

Under low-wind conditions, recurring PM₁₀ concentrations at the Cowtown monitor are dramatically higher than at any of the other monitors in the County. Under low-wind, or stagnation, conditions, ambient concentrations at PM₁₀ monitors other than the Cowtown monitor rarely even exceed a 24-hour average concentration of 200 micrograms-per-cubic-meter. However, under similar concentrations at the Cowtown monitor regularly exceed 500 micrograms-per-cubic-meter, and can even reach levels of 1000 micrograms-per-cubic-meter.

At the Cowtown monitor, manure constitutes the dominant fraction of PM₁₀. A

chemical speciation study found that at PM₁₀ monitors other than the Cowtown monitor, manure constituted no more than 20% of observed particulate matter. However, at the Cowtown monitor a chemical speciation analysis indicated that more than 60% of observed particulate matter consisted of manure.

An analysis of prevailing wind patterns at the Cowtown monitor indicated that for those days and times when excessive PM₁₀ concentrations were observed, the predominant wind carried across the feed lot complex before reaching the monitor.

Pinal County regularly reports local monitoring data to the EPA's AIRS AQS data system. See www.epa.gov/air/data/aqsdb.htm. The combination of the number of PM₁₀ exceedances and the very high PM₁₀ concentrations observed at the Cowtown monitor result in the AIRS AQS system reporting that for PM₁₀, Pinal County constitutes the most polluted place in the country.

Monitoring data, as well as empirical observation, indicate that feedlot-related PM₁₀ ambient concentrations reach a peak at dusk.

From every perspective, PM₁₀ emissions from the feedlots appear to substantially contribute to the inordinate number of PM₁₀ exceedances at the Cowtown monitor.

By any measure, the efforts historically expended to comply with the existing "reasonable precaution" rules have fallen short of achieving compliance with the prevailing health-based PM₁₀ ambient air quality standard.

To protect public health, to comply with the prevailing ambient air quality standards, and to address Pinal County's characterization as a pollution hot-spot, the situation calls for specific, measurable, action-oriented, realistic and time-sensitive action.

b. Scope of This Proposal

The proposed PM₁₀ standards focus specifically on beef feedlots. Only bovine facilities are affected. Facilities with a dominant population of dairy cows are excluded. Small operations with fewer than 100 head of cattle are exempted. Grazing operations are exempted.

This package proposes adoption of a set of PM₁₀ rules for feedlots, as follows:

- i. An objective moisture-content standard for the manure pack in cattle pens will reduce emissions from cattle movement and wind-action;
- ii. An objective opacity standard for fugitive emissions from within cattle pens will allow ready confirmation of the adequacy of dust suppression measures in the pens;
- iii. An objective silt-loading and silt-content standard for roadways will implicitly require measures to stabilize the surface and thereby reduce emissions from traffic;
- iv. An objective opacity standard for roadways will allow ready confirmation of the adequacy of dust suppression measures on roadways;

- v. A property-line opacity standard will allow ready confirmation that control measures, in the aggregate, are sufficient to achieve meaningful reduction in PM₁₀ emissions;
- vi. A trackout limitation for facilities on paved roads will reduce PM₁₀ emissions from re-entrained dust; and
- viii. A self-assessment requirement to assure that the owner and/or operator regularly does a self-compliance assessment with respect to the other objective measures.
- ix. A corresponding recordkeeping requirement will provide a ready means for demonstrating compliance with the foregoing requirements.

The proposed rules do not impose new fees or affect existing fees.

The package will also include a corresponding proposed revision to §1-1-105, designating each of the other proposed rule changes as revisions to the Arizona State Implementation Plan.

C. Comparative Analysis

1. Maricopa County

Maricopa County regulates PM₁₀ emissions from feedlots under Rule 310.01.302.8.

In terms of applicability, Maricopa's rule very broadly applies to "livestock activities." See Maricopa Rule 310.01.216. Pinal's proposal affects only beef-cattle feeding operations, and excludes dairies and small operations.

Maricopa imposes objective internal and lot-line opacity standards, and the Pinal proposal tracks those standards with one modification. Maricopa appears to impose an instantaneous, one-strike lot-line opacity limitation, but Pinal is proposing to invoke a time-aggregation opacity standard, allowing visible opacity for up to 30 seconds in 6 minutes, as a lot-line limitation.

Maricopa also imposes a variety of work practice standard requirements. See 310.01.302.8.b. For the most part, those requirements lack any objective compliance requirement, and instead rely upon the objective opacity standards to assess the adequacy of the work practice standard implementation. Pinal's proposal invokes only a single work-practice requirement, namely a trackout cleanup requirement for affected facilities that generate traffic onto a paved road.

2. Imperial County Air Pollution Control District

Imperial County Air Pollution Control District regulates beef feedlots under Rule 420 (10/10/2006). See www.arb.ca.gov/drdb/imp/cur.htm.

In functional terms, the Imperial County imposes a minimum moisture content requirement for manure in pens, and also requires a facility-specific permit that includes an operator-defined "outline of manure management practices," configured to effectively control dust.

The Pinal proposal incorporates the minimum moisture requirement, but does not establish a permit requirement.

3. San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District

A review of San Joaquin Rule 4570 (6/15/06) regulates "confined animal facilities," but only for purposes of limiting emissions of VOCs.

San Joaquin Rule 8081 addresses PM₁₀ from agricultural sources, but apart from establishing roadway-dust-suppression requirements, does not deal with animal feeding operations.

4. South Coast Air Quality Management District

SCAQMD Rule 223 (6/2/06) deals with "large confined animal facilities," but really doesn't impose any PM₁₀ control requirements other than requiring covering of piles of dry manure.

SCAQMD Rule 1186 (4/2/04) does address "livestock operations," but only imposes roadway-stabilization requirements coupled with a ban on "hay grinding" during the late afternoon hours, and even then exempts any facility under 10 acres in size.

D. Rulemaking Process. (ARS §49-471.05.3)

1. Procedure.

This constitutes a preliminary notice, and a subsequent formal notice published in the Arizona Administrative Register will commence a formal rulemaking process pursuant to ARS §§49-471.01 and 49-479.

2. Access to Copies of Proposal; Communications. (ARS §49-471.05.2)

Persons may obtain a full copy of the proposed rules, existing rules, or other relevant information from Scott DiBiase, Planning Manager, Pinal County Air Quality, 31 North Pinal St., Building F, Florence, Arizona, 520-866-6929. To the extent possible, the District will also post information on the County's website, www.pinalcountyz.gov, under the "air quality" link.

3. Date, time, and location of further proceedings: scheduled public workshops and hearings:

a. Stakeholder Workshop. A workshop will be held at 9:30 a.m. on April 17, 2009, in the Emergency Operations Center in Building F, 31 North Pinal Street, Florence, Arizona. The nature of the meeting will be to solicit public comment upon this proposal. Pinal County specifically requests stakeholder input regarding the following issues:

- Are the proposed measures all necessary in order to reach compliance with the PM₁₀ standard?
- Is compliance with the proposed standards technically feasible?
- What costs would compliance with the proposed standards impose on affected facilities?

- Do the proposed standards conflict with any other regulatory limitations?

4. Proposed Effective Date. (ARS §49-471.05.7) Not applicable at this time.

E. Supporting Studies. Aside from the monitoring data, speciation study and comparative regulatory analyses discussed above, there are no specific studies relied upon to justify the proposed changes.

F. Economic, Small Business and Consumer Impact Statement. (A.R.S. §49-471.05.6; A.R.S. §41-1055(A), (B) and (C))

Not applicable at this time, but Pinal County specifically solicits stakeholder input regarding the issues of economic impact, small business impact, and consumer impact.

G. Other Matters (ARS §49-471.05.8)

1. Justification for "More Stringent" Rules; A.R.S. §49-112. To the extent these rules are more stringent than those of ADEQ, Pinal County submits that PM₁₀ levels discussed above, and the prospect of an impending nonattainment designation for PM₁₀, combine to satisfy the conditions set forth in A.R.S. §49-112(A)(1) and A(2)(a).

2. Compliance With the Fee-limitations of A.R.S. §49-112 (A) or (B). Not applicable at this time, because this package does not propose to impose any fees.

3. Prior AAR Notices. Not applicable.

II. List of Sections Affected

Section Affected	Rulemaking Action
Chapter 4, Article 9	Existing
§4-9-350 Moisture Test Methods	New
Chapter 4, Article 10	New
§4-10-400 General Provisions	New
§4-10-410 Definitions	New
§4-10-420 Objective Standards	New
§4-10-430 Work Practice Standards	New
§4-10-440 Compliance Self-Verification	New
§4-10-450 Recordkeeping	New

III. The full text of the proposed changes follows:

Article 9 - TEST METHODS [Existing]

4-9-350 Determination of Surface Moisture at Feedlots (New)

The following test method shall be used to determine moisture content within occupied pens at feedlots.

- A. The pens shall be sampled in such a manner as to be representative of the feedlot. No fewer than 10% of the total number of occupied pens shall be tested. Selection shall be random and must have at least four (4) inches of manure base for the test to be valid. Boot covers should be worn to help prevent transport of biological contaminants into the pens.
- B. Random samples shall be taken throughout each selected pen. The moisture content of manure shall be determined with an electrical conductivity moisture meter. Moisture reading shall be taken by introducing the probe three (3) inches into the manure. All readings shall be recorded and averaged.
- C. For purposes of this rule, "random samples" means taking moisture readings in occupied pens in a manner lacking previous calculation, direction, and without intent of a specific result or purpose.

ARTICLE 10. PM-10 RULES; FEEDLOTS [New]

4-10-400. General Provisions [New]

- A. Intent. The intent of this Article is to avoid violations of the prevailing PM₁₀ standard and additionally minimize nuisance impacts by improving control of excessive fugitive dust emissions from cattle feedlots.
- B. Relationship to other rules. The provisions of this Article supplement and do not supplant the other provisions of these rules.
- C. Geographic Applicability

This Article applies to all areas of Pinal County subject to the County's authority under A.R.S. Title 49, Chapter 3, Article 3, A.R.S. §49-471 *et seq.*
- D. Right of entry and inspection.

Subject to the requirements of 49-471.03, any Site affected under this Article is subject to inspection without prior notice by the Control Officer.
- E. Violations

Failure by any person to comply with the applicable requirements of this Article shall constitute a violation subject to penalty as provided in these rules and A.R.S. Title 49, Chapter 3, Article 3, A.R.S. §49-471 *et seq.*

4-10-410 Definitions [New]

As used in this Article:

- A. Feedlot - a confined animal feeding operation, or series of adjoining such operations subject to common control, configured and used for raising or finishing beef cattle livestock, but excluding the following:
 - 1. Any small facility that never accommodates more than 100 animals;
 - 2. Any dairy facility in which at least 95% of the animals consist of dairy cows and veal calves; or
 - 3. Any grazing facility in which the dominant food source for the animals consists of vegetation rooted to the earth.
- B. "Fugitive dust" as used in this rule, means regulated particulate matter, which is not collected by a capture system, which is entrained in the ambient air, and which is caused from human and/or natural activities, such as but not limited to, movement of soils, vehicles, equipment, blasting, and wind. For the purpose of this rule, fugitive dust does not include particulate matter emitted directly from the exhaust of motor vehicles and other internal combustion engines, from portable brazing, soldering, or welding equipment, and from piledrivers.
- C. "Net opacity contribution" means the difference between opacity leaving the Site and opacity entering the Site.
- D. "Objective requirements" or "objective standards" mean those standards which either establish a numerical performance standard, or which have a formal compliance assessment method established under this Article. Examples include opacity standards, surface stabilization standards and length and pack-thickness limitations on visible trackout.
- E. "Opacity" as used in this rule, means the degree to which emissions reduce the transmission of light and obscure the view of an object in the background. See Article 9 for specific methods for assessing opacity.
- F. Owner and/or operator - Any person who owns, leases, operates, controls, maintains or supervises a feedlot subject to the requirements of this Article.
- G. Property line - The boundaries of an area in which either a person causing the emission or a person allowing the emission has the legal use or possession of the property. Where such property is divided into one or more sub-tenancies, the property line(s) shall refer to the boundaries dividing the areas of all sub-tenancies.
- H. "Silt" means any aggregate material with a particle size less than 75 micrometers in diameter, which passes through a No. 200 Sieve.
- I. "Site," for purposes of this Article, means a Feedlot.
- J. "Trackout" means visible material deposited onto any paved public roadway, as defined in this Article, by traffic leaving a Site.
- K. "Work practice standards" mean those standards which have neither a numerical performance standard or a compliance assessment method established. Compliance with work practice standards is assessed on a pass/fail basis.

4-10-420. Objective Standards; [New]

A. Cattle Pen Maintenance; Minimum Moisture Standard

In any occupied cattle pen having a manure pack more than 3" in depth, a minimum 20% moisture factor shall be maintained in the manure pack at all times. The moisture factor shall be determined based on a test analysis as specified in Article 9, §4-9-350.

B. [Roadway/Alley/Parking Silt Content/Silt Loading Limitations] Every unpaved roadway, alley, working yard or parking area shall show compliance at all times with one of the following objective standards as assessed in accord with Article 9, §4-9-320.A:

1. Silt loading shall not exceed 0.33 oz/ft²; or
2. Silt content shall not exceed 8%.

C. [Opacity Limitations] Observed opacity shall not exceed any of:

1. 20% Internal Roadway Opacity Limitation. For any fugitive dust plume caused by movement on unpaved roads or unpaved feed lane access areas, a limit of 20 percent opacity based on an intermittent opacity method, as determined by the applicable test method of Article 9. See §4-9-340.D.;
2. 20% Internal Pen Opacity Limitation. For any fugitive dust plume generated within pens or corrals, a limit of 20 percent opacity for a period aggregating more than three minutes in any 60 minute period, as determined by the applicable time-aggregation test method of Article 9. See §4-9-340.F.;
3. 0% Property Line Opacity Limitation. The net opacity contribution from any cattle feed lot shall not violate a 0% opacity standard beyond the property line within which the emissions are generated for more than 30 seconds in any continuous six-minute period. For purposes of this limitation, opacity shall be determined based on a time-aggregation method. See Article 9, §4-9-340.F.

D. Trackout Limitations.

Continuous visible trackout from any Site onto a paved public roadway shall not exceed 25' in length or exhibit a trackout pack-depth greater than 0.25".

4-10-430. Work Practice Standards [New]

A. Trackout Cleanup Requirement

If trackout occurs in excess of the limit imposed under 4-10-420.D, the Owner and/or Operator shall:

1. Clean-up immediately such trackout from paved areas accessible to the public including curbs, gutters, and sidewalks when trackout exceeds a cumulative distance of 25 lineal feet;

2. Clean-up all visible trackout from paved areas accessible to the public at the end of the day.
3. Make a record of the repair, replacement and/or cleanup action taken.

4-10-440. Compliance Self-Verification [New]

- A. The Owner and/or operator of any feedlot facility located within five miles of a PM₁₀ monitor that exceeded the prevailing PM₁₀ standard more than 10 times in the preceding calendar year shall assess compliance with the standards under this Article, and make a permanent record of the results of that assessment, on the following schedule:
1. §4-10-420.A - Minimum moisture content ----- Weekly
 2. §4-10-420.B - Silt content/silt loading ----- Semi-annually
 3. §4-10-420.C.1 - Roadway opacity ----- Weekly
 4. §4-10-420.C.2 - Pen opacity ----- Weekly
 5. §4-10-420.C.3 - Lot-line opacity ----- Weekly
 6. §4-10-420.D - Trackout ----- Weekly
- B. The Owner and/or operator of any other affected feedlot facility shall assess compliance with the standards under this Article, and make a permanent record of the results of that assessment, on the following schedule:
1. §4-10-420.A - Minimum moisture content ----- Quarterly
 2. §4-10-420.B - Silt content/silt loading ----- Annually
 3. §4-10-420.C.1 - Roadway opacity ----- Semi-annually
 4. §4-10-420.C.2 - Pen opacity ----- Semi-annually
 5. §4-10-420.C.3 - Lot-line opacity ----- Semi-annually
 6. §4-10-420.D - Trackout ----- Monthly

4-10-450. Recordkeeping and Records Retention [New]

Unless otherwise specified in a stationary source permit for the affected facility, the following recordkeeping requirements shall apply to every facility affected under this Article.

- A. Requirement to furnish records upon request. Upon verbal or written request by the Control Officer, the log or the records and supporting documentation required under this Article shall be provided as soon as possible but no later than 48 hours, excluding weekends. If the Control Officer is at the Site where requested records are kept, records shall be provided without delay.
- B. Records Retention. Any person subject to a record-keeping requirement shall retain copies of approved control measure implementation records, and all supporting documentation for at least two years from the date such records were initiated.