

PART F – BEST AVAILABLE RETROFIT TECHNOLOGY (BART)

The provisions of Part 51, Appendix Y, Title 40, of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), promulgated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency listed in this Section are hereby incorporated by reference by the Air Quality Control Commission and made a part of the Colorado Air Quality Control Commission Regulations as modified by the following Regulation Number 3, Part F. Materials incorporated by reference are those in existence as July 6, 2005 and do not include later amendments. The material incorporated by reference is available for public inspection during regular business hours at the Office of the Commission, located at 4300 Cherry Creek Drive South, Denver, Colorado 80246, or may be examined at any state publications depository library. Parties wishing to inspect these materials should contact the Technical Secretary of the Commission, located at the Office of the Commission.

I. Applicability

The provisions of this regulation apply to existing stationary facilities, as defined in Section II.I. of this regulation. Existing stationary facilities shall be BART-eligible sources.

II. Definitions

II.A. Adverse impact on visibility

Means visibility impairment that interferes with the management, protection, preservation, or enjoyment of the visitor's visual experience of the Federal Class I area. This determination must be made on a case-by-case basis taking into account the geographic extent, intensity, duration, frequency and time of visibility impairments, and how these factors correlate with (1) times of visitor use of the Federal Class I area, and (2) the frequency and timing of natural conditions that reduce visibility. This term does not include effects on integral vistas.

II.B. Available Technology

Means that a technology is licensed and available through commercial sales.

II.C. Applicable Technology

Means a commercially available control option that has been or is soon to be deployed (*e.g.*, is specified in a permit) on the same or a similar source type or a technology that has been used on a pollutant-bearing gas stream that is the same or similar to the gas stream characteristics of the source.

II.D. Average Cost Effectiveness

Means the total annualized costs of control divided by annual emissions reductions (the difference between baseline annual emissions and the estimate of emissions after controls). For the purposes of calculating average cost effectiveness, baseline annual emissions means a realistic depiction of anticipated annual emissions for the source. The source or the Division may use state or federally enforceable permit limits or estimate the anticipated annual emissions based upon actual emissions from a representative baseline period.

II.E. BART Alternative

Means an alternative measure to the installation, operation, and maintenance of BART that will achieve greater reasonable progress toward national visibility goals than would have resulted from the installation, operation, and maintenance of BART at BART-eligible sources within industry source categories subject to BART requirements.

II.F. BART-eligible source

Means an existing stationary facility as defined in Section II.I.

II.G. Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART)

Means an emission limitation based on the degree of reduction achievable through the application of the best system of continuous emission reduction for each pollutant that is emitted by an existing stationary facility. The emission limitation must be established, on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration the technology available, the costs of compliance, the energy and non-air quality environmental impacts of compliance, any pollution control equipment in use or in existence at the source or unit, the remaining useful life of the source or unit, and the degree of improvement in visibility which may reasonably be anticipated to result from the use of such technology.

II.H. Deciview

Means a measurement of visibility impairment. A deciview is a haze index derived from calculated light extinction, such that uniform changes in haziness correspond to uniform incremental changes in perception across the entire range of conditions, from pristine to highly impaired. The deciview haze index is calculated based on the following equation (for the purposes of calculating deciview, the atmospheric light extinction coefficient must be calculated from aerosol measurements):

$$\text{Deciview haze index} = 10 \ln_e (b_{\text{ext}}/10 \text{ Mm}^{-1})$$

Where b_{ext} = the atmospheric light extinction coefficient, expressed in inverse megameters (Mm^{-1}).

II.I. Existing stationary facility

Means any of the following stationary sources of air pollutants, including any reconstructed source, which was not in operation prior to August 7, 1962, and was in existence on August 7, 1977, and has the potential to emit 250 tons per year or more of any visibility impairing air pollutant. In determining potential to emit, fugitive emissions, to the extent quantifiable, must be counted.

II.I.1. Fossil-fuel fired steam electric plants of more than 250 million British thermal units (BTU) per hour heat input that generate electricity for sale

II.I.1.a. Boiler capacities shall be aggregated to determine the heat input of a plant

II.I.1.b. Includes plants that co-generate steam and electricity and combined cycle turbines

II.I.2. Coal cleaning plants (thermal dryers)

II.I.3. Kraft pulp mills

II.I.4. Portland cement plants

II.I.5. Primary zinc smelters

II.I.6. Iron and steel mill plants

II.I.7. Primary aluminum ore reduction plants

II.I.8. Primary copper smelters

II.I.9. Municipal incinerators capable of charging more than 250 tons of refuse per day

II.I.10. Hydrofluoric, sulfuric, and nitric acid plants

II.I.11. Petroleum refineries

II.I.12. Lime plants

II.I.13. Phosphate rock processing plants

Includes all types of phosphate rock processing facilities, including elemental phosphorous plants as well as fertilizer production plants

II.I.14. Coke oven batteries

II.I.15. Sulfur recovery plants

II.I.16. Carbon black plants (furnace process)

II.I.17. Primary lead smelters

II.I.18. Fuel conversion plants

II.I.19. Sintering plants

II.I.20. Secondary metal production facilities

Includes nonferrous metal facilities included within Standard Industrial Classification code 3341, and secondary ferrous metal facilities in the category "iron and steel mill plants."

II.I.21. Chemical process plants

Includes those facilities within the 2-digit Standard Industrial Classification 28, including pharmaceutical manufacturing facilities

II.I.22. Fossil-fuel boilers of more than 250 million BTUs per hour heat input

II.I.22.a. Individual boilers greater than 250 million BTU/hr, considering federally enforceable operational limits

II.I.22.b. Includes multi-fuel boilers that burn at least fifty percent fossil fuels

II.I.23. Petroleum storage and transfer facilities with a capacity exceeding 300,000 barrels

II.I.23.a. 300,000 barrels refers to total facility-wide tank capacity for tanks put in place after August 7, 1962 and in existence on August 7, 1977

II.I.23.b. Includes gasoline and other petroleum-derived liquids.

II.I.24. Taconite ore processing facilities

II.I.25. Glass fiber processing plants

II.I.26. Charcoal production facilities

Includes charcoal briquette manufacturing and activated carbon production

II.J. Incremental Cost Effectiveness

Means the comparison of the costs and emissions performance level of a control option to those of the next most stringent option, as shown in the following formula:

Incremental Cost Effectiveness (dollars per incremental ton removed) = $\frac{[(\text{Total annualized costs of control option}) - (\text{Total annualized costs of next control option})]}{[(\text{Next Control option annual emissions}) - (\text{control option annual emissions})]}$

II.K. In existence

Means that the owner or operator has obtained all necessary preconstruction approvals or permits required by Federal, State, or local air pollution emissions and air quality laws or regulations and either has (1) begun, or caused to begin, a continuous program of physical on-site construction of the facility or (2) entered into binding agreements or contractual obligations, which cannot be cancelled or modified without substantial loss to the owner or operator, to undertake a program of construction of the facility to be completed in a reasonable time.

II.L. In operation

Means engaged in activity related to the primary design function of the source.

II.M. Integral vista

Means a view perceived from within the mandatory Class I Federal area of a specific landmark or panorama located outside the boundary of the mandatory Class I Federal area.

II.N. Natural conditions

Means naturally occurring phenomena that reduce visibility as measured in terms of light extinction, visual range, contrast, or coloration.

II.O Plant

Means all emissions units at a stationary source.

II.P. Visibility-Impairing Air Pollutant

Includes the following:

II.P.1. Sulfur dioxide (SO₂),

II.P.2. Nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and

II.P.3. Particulate matter. (PM₁₀ will be used as the indicator for particulate matter. Emissions of PM₁₀ include the components of PM_{2.5} as a subset.).

III. Sources required to Perform a BART Analysis

Each source that the Division determines is BART-eligible and subject to BART shall complete a BART analysis under Section IV. The Division shall provide written notice to each source determined to be subject to BART. Within twenty calendar days of the mailing of such notice a source may appeal such determination to the Commission by filing a petition for a hearing with the Commission. Any such hearing shall be subject to Section 1.6.0 of the Procedural Rules.

III.A. Determining Potential to Emit for a BART Source

For the purposes of determining whether the potential to emit of an existing stationary source is greater than 250 TPY the potential emissions of visibility impairing pollutants from the existing stationary source shall include the emissions from all BART-eligible units which belong to the same industrial grouping, are located on one or more contiguous or adjacent properties, and are under the control of the same person (or persons under common control). Pollutant-emitting activities shall be considered as part of the same industrial grouping if they belong to the same Major Group (*i.e.*, which have the same two-digit code) as described in the Standard Industrial Classification Manual.

III.B. Identification of sources subject to BART

III.B.1. Identification of sources subject to BART shall be performed in accordance with EPA's guidelines for BART determinations under the regional haze rule 40 CFR Part 51, Appendix Y. A BART-eligible source described in Section III.A, above, is subject to BART unless valid air quality dispersion modeling demonstrates that the source will not cause or contribute to visibility impairment in any Class I area.

III.B.1.a. A single source that is responsible for a 1.0 deciview change or more is considered to "cause" visibility impairment in any Class I area.

III.B.1.b. A single source that is responsible for a 0.5 deciview change or more is considered to "contribute" visibility impairment in any Class I area.

III.B.1.c. A single source is exempt from BART if the 98th percentile daily change in visibility, as compared against natural background conditions, is less than 0.5 deciviews at all Class I federal areas for each year modeled and for the entire multi-year modeling period.

III.B.2. The Division will perform air quality dispersion modeling for each source identified as BART-eligible, for all visibility impairing pollutants, for class I areas. The modeling results will be provided to each source.

IV. BART Analysis

IV.A. Presumptive BART for Coal Fired Power Plants

IV.A.1. Plants with a Generating Capacity of 750MW or Greater

BART-eligible coal fired power plants with a generating capacity of 750 MW OR GREATER is presumed to be able to meet the presumptive limits. Regardless of whether or not a unit can meet the presumptive BART limits the source must complete a BART analysis.

IV.A.2. Other Coal Fired Power Plants

The Division shall use the presumptive BART limits as guidelines and may establish a BART level for the unit either above or below the presumptive BART level based on the BART determination. coal-fired power plants that meet, or will meet with proposed controls, the presumptive limits set forth in iv.a.3, and have submitted an analysis demonstrating the appropriateness of applying these limits shall be presumed to meet the BART analysis requirements, absent a contrary showing.

IV.A.3. Coal-Fired Electric Generating Units

IV.A.3.a. Sulfur Dioxide

Coal-Fired Electric Generating Units: 95 percent reduction or 0.15 lb SO₂/mmBTU.

IV.A.3.b. Nitrogen Oxides

Unit Type	Coal Type	NO _x limit (lb/mm BTU)
Dry bottom Wall fired	Bituminous	0.39
	Sub-bituminous	0.23
	Lignite	0.29
Tangential Fired	Bituminous	0.28
	Sub-bituminous	0.15
	Lignite	0.17
Cell Burners	Bituminous	0.40
	Sub-bituminous	0.45
Dry-turbo-fired	Bituminous	0.32
	Sub-bituminous	0.23
Wet-bottom tangential-fired	Bituminous	0.62

- IV.B. Each source subject to BART pursuant to Section III shall submit a BART application for a construction permit, which shall include a BART analysis, a proposal for BART at the source and a justification for the BART proposal to the Division by August 1, 2006. Electric Generating Units and Fossil Fuel Boilers do not need to consider post combustion controls for NO_x purposes in the BART analysis and the Division may not require post combustion controls for NO_x purposes for Electric Generating Units and Fossil Fuel Boilers. Sources required to analyze post combustion NO_x controls shall submit a permit application including the analysis of post combustion NO_x controls to the Division by September 1, 2008.

IV.B.1. The BART analysis must include, at a minimum:

IV.B.1.a. A list of the demonstrated and potentially applicable retrofit control options for the units subject to BART. Sources are not required to evaluate control options, which are less effective than the controls currently installed on the BART subject source or unit.

IV.B.1.b. A discussion of the technical feasibility of each of the technologies identified in Section IV.B.1.a. This discussion should include an analysis of whether the proposed technology is available and applicable. If the source determines that a technology is not technically feasible the discussion shall include a factual demonstration that the option is not commercially available or that unusual circumstances preclude its application to the emission unit.

IV.B.1.c. A ranking of all the technically feasible technologies identified in Section IV.B.1.b. The ranking shall take into account various emission performance characteristics of the technologies. The technologies should be ranked from lowest emissions to highest emissions for each pollutant and each emissions unit. The ranking should include a discussion of pollution control equipment in use at the unit, including upgrading existing equipment if technically feasible.

IV.B.1.d. An evaluation of the impacts of the technically feasible BART options. The impact evaluation shall include:

IV.B.1.d.(i). An estimate of the Average Cost Effectiveness of each of the control technologies identified as technically feasible in Section IV.B.1.b. This analysis shall specify the emissions unit being controlled, the design parameters for the emission controls and cost estimates based on those design parameters. The remaining useful life of the source or unit may be taken into account in the cost of the technologies. The remaining useful life is the difference between: (1) The date that controls will be put in place (capital and other construction costs incurred before controls are put in place can be rolled into the first year); and (2) The date the facility permanently stops operations. Where this affects the BART determination, this date should be assured by a federally- or State-enforceable restriction preventing further operation. The analysis must also include the energy and non-air quality environmental impacts of control options.

IV.B.1.d.(ii). An analysis of the incremental cost effectiveness. Before a control technology can be eliminated the source shall evaluate the incremental cost effectiveness in combination with the total cost effectiveness in order to justify elimination of a control option.

IV.B.1.d.(iii). An evaluation of the visibility impacts for each BART option according to modeling guidance provided by the Division.

IV.B.1.d.(iv). An evaluation of non-air quality impacts. The non-air quality impacts may include water use increases, solid waste disposal, or other adverse environmental impacts.

IV.B.1.d.(v). An evaluation of the energy impacts. The energy impact analysis should look at the energy requirements of the control technology and any energy penalties or benefits associated with the control. The analysis should also consider direct energy consumption and may address concerns over the use of locally scarce fuels or the use of locally or regionally available coal.

IV.B.1.d.(v).(1). The energy impacts analysis may consider whether there are relative differences between alternatives regarding the use of locally or regionally available coal, and whether a given alternative would result in significant economic disruption or unemployment.

IV.B.1.e. An evaluation and justification of the proposed averaging time to evaluate compliance with the proposed emission limitations.

IV.B.1.f. Coal-fired power plants may, in their discretion, include in the BART analysis an evaluation of representative characteristics (including nitrogen content) of coal from sources they reasonably expect to use, to the extent such characteristics tend to result in higher NO_x emissions than coals of the same classification from alternative sources. The analysis also may consider whether a particular BART limit might lead the power plant not to use coal from a particular mine due to such coal characteristics, and the extent to which such a decision might result in economic disruption or unemployment at the mine or in nearby communities.

IV.B.1.g. Sources subject to a MACT standard may limit the analysis for those pollutants covered by the MACT to a discussion of new technologies that have become available since the promulgation of the MACT.

IV.B.2. Sources with a potential to emit of less than 40 tons per year of SO₂ and NO_x and less than 15 TPY of PM₁₀ may exclude those pollutants from the BART determination.

IV.B.3. Selecting a best alternative

The source shall submit a proposal for BART at the source or unit(s), including a justification for selecting the technology proposed. The justification shall be based on the following factors: (1) the technology available; (2) the costs of compliance; (3) the energy and non-air environmental impacts of compliance; (4) any pollution control equipment in use at the source or unit(s); (5) the remaining useful life of the source or unit(s) and; (6) the degree of improvement in visibility which may reasonably be anticipated to result from the use of such technology.

IV.B.4. Schedules to install and operate BART

IV.B.4.a. The technology analysis shall include a schedule to install and operate BART or a BART alternative as expeditiously as practicable following EPA approval of the state implementation plan for regional haze that incorporates such BART requirements. The source must install BART or a BART alternative no later than 5 years after approval of the state implementation plan by EPA for regional haze.

IV.B.4.b. A source or unit subject to BART may implement a BART alternative in lieu of BART if such BART alternative is authorized by the Division.

IV.C. BART Alternative

As an alternative to the installation of BART for a source or sources, the Division may approve a BART Alternative. If the Division approves source grouping as a BART Alternative, only sources (including BART-eligible and non-BART eligible sources) within the same source category (as defined by SIC or NAICS code) within the same airshed may be grouped together.

IV.C.1. If a Source (s) proposes a BART Alternative, the resultant emissions reduction and visibility impacts must be compared with those that would result from the BART options evaluated for the source(s).

IV.C.2. Source (s) proposing a BART alternative shall include in the BART analysis an analysis and justification of the averaging period and method of evaluating compliance with the proposed emission limitation.

IV.D. Emission limits

IV.D.1. Coal-Fired Electric Generating Units

Compliance with the emission limitation is determined on a 30-day rolling average basis for SO_x and NO_x, or may be determined by the Division based on the BART analysis submitted by the source. The emission limit shall be included in the construction permit.

IV.D.2. Other Sources Subject to BART

The Division will establish emission limits with averaging times consistent with established reference methods and include the limit in the construction permit.

IV.E. A source that has installed BART for regional haze or implemented a Division approved BART alternative for regional haze is exempted from the imposition of further controls pursuant to regional haze BART with respect to those pollutants that are controlled through BART or the BART alternative for Regional Haze. Sources may be subject to additional controls or emission reductions based on reasonable further progress requirements under the regional haze State Implementation Plan.

IV.F. Division Review and Approval

IV.F.1. The Division shall review and approve, disapprove or amend the proposed BART technology or BART alternative, including the schedule for compliance for the facility, and averaging period. The Division may place such findings in the construction permit for the facility, and may include such findings and associated requirements in an enforceable agreement between the Division and the source.

IV.F.2. If two or more sources are grouped together pursuant to Section IV.C. the Division shall establish recordkeeping and reporting requirements sufficient to determine that the sources meet the BART alternative emission limits.

IV.F.3. Any source seeking to modify the BART determination for that facility must submit a new BART analysis for review by the Division.

IV.F.4. Public Comment. Division approval of a construction permit or an enforceable agreement under Section IV.F.1 shall be subject to public comment pursuant to Regulation Number 3, Part B. Section III.C.

IV.F.5. Public Comment Hearing

If within thirty calendar days of publication of public notice pursuant to Regulation Number 3, Part B, Section III.C.4, the source or an interested person submits a written request for public hearing to the Division, the Division's preliminary decision respecting a construction permit or an enforceable agreement under Section IV.E that is the subject of such request shall be subject to a public comment hearing held pursuant to Section 25-7-114.5(6)(b), C.R.S. and the Air Quality Control Commission Procedural Rules (5 CCR 1001-1), Section 1.7.0.

V. Challenge of Division BART Determinations and Enforceable Agreements.

V.A. Sources. The owner or operator of a source or unit subject to a Division BART determination established as a permit condition may request a hearing pursuant to Section 25-7-114.5(8), C.R.S and the Air Quality Control Commission Procedural Rules (5CCR 1001-1) Section 1.6.0. The owner or operator of a source subject to such a BART determination may challenge the decision of the Commission pursuant to Article 4 of Title 24, C.R.S.

V.B. Other Interested Persons. Other interested persons seeking to challenge a BART determination or enforceable agreement may request a public comment hearing pursuant to IV.F.5 of this regulation Number 3 Part F, or may challenge a decision of the Commission pursuant to Article 4 of Title 24, C.R.S.

VI. BART Determinations

VI.A. The provisions of this Section VI of Regulation 3, Part F shall be incorporated into Colorado's Regional Haze State Implementation Plan.

VI.B. The sources listed below shall not emit or cause to be emitted nitrogen oxides (NO_x), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), or particulate in excess of the following limits:

UNIT	NO _x CONTROL TYPE	NO _x EMISSION LIMIT	SO ₂ CONTROL TYPE	SO ₂ EMISSION LIMIT	PARTICULATE TYPE AND LIMIT
CENC 4	Low NO _x burners w/ overfire air	115 lb/hr (rolling 30-day average)	None	1.2 lb/MMBtu (3-hour average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.07 lbs/MMBtu
CENC 5	Low NO _x burners w/ overfire air	182 lb/hr (rolling 30-day average)	None	1.2 lb/MMBtu (3-hour average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.07 lbs/MMBtu
Craig 1	Low NO _x burners w/ overfire air (already installed)*	0.39 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.30 lbs/MMBtu (calendar annual average)	Wet Limestone scrubber*	0.15 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.13 lbs/MMBtu (90-day rolling average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu

Craig 2	Low NOx burners w/ overfire air (already installed)*	0.39 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.30 lbs/MMBtu (calendar annual average)	Wet Limestone scrubber*	0.15 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.13 lbs/MMBtu (90-day rolling average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
------------	--	---	-------------------------------	--	--

* Controls are already operating

Unit	NOx CONTROL TYPE	NOx EMISSION LIMIT	SO2 CONTROL TYPE	SO2 EMISSION LIMIT	PARTICULATE TYPE AND LIMIT
Comanche Unit 1	Low NOx Burners	0.20 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average) 0.15 lbs/MMBtu (combined annual average for units 1 & 2)	Lime Spray Dryer	0.12 lbs/MMBtu (individual unit 30-day average) 0.10 lbs/MMBtu (combined unit annual average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Comanche Unit 2	Low NOx Burners	0.20 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average) 0.15 lbs/MMBtu (combined annual average for units 1 & 2)	Lime Spray Dryer	0.12 lbs/MMBtu (individual unit 30-day average) 0.10 lbs/MMBtu (combined unit annual average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Cherokee Unit 4	Modify existing low NOx burner and overfire air systems or install new burners	0.28 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average)	Lime Spray Dryer*	10,500 tons per year, or 70 percent removal, as determined on a calendar year annual basis for the Metro Facilities, combined	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Hayden Unit 1	Modify existing low NOx burner and overfire air systems or install new	0.39 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average)	Lime Spray Dryer*	0.160 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average) 0.13	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu

	burners			lbs/MMBtu (90-day average)	
Hayden Unit 2	Modify existing low NOx burner and overfire air systems or install new burners	0.28 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average)	Lime Spray Dryer*	0.160 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average) 0.13 lbs/MMBtu (90-day average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Pawnee Unit 1	Modify existing low NOx burner and overfire air systems or install new burners	0.23 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average)	Lime Spray Dryer	0.15 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average) 0.12 lbs/MMBtu (annual average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Valmont Unit 5	Modify existing low NOx burner and overfire air systems or install new burners	0.28 lbs/MMBtu (30-day average)	Lime Spray Dryer*	10,500 tons per year, or 70 percent removal, as determined on a calendar year annual basis for the Metro Facilities, combined	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Drake Unit 5	Install overfire air systems	0.39 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.35 lbs/MMBtu (rolling 12- month average)	No control	1.2 lbs/MMBtu (3-hour average) Regulation 1	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
Drake Unit 6	Install overfire air systems	0.39 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.35 lbs/MMBtu (rolling 12- month average)	Lime Spray Dryer	0.150 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu

Drake Unit 7	Install overfire air systems	0.39 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average) 0.35 lbs/MMBtu (rolling 12-month average)	Lime Spray Dryer	0.150 lbs/MMBtu (30-day rolling average)	Fabric Filter Baghouse* 0.03 lbs/MMBtu
CEMEX	Install SNCR	268 lb NOx/hr (30-day rolling average)	No control		Fabric Filter Baghouse*

* Controls are already operating VI.C. Each source listed in the above tables must install the control equipment required to comply with the above limits and averaging times (if not already installed) as expeditiously as practicable, but in no event later than five years after EPA approval of Colorado's state implementation plan for regional haze, or relevant component thereof. Each source listed in the above tables must maintain the control equipment required to comply with the above limits and averaging times, and establish procedures to ensure that such equipment is properly operated and maintained. These sources shall comply with monitoring, record keeping, and reporting requirements as applicable under Regulation No. 3, Regulation No. 1 or federal regulations to ensure compliance with the limits and averaging times listed in the above tables.

VI.D. The sources shall submit to the Division a proposed compliance schedule within sixty days after EPA approves the BART portion of the Regional Haze SIP. The Division shall publish these proposed schedules and provide for a thirty-day public comment period following publication. The Division shall publish its final determinations regarding the proposed schedules for compliance within sixty days after the close of the public comment period and will respond to all public comments received.

PART G STATEMENTS OF BASIS, SPECIFIC STATUTORY AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

I.SS. Adopted December 11, 2008

Revisions to Regulation Number 3, Part F