

**NOTICE OF FINAL RULEMAKING
MARICOPA COUNTY ORDINANCES**

P-27: VEHICLE PARKING AND USE ON UNSTABILIZED VACANT LOTS

P-28: OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE IN UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF MARICOPA COUNTY

PREAMBLE

- 1. Rules Affected** **Rulemaking Action**

Ordinance P-27: Vehicle Parking and Use on Unstabilized Vacant Lots	Amend
Ordinance P-28: Off-Road Vehicle Use in Unincorporated Areas of Maricopa County	Amend

- 2. Statutory authority for the rulemaking:**

Authorizing statutes: A.R.S. §§ 49-474.01 and 11-251
Implementing statutes: A.R.S. § 49-112

- 3. The effective date of the rule:**

Date of adoption: January 12, 2011

- 4. List of all previous notices appearing in the Register addressing the rulemaking:**

Notice of Rulemaking Docket Opening: 16 A.A.R. 1776, September 3, 2010
Notice of Proposed Rulemaking: 16 A.A.R. 1767, September 3, 2010

- 5. The name and address of department personnel with whom persons may communicate regarding the rulemaking:**

Name: Kathleen Sommer
Address: Maricopa County Air Quality Department
Planning and Analysis Division
1001 N. Central Avenue, Suite 595
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Telephone: (602) 506-0169
Fax: (602) 506-6179
E-mail: aqplanning@mail.maricopa.gov

- 6. An explanation of the rule, including the department's reasons for initiating the rulemaking:**

The Maricopa County Air Quality Department (department) has revised ordinances P-27 (Vehicle Parking and Use on Unstabilized Vacant Lots) and P-28 (Off-Road Vehicle Use in Unincorporated Areas of Maricopa County).

Background: These ordinances were adopted by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors on February 20, 2008. As authorized under Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S. § 49-474.01(A)(7)), Ordinance P-27 applies in the unincorporated sections of Area A within Maricopa County and restricts vehicle parking and use on unpaved property. Ordinance P-27 allows for vehicle access to properties if lawful authority is obtained from the land owner and if such use does not violate any other applicable laws. Authorized under A.R.S. § 11-251(43), Ordinance P-28 applies to all unincorporated areas within Maricopa County and applies to any person operating a vehicle on unpaved private property or unpaved public property. These ordinances fulfill the mandatory emissions curtailment elements as required by the passage of Senate Bill 1552 (2007) and commitments made in the Five Percent Plan (MAG, 2007).

Summary: The amendments to these ordinances resulted from recommendations made during meetings with the Maricopa County Justices of the Peace. The changes to Section 4 of the ordinances support graduated or tiered monetary fines for consecutive violations that can be enforced over a three-year period. The amendments impose a civil penalty and eliminate the more serious class 3 misdemeanor for parking on unstabilized vacant lots. In Ordinance P-27, the tiered fines under the civil code range from \$50 for the first violation, \$100 for a second violation and \$250 for a third and any subsequent violation within three years. Also eliminated from the Ordinance P-27 penalty structure is the option to complete an off-highway motor vehicle safety and environmental ethics course.

The tiered fines in Ordinance P-28 replaced a class 3 misdemeanor with civil violations (fines of \$100 and \$250) for the first and second offense, respectively. The criminal class 3 misdemeanor penalty applies after the third or any subsequent offense within any three-year period. Additionally, Ordinance P-28's penalty structure allows the option of completing community restitution or an off-highway motor vehicle safety and environmental ethics course. Other amendments to these ordinances clarify several definitions, address inconsistencies within the ordinances, and clarify exemptions.

As part of the rulemaking process, the department conducted two public workshops on September 30, 2008 and February 4, 2010 to solicit stakeholder comments on these ordinances. Stakeholder responses at these workshops came from regulatory agencies, members of the public, and representatives of the 8500-member Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition. Additionally, the department conducted nine internal meetings with staff and three meetings with stakeholders. The department received numerous written comments from stakeholders regarding this rulemaking. Issues raised during this process and at the workshops are listed and described below.

Issues Raised and Discussed During This Rulemaking Process:

- Why is there a recording requirement to dedicate a road or highway?
- Do state trespass laws and state access laws enacted for the Arizona Game and Fish Department (A.R.S. §§13-1502(A)(1) and 17-304) apply to these County ordinances?
- Clarify Ordinance P-28's "safety and environmental ethics course" option.
- Do these ordinances regulate the types of recreation that private property owners can allow on their property?
- How do these fugitive dust ordinances P-27 and P-28 differ from the County fugitive dust Rules 310 and 310.01?
- Why does Ordinance P-28 apply to all unincorporated areas of Maricopa County whereas Ordinance P-27 only applies to the unincorporated areas of Area A?
- How can OHV riders determine which trails that traverse multiple properties (with different owners) are lawfully accessible?
- Why does the proposed new definition of an approved trail system allow trails to be either "designated or managed or opened"?
- Why are the penalty fees for creating fugitive dust on commercial sites so many magnitudes higher than the penalty fees for public OHV riders creating fugitive dust?

Why is there a recording requirement to dedicate a road or highway?

During discussions of the first (2008) ordinance revisions, stakeholders objected to the definition of "road or highway" definition in which a recording requirement is specified to establish a private road, highway or managed trail. The objection to this requirement was first addressed when the ordinances were originally adopted in February, 2008. The response to this question is that the definition of a road or highway in Ordinance P-28 is consistent with state statute (A.R.S. § 28-1171), and the Maricopa County Zoning and Building Code definition of private road. After reviewing the Arizona Revised Statutes, the Code of Federal Regulations, and the Maricopa County Zoning Ordinance, and consulting with the concerned public and trust land managers, it was concluded that Ordinance P-28 cannot serve its purpose to reduce unrestricted cross-country vehicle travel unless appropriate routes can be identified with a recorded document.

Do state trespass laws and state access laws enacted for the Arizona Game and Fish Department (A.R.S. §§ 13-1502(A)(1) and 17-304) apply to these County ordinances??

A.R.S. § 13-1502(A)(1) (Criminal trespass in the third degree) applies to all criminal trespass where someone knowingly enters or remains unlawfully on any real property. In contrast, these ordinances do not address “access” to properties and only restrict where a person can operate or drive a vehicle. The ordinances do not address access by other means, such as walking. These ordinances describe that vehicle operators are responsible to understand where they are allowed to operate their vehicles just as hunters and anglers are responsible for knowing which lands are open to recreational activity.

A.R.S. § 17-304 (Prohibition by Landowner upon hunting; posting) establishes policies and programs managed by the Arizona Game and Fish Department. Specifically, A.R.S. § 17-304 provides landowners who desire to prohibit hunting, fishing or trapping on their lands, the authority to post such lands closed to hunting, fishing, or trapping using notices or signboards. These ordinances do not supersede this authority of the landowners on their own property. Ordinance P-28 restricts cross-country vehicle travel by identifying appropriate routes, and does not address recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, or trapping.

Clarify Ordinance P-28’s “safety and environmental ethics course” option.

Senate Bill 1167 (2008) defined the content of the off-highway vehicle safety course, which is now described in A.R.S. § 28-1175. Under this statute, the Arizona Game and Fish Department conducts or approves this educational course of instruction in off-highway vehicle safety and environmental ethics. The course includes instruction on off-highway vehicle use that limits air pollution and harm to natural terrain, vegetation and animals. Successful completion of the course requires passing a written examination.

Do these ordinances regulate the types of recreation that private property owners can allow on their property?

Private property access, use, exclusion, and management are controlled by the private property owner and County ordinances do not supersede the private property owner’s rights. Also, County regulations do not specify or address types of recreation allowed on private properties. A property owner can allow any or all types of recreation on their properties, such as hunting, fishing, and trapping, as long as they do not violate any other applicable laws or rules, such as Maricopa County Rule 310.01. Irrespective of what property owners choose to do on their land, they are still responsible for maintaining and stabilizing their properties under Maricopa County Rule 310.01.

How do these fugitive dust ordinances P-27 and P-28 differ from the County fugitive dust Rules 310 and 310.01?

Ordinances P-27 and P-28 reduce unrestricted vehicle access on unstabilized properties and do not supersede or overlap the Maricopa County fugitive dust rules (Rules 310 and 310.01). The difference between the ordinances and the Maricopa County fugitive dust rules (Rules 310 and 310.01) is that the ordinances apply to vehicle owners operating on unpaved property, while the rules apply to the property owner(s). Together the ordinances and the Maricopa County fugitive dust rules fulfill mandatory emissions curtailment elements as required by Senate Bill 1552 (2007), and commitments made in the Five Percent Plan for PM₁₀.

Why does Ordinance P-28 apply to all unincorporated areas of Maricopa County whereas Ordinance P-27 only applies to the unincorporated areas of Area A?

The two ordinances apply to different jurisdictions due to different statutory authorities. Ordinance P-28 is authorized by Title 11 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, which applies to all of Maricopa County. Ordinance P-27 is authorized by Senate Bill 1552 (2007), under Title 49 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, requiring the adoption of an ordinance for Area A within Maricopa County. Ordinance P-28’s purpose is to reduce unrestricted cross-country vehicle travel in unincorporated areas of Maricopa County, while Ordinance P-27 is designed to reduce vehicle parking and use in Area A of Maricopa County.

How can OHV riders determine which trails that traverse multiple properties (with different owners) are lawfully accessible?

Stakeholders commented that Arizona is a patchwork quilt of jurisdictions, so it is very difficult for OHV riders recreating across multiple properties to determine where they are lawfully allowed to ride. To help resolve the confusion of identifying approved trails, the County made the following ordinance revisions. The private property owners can make agreements with the land management agencies to manage the trails on their proper-

ties. The land management agencies can identify trails and properties that are open for OHV riders by posting signs, creating maps, or posting virtually. OHV riders will be able to rely on the land management agencies to identify trails, rather than being burdened to approach individual property owners. The land management agencies will also take responsibility for stabilizing and maintaining routes and trails on the private properties for which there is an agreement established.

Why does the proposed new definition of an approved trail system allow trails to be either “designated or managed or opened”?

Restricting vehicles activities to approved trails limits cross-country, off-trail, vehicle activity and helps reduce fugitive dust. The amendments to the definition of “designated or open trail system” allow vehicle routes and trails to be approved without going through the extensive and timely designation process. This process allows a route that is not officially “designated” to be approved for use by land management agencies as either “managed” or “opened”. This is consistent with A.R.S. § 28-1171.8, which defines “off-highway vehicle trail” as including a choice of designated or managed routes. Allowing additional methods of trail approval helps create more trails for OHV use and discourages the vehicle, off-trail activities.

Why are the penalty fees for creating fugitive dust on commercial sites so many magnitudes higher than the penalty fees for public OHV riders creating fugitive dust?

The legislature has established appropriate penalties for different entities, and the penalty structure in the County ordinances and rules follows this statutory authority.

Description of Amendments:

Ordinance P-27: Vehicle Parking and Use on Unstabilized Vacant Lots:

- Section 2: Revised and clarified the definitions “Designated, Managed or Opened Trail System”, “Road or Highway”, and added a definition of “Enforcement Officer”.
- Section 4: Revised this section to institute a new tiered penalty structure and deleted the alternative to the monetary fine of community restitution time or completing a safety/environmental course.

Ordinance P-28: Off-Road Vehicle Use in Unincorporated Areas of Maricopa County:

- Section 2: Revised and clarified the definitions “Designated, Managed, or Opened Trail System”, “Road or Highway”, and added a definition of “Enforcement Officer”.
- Section 3: Added a new paragraph clarifying where the restrictions apply and reorganized this section by eliminating the redundancy in the explanations of obtaining lawful authority and consent of the lawful owner.
- Section 3(D): Renamed and clarified the definition of “Proof of Lawful Authority or Consent”.
- Section 4: Revised this section to institute a new tiered penalty structure and clarified the alternatives to the penalty.
- Section 5: Clarified to whom the existing exemptions apply and added an exemption for commercial farming practices.

In addition, the amendments corrected typographical or other clerical errors; made minor grammatical changes to improve readability or clarity; modified the format, numbering, order, capitalization, punctuation, or syntax of certain text to increase standardization; or made various other minor changes of a purely editorial nature.

7. Demonstration of compliance with A.R.S. § 49-112:

Under A.R.S. § 49-479(C), a county may not adopt a rule or ordinance that is more stringent than the rules adopted by the Director of the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) for similar sources unless it demonstrates compliance with the requirements of A.R.S. § 49-112(A).

Compliance with A.R.S. § 49-112(A):

When authorized by law, a county may adopt a rule, ordinance, or other regulation that is more stringent than or in addition to a provision of this title or rule adopted by the director or any board or commission authorized to adopt rules pursuant to this title if all the following conditions are met:

1. The rule, ordinance or other regulation is necessary to address a peculiar local condition;
2. There is credible evidence that the rule, ordinance or other regulation is either:
 - (a) Necessary to prevent a significant threat to public health or the environment that results from a peculiar local condition and is technically and economically feasible, or

- (b) Required under a federal statute or regulation, or authorized pursuant to an intergovernmental agreement with the federal government to enforce federal statutes or regulations if the county rule, ordinance or other regulation is equivalent to federal statutes or regulations.
- 3. Any fee or tax adopted under the rule, ordinance or other regulation will not exceed the reasonable costs of the county to issue and administer that permit or plan approval program.

Ordinances P-27 and P-28 were first passed in February, 2008 after they were mandated under Senate Bill 1552 (2007) and A.R.S. § 11-251(43) in response to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designation of the Phoenix area as serious non-attainment area for particulate matter at 10 microns. This designation requires, under the Clean Air Act Section 189, an annual reduction in PM₁₀ or PM₁₀ precursor emissions of not less than 5 percent each year (Five Percent Plan) in the Phoenix area. The Phoenix area was designated as serious non-attainment for PM₁₀ after failing to attain the PM₁₀ standard by the federal deadline of December 31, 2006 (72 FR 31183, June 6, 2007).

The amendments to these ordinances are administrative changes and do not change the substance of these ordinances. These adopted revisions support a more flexible, graduated or tiered system of monetary fines for consecutive ordinance violations. Imposing a graduated fine structure encourages public awareness of the importance of these regulations and the potential severity of violating them. Imposing a civil penalty for initial violations of Ordinance P-28 allows a public education process or warning before the third offense becomes a more severe criminal violation. Because these revisions are administrative and do not impact the original ordinance purpose to reduce PM₁₀ emissions under the original mandates, this demonstrates these ordinance revisions continue to be necessary to address this peculiar local condition and qualifies under A.R.S. § 49-112(A).

Compliance with A.R.S. § 49-112(B):

The A.R.S. § 49-112(B) demonstration does not apply, because these particular ordinances are in the portion of the department's air quality program that is administered under direct statutory authority. Therefore, these ordinances were not proposed for adoption or revision in lieu of a state program.

8. Reference to any study relevant to the rule that the department reviewed and either proposes to rely on in its evaluation of or justification for the rule, where the public may obtain or review each study, all data underlying each study, and any analysis of each study and other supporting material:

MAG, 2007. MAG Five Percent Plan for PM₁₀ for the Maricopa County Nonattainment Area. Prepared by the Maricopa Association of Governments. December 2007.

9. A showing of good cause why the rule is necessary to promote a statewide interest if the rule will diminish a previous grant of authority of a political subdivision of this state:

Not applicable

10. The summary of the economic, small business, and consumer impact:

Summary: Ordinance P-27 restricts vehicle parking and use on vacant lots within Area A in Maricopa County. Ordinance P-28 prevents unrestricted vehicle access on properties in Maricopa County. These ordinances regulate the reduction of emissions of PM₁₀ as required for the annual Five Percent Nonattainment Plan for PM₁₀ required by EPA as well that required by Arizona Revised Statutes. These ordinance revisions are administrative (imposing a graduated system of monetary fines for repeated violations), and do not impose additional costs to implement, do not affect small business, and have negligible economic consequences for the community. This tiered penalty structure does not affect the economic impacts previously described in the Ordinances' original version's Notice of Final Rulemaking (14 A.A.R § 1148, April 11, 2008), such as the physical health and welfare effects, particulate matter emissions, or additional costs for the department to enforce compliance of these ordinances.

Conclusion of summary of economic, small business, and consumer impact: The graduated monetary fines do not change the substance of these ordinances and imposing the graduated fine structure should benefit the public. The tiered fine structure helps bring about an awareness of the importance of these regulations and the potential severity of violating them. The penalty consequence of the first and second violations of Ordinance P-

28 are civil violations, and provide education to the public that these regulations are in place before receiving a third offense, which can become a more severe criminal violation.

Because these revisions are administrative changes, they do not impact the original ordinance purpose to reduce PM₁₀ emissions. The ordinances will continue to fulfill the mandatory emissions curtailment elements as required by the passage of Senate Bill 1552 (2007) and commitments made in the Five Percent Plan to reduce PM₁₀ emissions in the Phoenix nonattainment area as required by the Federal Clean Air Act.

11. Name and address of department personnel with whom persons may communicate regarding the accuracy of the economic, small business, and consumer impact statement:

Name: Kathleen Sommer
Address: Maricopa County Air Quality Department
Planning and Analysis Division
1001 N. Central Avenue, Suite 595
Phoenix, AZ 85004
Telephone: (602) 506-0169
Fax: (602) 506-6179
E-mail: aqplanning@mail.maricopa.gov

12. Description of the changes between the proposed rule, including supplemental notices and final rule:

Since the final drafts of Ordinances P-27 and P-28 were published in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on September 3, 2010, and in response to formal comments received during the formal comment period September-October, 2010, the following changes to Ordinances P-27 and P-28 were adopted by the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors on January 12, 2011. These amendments to the ordinances appear in the text of the final ordinances published in this Notice of Final Rulemaking. The adopted amendments include the following:

Ordinance P-27:

Section 2, Definitions: In the introduction to Section 2, retained the original text and deleted text, which had been proposed to be added: "...in addition to those definitions found in Rule 100 (General Provisions and Definitions) of these rules. In the event of any inconsistency between any of the Maricopa County air pollution control rules, the definitions in this ordinance take precedence."

Section 2(B): Re-inserted the phrase "approved by such agency" at the end of the definition.

Ordinance P-28:

Section 2, Definitions: In the introduction to Section 2, retained the original text and deleted text, which was proposed to be added: "...in addition to those definitions found in Rule 100 (General Provisions and Definitions) of these rules. In the event of any inconsistency between any of the Maricopa County air pollution control rules, the definitions in this ordinance take precedence."

Section 2(A): Re-inserted the phrase "approved by such agency" at the end of the definition.

13. A summary of the comments made regarding the rule and the department response to them:

The department conducted two public workshops throughout the rulemaking process for Ordinances P-27 and P-28 and received formal comments during the comment period (September 3, 2010 through October 4, 2010) from the Arizona Game and Fish Department, Arizona State Land Department, and the Arizona Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition. The formal comments and the department's responses to comments are provided below:

Comment #1:

Comments received indicated that the ordinance revisions were approved by both regulators and the regulated community and that these revisions have addressed and satisfied the many concerns that they had about the County off-road vehicle regulations.

Response #1:

The department appreciates the cooperation of regulators in the land management community who partnered and participated with Maricopa County in the ordinance development process. The department will continue to

rely on the support of the regulatory agencies and the regulated community to help develop these air quality ordinances.

Comment #2:

Comments received indicated a concern with the change in the definition in Ordinance P-28, Section 2(A) “Designated, Managed or Opened Trail System”, where trails “opened to public motor vehicle travel by a government land management agency, by rule....” could require additional formal rulemaking within their agency to accommodate the requirement.

Response #2:

The purpose of the addition of multiple options for land management agencies to open trails to public motor vehicle travel was to encourage the creation of more trails for OHV use, which should help discourage the vehicle, off-trail activities. The definition of a “Designated, Managed or Opened Trail System” adds alternative methods of trail approval by which a trail can be created via means other than the lengthy trail designation process. If a formal rulemaking process is too cumbersome for an agency to use, then regulators may open or approve trails by other alternatives (such as an order, sign or map) as long as the process designates the approving agency as the responsible party willing to maintain and manage the trail.

Comment #3:

Comments received expressed concern about the removal of the phrase “approved by such agency” as it applies to OHV trail maps, in the proposed definition, Ordinance P-28, Section 2(A) “Designated, Managed or Opened Trail System”.

Response #3:

The department re-inserted the phrase “approved by such agency” at the end of the definition of “Designated, Managed or Opened Trail System”. Only the land management agency, with authority over a property, can open a trail on a property.

14. Any other matters prescribed by statute that are applicable to the specific department or to any specific rule or class of rules:

A.R.S. § 13-1502(A)(1) - Criminal trespass in the third degree.
A.R.S. § 17-304 - Prohibition by landowner upon hunting; posting.
A.R.S. § 28-1171 – Definition of a road or highway.

15. Incorporations by reference and their location in the rule:

Not applicable

16. Was this rule previously an emergency rule?

No

17. The full text of the rule follows:

MARICOPA COUNTY ORDINANCE

P-27

VEHICLE PARKING AND USE ON UNSTABILIZED VACANT LOTS

INDEX

SECTION 1 – GENERAL

- A. PURPOSE
- B. APPLICABILITY

SECTION 2 – DEFINITIONS

- A. AREA A
- B. DESIGNATED, MANAGED OR OPENED TRAIL SYSTEM
- C. ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
- ~~C~~.D. ROAD OR HIGHWAY
- ~~D~~.E. VACANT LOTS
- ~~E~~.F. VEHICLE

SECTION 3 – REQUIREMENTS

- A. RESTRICTED VEHICLE PARKING AND USE

SECTION 4 – ~~VIOLATIONS, NOTICES, AND PENALTIES~~ PENALTIES AND NOTICES

- A. VIOLATIONS
- B. NOTICES

SECTION 5 – EXEMPTIONS

MARICOPA COUNTY ORDINANCE

P-27

VEHICLE PARKING AND USE ON UNSTABILIZED VACANT LOTS

SECTION 1 – GENERAL

- A. **PURPOSE:** This ordinance ~~restricts all~~ limits particulate matter (PM₁₀) emissions into the ambient air from unrestricted vehicle parking and use on unstabilized vacant lots.
- B. **APPLICABILITY:** This ordinance applies to vehicle parking and use in the unincorporated sections of Area A that are within Maricopa County.

SECTION 2 – DEFINITIONS: For the purpose of this ordinance, the following definitions shall apply:

- A. **AREA A** – The part of the greater Phoenix metropolitan area where specific pollution control programs are in place for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. As defined in Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S. § 49-541(1)), the area in Maricopa County delineated as follows:
 - Township 8 North, Range 2 East and Range 3 East
 - Township 7 North, Range 2 West through Range 5 East
 - Township 6 North, Range 5 West through Range 6 East
 - Township 5 North, Range 5 West through Range 7 East
 - Township 4 North, Range 5 West through Range 8 East
 - Township 3 North, Range 5 West through Range 8 East
 - Township 2 North, Range 5 West through Range 8 East
 - Township 1 North, Range 5 West through Range 7 East
 - Township 1 South, Range 5 West through Range 7 East
 - Township 2 South, Range 5 West through Range 7 East
 - Township 3 South, Range 5 West through Range 1 East
 - Township 4 South, Range 5 West through Range 1 East
- B. **DESIGNATED, MANAGED OR OPENED TRAIL SYSTEM** – Roads, highways, multiple use corridors, trails or routes that are part of a system of trails and routes that are designated, managed or opened to public motor vehicle travel by a government land management agency by rule, order, travel management plan, sign, and/or map approved by such agency.

- C.** **ENFORCEMENT OFFICER** – A person who enforces rules, ordinances, codes or regulations including, but not limited to, Maricopa County Air Quality Department Inspectors, Building and Zoning Code Enforcement, Certified Peace Officers including, but not limited to, Maricopa County Sheriff Deputies.
- D.** **ROAD OR HIGHWAY** – The entire width between the boundary lines of every way publicly maintained by the federal government, a city, state agency, ~~a town~~, or a county if any part of the way is generally open to the use of the public for purposes of vehicular travel. For purposes of this ordinance, the term “road or highway” also includes designated, managed or opened trail systems; service roads regardless of surface composition; and any ~~other~~ private property dedicated or otherwise reserved for public or private street uses, as evidenced by a recorded document providing vehicular access to more than one property, or having thereon a public easement for such use.
- E.** **VACANT LOTS** – Any of the following described in Section ~~2(D)(1)~~ 2(E)(1) through Section ~~2(D)(4)~~ 2(E)(4) of this ordinance:
1. An unsubdivided or undeveloped tract of land.
 2. A subdivided residential, industrial, institutional, governmental, or commercial lot that contains no approved or permitted buildings, structures, or uses of a temporary or permanent nature.
 3. A partially developed residential, industrial, institutional, governmental, or commercial lot.
 4. For the purposes of this ordinance, a vacant lot is not a road or highway.
- F.** **VEHICLE** – A self-propelled device and its appurtenances, excluding devices moved by human power or used exclusively on stationary rails or tracks.

SECTION 3 – REQUIREMENTS

- A.** **RESTRICTED VEHICLE PARKING AND USE:** A person shall not park or use a vehicle on an unstabilized vacant lot within the unincorporated sections of Area A in Maricopa County.

SECTION 4 - VIOLATIONS, NOTICES, AND PENALTIES:- AND NOTICES

- A.** **VIOLATIONS:** A person who violates this ordinance is ~~guilty of a class 3 misdemeanor~~ subject to a civil penalty of \$50. A second violation of this ordinance within three years is subject to a civil penalty of \$100 and a third or any subsequent violation within a three-year period is subject to a civil penalty of \$250.
- B.** ~~In addition to or in lieu of a fine pursuant to this section, a judge may order the person to perform at least eight but not more than twenty four hours of a community restitution course related to the off highway operation of motor vehicles.~~

~~C.~~**B.** **NOTICES:** For violations of this ordinance, the Enforcement Officer shall use a uniform traffic ticket and complaint prescribed by the rules of procedure in civil traffic cases adopted by the Supreme Court. The Enforcement Officer may issue a citation to persons in violation of this ordinance.

SECTION 5 – EXEMPTIONS

- A.** The property owner, person entitled to immediate possession of the property, or invitee who has ~~lawful authority~~ permission from the land owner may operate such vehicles if such use does not violate any other applicable laws.

- B.** Any site that has been issued a permit by the Control Officer for the control of fugitive dust from dust generating operations.

MARICOPA COUNTY ORDINANCE

P-28

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE IN UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF MARICOPA COUNTY

INDEX

SECTION 1 – GENERAL

- A. PURPOSE
- B. APPLICABILITY

SECTION 2 – DEFINITIONS

- A. DESIGNATED, MANAGED OR OPENED TRAIL SYSTEM
- ~~B.~~ ROAD OR HIGHWAY ENFORCEMENT OFFICER
- ~~B.C.~~ VEHICLE ROAD OR HIGHWAY
- ~~C.D.~~ VEHICLE

SECTION 3 – RESTRICTIONS

- A. UNPAVED PUBLIC PROPERTY
- B. UNPAVED PRIVATE PROPERTY
- C. DETERMINATION OF LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR CONSENT OF THE LAWFUL OWNER
- D. PROOF OF LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR CONSENT

SECTION 4 – ~~VIOLATIONS, NOTICES, AND PENALTIES~~ PENALTIES AND NOTICES

- A. PENALTIES
- B. ALTERNATIVE PENALTY
- C. NOTICES

SECTION 5 – ~~EXEMPTION~~ EXEMPTIONS

MARICOPA COUNTY ORDINANCE

P-28

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE IN UNINCORPORATED AREAS
OF MARICOPA COUNTY

SECTION 1 – GENERAL

- A. **PURPOSE:** This ordinance ~~restricts the~~ limits particulate matter (PM₁₀) emissions into the ambient air from unrestricted operation of any vehicle on unpaved property.
- B. **APPLICABILITY:** This ordinance applies to the operation of any vehicle in unincorporated ~~sections~~ areas within Maricopa County.

SECTION 2 – DEFINITIONS: For the purpose of this ordinance, the following definitions shall apply:

- A. **DESIGNATED, MANAGED OR OPENED TRAIL SYSTEM** – Roads, highways, multiple-use corridors, trails or routes that are part of a system of trails and routes that are designated, managed or opened to public motor vehicle travel by a government land management agency by rule, order, travel management plan, sign, and/or map approved by such agency.
- B. **ENFORCEMENT OFFICER** - A person who enforces rules, ordinances, codes, or regulations including, but not limited to, Maricopa County Air Quality Department Inspectors, Building and Zoning Code enforcement, Certified Peace Officers including, but not limited to, Maricopa County Sheriff Deputies.
- ~~B.C.~~ **ROAD OR HIGHWAY** – The entire width between the boundary lines of every way publicly maintained by the federal government, a city, state agency, a town, or a county if any part of the way is generally open to the use of the public for purposes of vehicular travel. For purposes of this ordinance, the term “road or highway” also includes designated, managed or opened trail systems; service roads regardless of surface composition; and any ~~other~~ private property dedicated or otherwise reserved for public or private street uses, as evidenced by a recorded document providing vehicular access to more than one property or having thereon a public easement for such use.
- ~~C.D.~~ **VEHICLE**— A self-propelled device and its appurtenances, excluding devices moved by human power or used exclusively on stationary rails or tracks.

SECTION 3 – RESTRICTIONS: Vehicles operating on either unpaved public or private properties in the unincorporated areas of Maricopa County shall remain on roads or highways. A person operating a vehicle on portions of these properties other than roads or highways shall comply with the following:

A. UNPAVED PUBLIC PROPERTY: ~~A person shall not access~~ operating a vehicle on unpaved public property ~~with any vehicle within the unincorporated areas of Maricopa County without~~ shall obtain lawful authority. Lawful authority ~~shall consist~~ consists of one of the following: rules, regulations, or orders of a federal agency, this state, a county, or municipality. ~~which~~ Determination of lawful authority shall be made available to the public by any one of the following: options listed in Section 3(C) of this ordinance.

- ~~1. A sign to designate the property is/as open. Such sign shall be in compliance with the standard travel management signing protocol used by southwest land management agencies and, and shall at a minimum, be conspicuously placed at all points of vehicular access and contain the following information: “Travel must remain on designated routes.” Copies of the standard travel management signing protocol are available for review at the Maricopa County Air Quality Department, 1001 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ, 85004.~~
- ~~2. Through orders of a government land management agency.~~
- ~~3. Through most current maps approved by such government land management agency.~~
- ~~4. Virtual posting from a government land management agency.~~

B. UNPAVED PRIVATE PROPERTY: ~~A person shall not operate~~ operating a vehicle on unpaved private property ~~within the unincorporated areas of Maricopa County without~~ shall obtain the consent of the lawful property owner. Consent of the lawful owner ~~consists of either or both of the following:~~ can be obtained by any one of the options listed in Section 3(C) of this ordinance.

- ~~1. A sign to designate the property is/as open. Such sign shall be in compliance with the standard travel management signing protocol used by southwest land management agencies and shall at a minimum, be conspicuously placed at all points of vehicular access and contain the following information: “Travel must remain on designated routes.” Copies of the standard travel management signing protocol are available for review at the Maricopa County Air Quality Department, 1001 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ, 85004.~~
- ~~2. Prior written permission which contains the following:~~

C. DETERMINATION OF LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR CONSENT OF THE LAWFUL OWNER: Determination of lawful authority or consent of the lawful owner shall be made available by any one of the options listed below:

1. A sign to designate the property is/as open. Such signs shall be in compliance with the standard travel management signing protocol used by each land managing agency which specifies the open roads and highways. The signs at a minimum shall be conspicuously placed at all points of vehicular access.
2. Posting, publishing, or filing a rule, regulation, travel management plan, or order at the locations identified at the government agency’s office, or on its website.

3. Current maps published and approved by a government land management agency.
4. Virtual postings from a government land management agency.
5. Prior written recreational access agreement originating from the lawful owner granting vehicular access which shall contain the following:
 - (a) The name, address, and telephone number of the person or organization granting permission for the use of the property;
 - (b) A description of the interest the person or organization granting permission has in the property (i.e., property owner, lessee, or agent);
 - (c) If the person or organization granting permission is not the owner of the property, the written permission shall also contain the name, address, and telephone number of the property owner;
 - (d) Specify the period of time for which permission for the use of the property is being granted and whether access is approved for any or a combination of OHV recreation, hunting, fishing, and/or trapping; and
 - (e) The signature of the person or organization representative granting permission for the use of the property.
6. Written permission of consent originating from the lawful owner granting vehicular access, which shall contain the following:
 - (a) The name, address, and telephone number of the person granting permission for the use of the property;
 - (b) A description of the interest the person granting permission has in the property (i.e., property owner, lessee, or agent);
 - (c) If the person granting permission is not the owner of the property, the written permission shall also contain the name, address, and telephone number of the property owner;
 - (d) Specify the period of time for which permission for the use of the property is being granted; and
 - (e) The signature of the person or organization representative granting permission for the use of the property.

C.D. **PROOF OF LAWFUL AUTHORITY OR CONSENT:** Whenever any person is stopped by an Enforcement Officer for a violation of Section 3 of this ordinance, ~~he/she~~ such person shall, upon the request of the Enforcement Officer, identify or present ~~the lawful authority~~ proof of lawful authority or lawful owner consent as required in ~~this~~ section 3(C) of this ordinance.

SECTION 4 – VIOLATIONS, NOTICES, AND PENALTIES AND NOTICES: Violations of this ordinance shall be punishable by civil or criminal penalties. The issuance of any lawful authority, consent of the lawful owner, or written permission, as allowed by this ordinance, shall not relieve any person subject to the requirements of this ordinance from complying with any federal laws, Arizona laws, or the Maricopa County Air Pollution Control Regulations.

- A. ~~A person who violates this ordinance is guilty of a class 3 misdemeanor.~~ **PENALTIES:** A person who violates this ordinance shall be subject to the following penalties:
1. For the first offense, a civil penalty of \$100.
 2. For the second offense within a three-year period, a civil penalty of \$250.
 3. For the third or any subsequent offense within a three-year period, a class 3 misdemeanor.
- B. **ALTERNATIVE PENALTY:** In addition to or in lieu of a fine ~~pursuant to this section~~ under Section 4 of this ordinance, a judge may order the person to perform at least eight but not more than twenty-four hours of a community restitution ~~course~~ or complete a safety and environmental ethics course according to A.R.S. § 28-1175 related to the off-highway operation of motor vehicles, or both.
- C. **NOTICES:** For violations of this ordinance, the Enforcement Officer shall use a uniform traffic ticket and complaint prescribed by the rules of procedure in civil traffic cases adopted by the Supreme Court. The Enforcement Officer may issue a citation to persons in violation of this ordinance.

SECTION 5 – ~~EXEMPTION:~~ EXEMPTIONS:

- A. This ordinance shall not apply during a period of emergency or if the operation is directed by a peace officer or other public authority.
- B. ~~The~~ This ordinance shall not apply to the property owner, or person entitled to immediate possession of the property, or invitee who has lawful authority may operate such vehicles on the property if such use provided such property owner or person does not violate any other applicable laws.
- C. ~~For the purposes of this ordinance, unpaved public or unpaved private property does not include roads or highways.~~
- ~~D.C.~~ This ordinance shall not apply to operations directed by utilities for operation, distribution, and transmission systems and operations directed by railroad companies for operation and maintenance provided that both of the following conditions are met:
1. Operations are performed in ~~a/~~ or using a marked company vehicle; and
 2. If operations are performed in ~~a/~~ or using a personal vehicle, then identification of the company shall be visible and readable by the public without having to be asked by the public (e.g., included in / posted ~~in~~ on a sign that is visible on the vehicle or ~~included / posted in a sign that is visible~~ in the window of the vehicle).
- D.** This ordinance shall not apply to commercial farming practices including activities of a dairy, a beef cattle feed lot, a poultry facility and a swine facility.