

AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued To: Yellowstone Valley Veterinary Inc.
50 Moore Lane
Billings, MT 59101

Permit: #4195-00
Application Complete: 2/18/2008
Preliminary Determination Issued: 03/05/08
Department's Decision Issued: 3/21/08
Permit Final: 04/08/07
AFS #: 111-0041

An air quality permit, with conditions, is hereby granted to Yellowstone Valley Veterinary Inc. (YVV), pursuant to Sections 75-2-204, 211, and 215 of the Montana Code Annotated (MCA), as amended, and Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.8.740, *et seq.*, as amended, for the following:

SECTION I: Permitted Facilities

A. Permitted Equipment

YVV proposed to operate a natural gas-fired 2004 model Power-Pak JR (1E43-PPJ) animal crematory (Unit #2) with a maximum incineration capacity of 75 pounds per hour (lb/hr) and associated equipment. In addition, YVV operates an existing natural gas-fired 1990 model 1E43-PPJ Power Pak JR animal crematory (Unit #1) with a maximum incineration capacity of 75 lb/hr, which predates the permitting requirements for incinerators under Section 75-2-215, MCA. A complete description of the permitted equipment is contained in the permit analysis.

B. Plant Location

The YVV facility is located at 50 Moore Lane, Billings, Montana. The legal description of the site is Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, in Yellowstone County, Montana.

SECTION II: Conditions and Limitations

A. Operational Requirements

1. YVV shall not incinerate/cremate any material other than animal remains and any corresponding animal remains container, unless otherwise approved by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). YVV shall provide written notice to the Department and obtain approval from the Department if material other than what would normally be termed animal remains and/or animal remains container is to be incinerated (ARM 17.8.749).
2. Unit #2 shall be equipped with auxiliary fuel burners. The auxiliary fuel burners shall be used to preheat the secondary chamber of the crematoriums to the minimum required operating temperature prior to igniting the primary chamber burner. The operating temperatures shall be maintained during operation and for one-half hour after waste feed has stopped. The secondary chamber operating temperature of the crematoriums shall be maintained above 1500°F for any one-hour averaging period with no single reading less than 1400°F (ARM 17.8.752).

3. YVV shall operate Unit #2 as specified in the application for Montana Air Quality Permit #4195-00. Further, YVV shall develop crematorium operation procedures, print those procedures in a crematorium operation procedures manual and require all personnel who operate the crematorium to familiarize themselves with the operating procedures. A copy of this manual shall be supplied to the Department (ARM 17.8.752).

B. Emission Limitations

YVV shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from Unit #2:

1. Visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.752); and
2. Any particulate emissions in excess of 0.10 grams per dry standard cubic foot (gr/dscf), corrected to 12% carbon Dioxide (CO₂) (ARM 17.8.752).

C. Testing Requirements

1. All compliance source tests shall conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (ARM 17.8.106).
2. The Department may require testing (ARM 17.8.105).

D. Monitoring Requirements

YVV shall install, calibrate, maintain, and operate continuous monitoring and recording equipment, or use another measurement/recording system as may be approved by the Department, on Unit #2 to measure the secondary chamber exit gas temperature. YVV shall also record the daily quantity of material incinerated/cremated and the daily hours of operation of the crematorium (ARM 17.8.749).

E. Operation Reporting Requirements

1. YVV shall supply the Department with annual production information for all emission points, as required by the Department in the annual emission inventory request. The request will include, but is not limited to, all sources of emissions identified in the emission inventory contained in the permit analysis.

Production information shall be gathered on a calendar-year basis and submitted to the Department by the date required in the emission inventory request. Information shall be in the units required by the Department (ARM 17.8.505).

2. YVV shall notify the Department of any construction or improvement project conducted pursuant to ARM 17.8.745, that would include a change in control equipment, stack height, stack diameter, stack flow, stack gas temperature, source location or fuel specifications, or would result in an increase in source capacity above its permitted operation or the addition of a new emission unit. The notice must be submitted to the Department, in writing, 10 days prior to start up or use of the proposed de minimis change, or as soon as reasonably practicable in the event of an unanticipated circumstance causing the de minimis change, and must include the information requested in ARM 17.8.745(1)(d) (ARM 17.8.745).

3. All records compiled in accordance with this permit must be maintained by YVV as a permanent business record for at least 5 years following the date of the measurement, must be available at the plant site for inspection by the Department, and must be submitted to the Department upon request (ARM 17.8.749).

F. Notification

YVV shall provide the Department with written notification of the following dates within the specified time periods (ARM 17.8.749):

1. Commencement of construction of Cremation Unit #2 within 30 days after commencement of construction.
2. Actual start-up date of Cremation Unit #2 within 15 days after the actual start-up date.

SECTION III: General Conditions

- A. Inspection – YVV shall allow the Department’s representatives access to the source at all reasonable times for the purpose of making inspections or surveys, collecting samples, obtaining data, auditing any monitoring equipment (CEMS, CERMS) or observing any monitoring or testing, and otherwise conducting all necessary functions related to this permit.
- B. Waiver – The permit and the terms, conditions, and matters stated herein shall be deemed accepted if YVV fails to appeal as indicated below.
- C. Compliance with Statutes and Regulations – Nothing in this permit shall be construed as relieving YVV of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule, or standard, except as specifically provided in ARM 17.8.740, *et seq.* (ARM 17.8.756).
- D. Enforcement – Violations of limitations, conditions and requirements contained herein may constitute grounds for permit revocation, penalties, or other enforcement action as specified in Section 75-2-401, *et seq.*, MCA.
- E. Appeals – Any person or persons jointly or severally adversely affected by the Department’s decision may request, within 15 days after the Department renders its decision, upon affidavit setting forth the grounds therefore, a hearing before the Board of Environmental Review (Board). A hearing shall be held under the provisions of the Montana Administrative Procedures Act. The filing of a request for a hearing does not stay the Department’s decision, unless the Board issues a stay upon receipt of a petition and a finding that a stay is appropriate under Section 75-2-211(11)(b), MCA. The issuance of a stay on a permit by the Board postpones the effective date of the Department’s decision until conclusion of the hearing and issuance of a final decision by the Board. If a stay is not issued by the Board, the Department’s decision on the application is final 16 days after the Department’s decision is made.
- F. Permit Inspection – As required by ARM 17.8.755, Inspection of Permit, a copy of the air quality permit shall be made available for inspection by the Department at the location of the source.
- G. Permit Fee – Pursuant to Section 75-2-220, MCA, as amended by the 1991 Legislature, failure to pay the annual operation fee by YVV may be grounds for revocation of this permit, as required by that section and rules adopted thereunder by the Board.

- H. Construction Commencement – Construction must begin within 3 years of permit issuance and proceed with due diligence until the project is complete or the permit shall be revoked (ARM 17.8.762).

Permit Analysis
Yellowstone Valley Veterinary, Inc.
Permit #4195-00

I. Introduction/Process Description

Yellowstone Valley Veterinary, Inc. (YVV) owns and operates an animal crematorium. The YVV facility is located at 50 Moore Lane, Billings, Montana. The legal description of the site is Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, in Yellowstone County, Montana.

A. Permitted Equipment

YVV proposed to operate a natural gas-fired 2004 model Power-Pak JR (1E43-PPJ) animal crematory (Unit #2) with a maximum incineration capacity of 75 pounds per hour (lb/hr) and associated equipment. In addition, YVV operates an existing natural gas-fired 1990 model 1E43-PPJ Power Pak JR animal crematory (Unit #1) with a maximum incineration capacity of 75 lb/hr, which predates the permitting requirements for incinerators under Section 75-2-215, Montana Code Annotated (MCA).

B. Source Description

Unit #2 incorporates primary and secondary combustion chambers and is fueled by natural gas. The unit will be used to incinerate animal remains and/or animal remains containers.

II. Applicable Rules and Regulations

The following are partial explanations of some applicable rules and regulations that apply to the facility. The complete rules are stated in the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) and are available, upon request, from the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). Upon request, the Department will provide references for location of complete copies of all applicable rules and regulations or copies where appropriate.

A. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 1 – General Provisions, including but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.101 Definitions. This rule includes a list of applicable definitions used in this chapter, unless indicated otherwise in a specific subchapter.
2. ARM 17.8.105 Testing Requirements. Any person or persons responsible for the emission of any air contaminant into the outdoor atmosphere shall, upon written request of the Department, provide the facilities and necessary equipment (including instruments and sensing devices) and shall conduct tests, emission or ambient, for such periods of time as may be necessary using methods approved by the Department.
3. ARM 17.8.106 Source Testing Protocol. The requirements of this rule apply to any emission source testing conducted by the Department, any source or other entity as required by any rule in this chapter, or any permit or order issued pursuant to this chapter, or the provisions of the Clean Air Act of Montana, 75-2-101, *et seq.*, MCA.

YVV shall comply with the requirements contained in the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual, including, but not limited to, using the proper test methods and supplying the required reports. A copy of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual is available from the Department upon request.

4. ARM 17.8.110 Malfunctions. (2) The Department must be notified promptly by telephone whenever a malfunction occurs that can be expected to create emissions in excess of any applicable emission limitation or to continue for a period greater than 4 hours.
5. ARM 17.8.111 Circumvention. (1) No person shall cause or permit the installation or use of any device or any means that, without resulting in reduction of the total amount of air contaminant emitted, conceals or dilutes an emission of air contaminant that would otherwise violate an air pollution control regulation. (2) No equipment that may produce emissions shall be operated or maintained in such a manner as to create a public nuisance.

B. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 2 – Ambient Air Quality, including, but not limited to the following:

1. ARM 17.8.210 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Sulfur Dioxide
2. ARM 17.8.211 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Nitrogen Dioxide
3. ARM 17.8.212 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide
4. ARM 17.8.214 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Hydrogen Sulfide
5. ARM 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Settled Particulate Matter
6. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM₁₀

YVV must maintain compliance with the applicable ambient air quality standards. As part of the risk assessment required for this project, the Department conducted SCREENVIEW modeling, an EPA-approved air dispersion model. This analysis demonstrated that the proposed project would comply with all applicable ambient air quality standards as required for permit issuance.

C. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 3 – Emission Standards, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.304 Visible Air Contaminants. This rule requires that no person may cause or authorize emissions to be discharged into the outdoor atmosphere from any source installed after November 23, 1968, that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes.

ARM 17.8.308 Particulate Matter, Airborne. (1) This rule requires an opacity limitation of less than 20% for all fugitive emission sources and that reasonable precautions be taken to control emissions of airborne particulate matter (PM).

2. ARM 17.8.309 Particulate Matter, Fuel Burning Equipment. This rule requires that no person shall cause, allow, or permit to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter caused by the combustion of fuel in excess of the amount determined by this rule.
3. ARM 17.8.310 Particulate Matter, Industrial Process. This rule requires that no person shall cause, allow, or permit to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter in excess of the amount set forth in this rule.
4. ARM 17.8.316 Incinerators. This rule requires that no person may cause or authorize emissions to be discharged into the outdoor atmosphere from any incinerator, particulate matter in excess of 0.10 grains per standard cubic foot of dry flue gas, adjusted to 12% carbon dioxide and calculated as if no auxiliary fuel had been used. Also, no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the outdoor atmosphere from any incinerator, emissions that exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. This rule does not apply to Unit #2 because YVV has applied for and received an air quality permit in accordance with ARM 17.8.770 and MCA 75-2-215 for this unit. However, because Unit #1 is an existing incinerator the unit is subject to the requirements of this rule as generally applicable requirements.

5. ARM 17.8.322 Sulfur Oxide Emissions--Sulfur in Fuel. This rule requires that no person shall burn liquid, solid, or gaseous fuel in excess of the amount set forth in this rule.
 6. ARM 17.8.324 Hydrocarbon Emissions--Petroleum Products. (3) No person shall load or permit the loading of gasoline into any stationary tank with a capacity of 250 gallons or more from any tank truck or trailer, except through a permanent submerged fill pipe, unless such tank is equipped with a vapor loss control device as described in (1) of this rule.
 7. ARM 17.8.340 Standard of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 CFR Part 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS). This facility is not an NSPS affected source because it does not meet the definition of any NSPS subpart defined in 40 CFR Part 60.
- D. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 5 – Air Quality Permit Application, Operation, and Open Burning Fees, including, but not limited to:
1. ARM 17.8.504 Air Quality Permit Application Fees. This rule requires that an applicant submit an air quality permit application fee concurrent with the submittal of an air quality permit application. A permit application is incomplete until the proper application fee is paid to the Department. YVV submitted the appropriate permit application fee for the current permit action.
 2. ARM 17.8.505 Air Quality Operation Fees. An annual air quality operation fee must, as a condition of continued operation, be submitted to the Department by each source of air contaminants holding an air quality permit (excluding an open burning permit) issued by the Department. The air quality operation fee is based on the actual or estimated actual amount of air pollutants emitted during the previous calendar year.
- An air quality operation fee is separate and distinct from an air quality permit application fee. The annual assessment and collection of the air quality operation fee, described above, shall take place on a calendar-year basis. The Department may insert into any final permit issued after the effective date of these rules, such conditions as may be necessary to require the payment of an air quality operation fee on a calendar-year basis, including provisions that prorate the required fee amount.
- E. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 7 – Permit, Construction, and Operation of Air Contaminant Sources, including, but not limited to:
1. ARM 17.8.740 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this chapter, unless indicated otherwise in a specific subchapter.
 2. ARM 17.8.743 Montana Air Quality Permits--When Required. This rule requires a person to obtain an air quality permit or permit alteration to construct, alter, or use any air contaminant sources that have the potential to emit (PTE) greater than 25 tons per year (TPY) of any pollutant. YVV does not have a PTE greater than 25 tons per year of any pollutant; however, in accordance with the MCA 75-2-215, an air quality permit must be obtained prior to the construction and operation of any incinerator, regardless of potential incinerator emissions. Because YVV must obtain an air quality permit, all normally applicable requirements apply in this case.
 3. ARM 17.8.744 Montana Air Quality Permits--General Exclusions. This rule identifies the activities that are not subject to the Montana Air Quality Permit program.

4. ARM 17.8.745 Montana Air Quality Permits--Exclusion for De Minimis Changes. This rule identifies the de minimis changes at permitted facilities that do not require a permit under the Montana Air Quality Permit Program.
5. ARM 17.8.748 New or Modified Emitting Units--Permit Application Requirements. (1) This rule requires that a permit application be submitted prior to installation, alteration, or use of a source. YVV submitted the required permit application for the current permit action. (7) This rule requires that the applicant notify the public by means of legal publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the area affected by the application for a permit. YVV submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the January 12, 2008, issue of the *Billings Gazette*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Billings in Yellowstone County, as proof of compliance with the public notice requirements.
6. ARM 17.8.749 Conditions for Issuance or Denial of Permit. This rule requires that the permits issued by the Department must authorize the construction and operation of the facility or emitting unit subject to the conditions in the permit and the requirements of this subchapter. This rule also requires that the permit must contain any conditions necessary to assure compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), the Clean Air Act of Montana, and rules adopted under those acts.
7. ARM 17.8.752 Emission Control Requirements. This rule requires a source to install the maximum air pollution control capability that is technically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be utilized. The required BACT analysis is included in Section III of this permit analysis.
8. ARM 17.8.755 Inspection of Permit. This rule requires that air quality permits shall be made available for inspection by the Department at the location of the source.
9. ARM 17.8.756 Compliance with Other Requirements. This rule states that nothing in the permit shall be construed as relieving YVV of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule, or standard, except as specifically provided in ARM 17.8.740, *et seq.*
10. ARM 17.8.759 Review of Permit Applications. This rule describes the Department's responsibilities for processing permit applications and making permit decisions on those permit applications that do not require the preparation of an environmental impact statement.
11. ARM 17.8.762 Duration of Permit. An air quality permit shall be valid until revoked or modified, as provided in this subchapter, except that a permit issued prior to construction of a new or altered source may contain a condition providing that the permit will expire unless construction is commenced within the time specified in the permit, which in no event may be less than 1 year after the permit is issued.
12. ARM 17.8.763 Revocation of Permit. An air quality permit may be revoked upon written request of the permittee, or for violations of any requirement of the Clean Air Act of Montana, rules adopted under the Clean Air Act of Montana, the FCAA, rules adopted under the FCAA, or any applicable requirement contained in the Montana State Implementation Plan (SIP).

13. ARM 17.8.764 Administrative Amendment to Permit. An air quality permit may be amended for changes in any applicable rules and standards adopted by the Board of Environmental Review (Board) or changed conditions of operation at a source or stack that do not result in an increase of emissions as a result of those changed conditions. The owner or operator of a facility may not increase the facility's emissions beyond permit limits unless the increase meets the criteria in ARM 17.8.745 for a de minimis change not requiring a permit, or unless the owner or operator applies for and receives another permit in accordance with ARM 17.8.748, ARM 17.8.749, ARM 17.8.752, ARM 17.8.755, and ARM 17.8.756, and with all applicable requirements in ARM Title 17, Chapter 8, Subchapters 8, 9, and 10.
 14. ARM 17.8.765 Transfer of Permit. This rule states that an air quality permit may be transferred from one person to another if written notice of intent to transfer, including the names of the transferor and the transferee, is sent to the Department.
 15. ARM 17.8.770 Additional Requirements for Incinerators. This rule specifies the additional information that must be submitted to the Department for incineration facilities subject to 75-2-215, Montana Code Annotated (MCA).
- F. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 8 – Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality, including, but not limited to:
1. ARM 17.8.801 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this subchapter.
 2. ARM 17.8.818 Review of Major Stationary Sources and Major Modifications--Source Applicability and Exemptions. The requirements contained in ARM 17.8.819 through ARM 17.8.827 shall apply to any major stationary source and any major modification, with respect to each pollutant subject to regulation under the FCAA that it would emit, except as this subchapter would otherwise allow.

This facility is not a major stationary source since this facility is not a listed source and the facility's PTE is below 250 TPY of any pollutant (excluding fugitive emissions).

- G. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 12 – Operating Permit Program Applicability, including, but not limited to:
1. ARM 17.8.1201 Definitions. (23) Major Source under Section 7412 of the FCAA is defined as any source having:
 - a. PTE > 100 tons/year of any pollutant;
 - b. PTE > 10 tons/year of any one hazardous air pollutant (HAP), PTE > 25 tons/year of a combination of all HAPs, or lesser quantity as the Department may establish by rule; or
 - c. PTE > 70 tons/year of particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.
 2. ARM 17.8.1204 Air Quality Operating Permit Program. (1) Title V of the FCAA amendments of 1990 requires that all sources, as defined in ARM 17.8.1204(1), obtain a Title V Operating Permit. In reviewing and issuing Air Quality Permit #4195-00 for YVV, the following conclusions were made:

- a. The facility's PTE is less than 100 tons/year for any pollutant.
- b. The facility's PTE is less than 10 tons/year for any one HAP and less than 25 tons/year for all HAPs.
- c. This source is not located in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.
- d. This facility is not subject to any current NSPS.
- e. This facility is not subject to any current NESHAP standards.
- f. This source is not a Title IV affected source, or a solid waste combustion unit.
- g. This source is not an EPA designated Title V source.

Based on these facts, the Department determined that YVV will be a minor source of emissions as defined under Title V.

G. MCA 75-2-103, Definitions provides, in part, as follows:

- 1. "Incinerator" means any single or multiple-chambered combustion device that burns combustible material, alone or with a supplemental fuel or catalytic combustion assistance, primarily for the purpose of removal, destruction, disposal, or volume reduction of all or any portion of the input material.
- 2. "Solid waste" means all putrescible and nonputrescible solid, semisolid, liquid, or gaseous wastes, including, but not limited to...air pollution control facilities...

H. MCA 75-2-215, Solid or hazardous waste incineration - additional permit requirements:

- 1. MCA 75-2-215 requires air quality permits for all new commercial solid waste incinerators; therefore, YVV must obtain an air quality permit.
- 2. MCA 75-2-215 requires the applicant to provide, to the Department's satisfaction, a characterization and estimate of emissions and ambient concentrations of air pollutants, including hazardous air pollutants from the incineration of solid waste. The Department determined that the information submitted in this application is sufficient to fulfill this requirement.
- 3. MCA 75-2-215 requires that the Department reach a determination that the projected emissions and ambient concentrations constitute a negligible risk to public health, safety, and welfare. The Department completed a health risk assessment based on an emissions inventory and ambient air quality modeling for this proposal. Based on the results of the emission inventory, modeling, and the health risk assessment, the Department determined that YVV's proposal complies with this requirement.
- 4. MCA 75-2-215 requires the application of pollution control equipment or procedures that meet or exceed BACT. The Department determined that the proposed incinerator (Unit #2) constitutes BACT.

III. BACT Determination

A BACT determination is required for each new or modified source of emissions. YVV shall install on the new or modified source the maximum air pollution control capability that is technically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be utilized. In addition, MCA 75-2-215 requires a BACT determination for all pollutants resulting from Unit #2 operations, not only criteria pollutants.

The Department reviewed other BACT analyses as part of this analysis. YVV proposes to control the emissions from Unit #2 with a secondary chamber designed specifically to reduce the amount of pollutants, including hazardous air pollutants, emitted from Unit #2. Research conducted by the Department indicates very few crematoriums have been required to install additional air pollution control equipment beyond that provided by the design of the incinerator. With the estimated particulate matter emissions from Unit #2 being 1.64 TPY, the incremental cost per ton of additional control would be very high and not in line with control costs of other similar sources. In addition, the incinerator is limited by permit to 0.10 gr/dscf for particulate matter and to 10% opacity. Therefore, the Department determined that compliance with the particulate matter and opacity emission limits, with no additional controls required, constitutes BACT in this case.

BACT for products of combustion/incineration (carbon monoxide (CO), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead) and HAPs resulting from Unit #2 operations is good combustion including the requirement that the secondary chamber must be maintained at an operating temperature, which exceeds 1500°F on an hourly average with no single reading less than 1400°F. The operating procedures and minimum operating temperature requirements contained in Permit #4195-00 will ensure good combustion and constitute BACT for Unit #2.

Further, natural gas combustion inherently results in low emissions of air pollutants due to characteristics of the natural gas fuel fired. Potential particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀), NO_x, CO, VOC, and SO₂ emissions from the combustion of natural gas to operate Unit #2 are 0.05 TPY, 0.64 TPY, 0.54 TPY, 0.04 TPY, and 0.00 TPY respectively. Because potential emissions of all regulated pollutants resulting from natural gas combustion are low, incorporation of available pollutant-specific control technologies would result in high cost-effective (\$/ton removed) values thereby making pollutant-specific add-on controls for PM₁₀, NO_x, CO, VOC, and SO₂ economically infeasible in this case. Therefore, the Department determined that combustion of pipeline-quality natural gas only and proper operation and maintenance of Unit #2 with no additional control constitutes BACT for all regulated pollutants resulting from natural gas combustion, in this case.

The control options that have been selected as part of this review have controls and control costs similar to other recently permitted similar sources and are capable of achieving the appropriate emission standards.

IV. Emission Inventory

An emission inventory was completed for YVV's proposal. This emission inventory for criteria pollutants for Unit #1 and #2 was based on emission factors from the AIRS FACILITY SUBSYSTEM SOURCE CLASSIFICATION CODES (AFSSCC) manual dated March 1990. The application indicated that the fuel used would be natural gas; therefore, the Department also used emission factors from AP-42, Section 1.4, Natural Gas Combustion, to estimate project-specific emissions from the combustion of natural gas.

Further, because Unit #2 is also subject to the requirements of MCA 75-2-215, the Department developed a HAP emission inventory for Unit #2 using those emission factors contained in FIRE (the EPA emission factor repository) under SCC 5-02-005-05, pathological incineration. In accordance with the requirements of MCA 75-2-215, estimated HAP emissions from Unit #2 will be used to demonstrate project compliance with negligible risk to human health and the environment. The Department considered only those HAPs for which an emission factor was available and that have been analyzed for other permitted similar sources. A detailed analysis and the results of the demonstration are contained in Section V and VI of the permit analysis.

Criteria Pollutants Emissions Units #1 and #2							
Source	PM	PM ₁₀	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x	Lead
Unit #1	0.77	0.77	0.58	0.49	0.48	0.36	0.01
Unit #1 Natural Gas Fuel Combustion	0.05	0.05	0.64	0.04	0.54	0.00	0.00
Unit #2	0.77	0.77	0.58	0.49	0.48	0.36	0.01
Unit #2 Natural Gas Fuel Combustion	0.05	0.05	0.64	0.04	0.54	0.00	0.00
Total Criteria Pollutant Potential Emissions	1.64	1.64	2.44	1.06	2.04	0.72	0.02

Units #1 and #2: Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions	
HAP	TPY
Bromoform	4.76E-06
Carbon Tetrachloride	9.43E-06
Chloroform	8.95E-06
1,2-Dichloropropane	2.17E-04
Ethyl Benzene	2.64E-04
Naphthalene	1.91E-03
Tetrachloroethylene	6.62E-06
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	1.81E-05
Toluene	7.59E-04
Vinylidene Chloride	1.17E-05
Xylene	3.61E-04
Total HAP Potential Emissions	3.57E-03

CRITERIA POLLUTANT EMISSION CALCULATIONS

Units #1 and #2

Maximum Rated Design Capacity: 75 lb/hr
 Operating Hours: 8760 hr/yr
 Conversion: 75 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = 328.5 ton/yr

PM Emissions

Emission Factor: 4.67 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 2.3-2, 07/93)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: 328.5 tons/year * 4.67 lb/ton * 0.0005 ton/lb = 0.77 ton/yr

PM₁₀ Emissions:

Emission Factor: 4.67 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 2.3-2, 07/93)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: 328.5 tons/year * 4.67 lb/ton * 0.0005 ton/lb = 0.77 ton/yr

NO_x Emissions:

Emission Factor: 3.56 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 2.3-1, 07/93)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: 328.5 tons/year * 3.56 lb/ton * 0.0005 ton/lb = 0.58 ton/yr

VOC Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 3.00 lb/ton (AFSSCC 5-02-005-05, 03/90, Page 227)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: $328.5 \text{ tons/year} * 3 \text{ lb/ton} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.49 \text{ ton/yr}$

CO Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 2.95 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 2.3-1, 07/93)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: $328.5 \text{ tons/year} * 2.95 \text{ lb/ton} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.48 \text{ ton/yr}$

SO_x Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 2.17 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 2.3-1, 07/93)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: $328.5 \text{ tons/year} * 2.17 \text{ lb/ton} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.36 \text{ ton/yr}$

Lead Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 0.07 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 2.3-2, 07/93)
 Fuel Consumption: 328.5 tons/year (Maximum Rated Design)
 Calculations: $328.5 \text{ tons/year} * 0.07 \text{ lb/ton} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.01 \text{ ton/yr}$

Natural Gas Fuel Combustion: Units #1 and #2

Heat Input Value: 0.0016 MMscf/hr (Maximum Capacity - Company Information)
 Hours of Operation: 8760 hr/yr

PM Emissions

All PM emissions assumed to be PM₁₀ emissions (AP-42, Table 1.4-2, 07/98)

PM₁₀ Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 7.6 lb/MMscf (AP42, Table 1.4-2, 07/98)
 Calculations: $7.6 \text{ lb/MMscf} * 0.0016 \text{ MMscf/hr} = 0.012 \text{ lb/hr}$
 $0.012 \text{ lb/hr} * 8760 \text{ hr/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.05 \text{ ton/yr}$

NO_x Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 100 lb/MMscf (AP42, Table 1.4-2, 07/98)
 Calculations: $100 \text{ lb/MMscf} * 0.0016 \text{ MMscf/hr} = 0.160 \text{ lb/hr}$
 $0.160 \text{ lb/hr} * 8760 \text{ hr/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.70 \text{ ton/yr}$

VOC Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 5.5 lb/MMscf (AP42, Table 1.4-2, 07/98)
 Calculations: $5.5 \text{ lb/MMscf} * 0.0016 \text{ MMscf/hr} = 0.009 \text{ lb/hr}$
 $0.009 \text{ lb/hr} * 8760 \text{ hr/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.04 \text{ ton/yr}$

CO Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 84 lb/MMscf (AP42, Table 1.4-2, 07/98)
 Calculations: $84 \text{ lb/MMscf} * 0.0016 \text{ MMscf/hr} = 0.134 \text{ lb/hr}$
 $0.134 \text{ lb/hr} * 8760 \text{ hr/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.59 \text{ ton/yr}$

SO_x Emissions:
 Emission Factor: 0.6 lb/MMscf (AP42, Table 1.4-2, 07/98)
 Calculations: $0.6 \text{ lb/MMscf} * 0.0016 \text{ MMscf/hr} = 0.00096 \text{ lb/hr}$
 $0.00096 \text{ lb/hr} * 8760 \text{ hr/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 0.00 \text{ ton/yr}$

Unit #2: Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions

Bromoform

Emission Factor: 2.90E-05 lb/ton (AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
 Calculations: $2.90 \text{ E-05 lb/ton} * 328.5 \text{ ton/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 4.76\text{E-06 ton/yr}$

Carbon Tetrachloride

Emission Factor: 5.74E-05 lb/ton (AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
 Calculations: $5.74\text{E-05 lb/ton} * 328.5 \text{ ton/yr} * 0.0005 \text{ ton/lb} = 9.43\text{E-06 ton/yr}$

Chloroform		
Emission Factor:	5.45E-05 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	5.45E-05 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	8.95E-06 ton/yr
1,2-Dichloropropane		
Emission Factor:	1.32E-03 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	1.32E-03 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	2.17E-04 ton/yr
Ethyl Benzene		
Emission Factor:	1.61E-03 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	1.61E-03 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	2.64E-04 ton/yr
Naphthalene		
Emission Factor:	1.16E-02 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	1.16E-02 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	1.91E-03 ton/yr
Tetrachloroethylene		
Emission Factor:	4.03E-05 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	4.03E-05 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	6.62E-06 ton/yr
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane		
Emission Factor:	1.10E-04 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	1.10E-04 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	1.81E-05 ton/yr
Toluene		
Emission Factor:	4.62E-03 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	4.62E-03 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	7.59E-04 ton/yr
Vinylidene Chloride		
Emission Factor:	7.10E-05 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	7.10E-05 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	1.17E-05 ton/yr
Xylene		
Emission Factor:	2.20E-03 lb/ton	(AFSSCC 5-02-005-05)
Calculations:	2.20E-03 lb/ ton * 328.5 ton/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	3.61E-04 ton/yr

V. Ambient Air Impact Analysis

The Department conducted SCREENVIEW, an EPA-approved screening model, using the indicated inputs obtained from the permit application and an emission rate of 1.03E-04 gram per second, which is the sum of all the hazardous air pollutant emissions from the proposed Unit #2. The individual 1-hour results for each pollutant were then calculated by multiplying the modeled impact of 0.2657E-01 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$ by the percentage of each individual HAP making up the total of the HAP emissions. The maximum 1-hour concentrations were then converted to an annual average and used in the risk assessment. The results are contained in Section VI, Health Risk Assessment, of the permit analysis

Unit #2: SCREENVIEW Model Run

Simple Terrain Inputs:

Source Type	=	POINT
Emission Rate (G/S)	=	1.03E-04
Stack Height (M)	=	5.18
Stack Inside Diam (M)	=	0.381
Stack Exit Velocity (M/S)	=	6.35
Stack Gas Exit Temp (K)	=	782.04
Ambient Air Temp (K)	=	293.15
Receptor Height (M)	=	0.0000
Urban/Rural Option	=	RURAL

Stack exit velocity was calculated using a volumetric flow rate of 1534 ACFM.

Summary of Screen View Model Results

Calculation Procedure	Maximum 1 Hour Concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Distance of Maximum (M)	Terrain Height (M)
Simple Terrain	0.2657E-01	66	0

VI. Health Risk Assessment

A health risk assessment was conducted to determine if the proposed Unit #2 complies with the negligible risk requirement of MCA 75-2-215. The emission inventory did not contain sufficient quantities of any pollutant on the Department's list of pollutants for which non-inhalation impacts must be considered; therefore, the Department determined that inhalation risk was the only necessary pathway to consider. Only those hazardous air pollutants for which there were established emission factors were considered in the emission inventory.

Negligible Risk Assessment ⁽¹⁾					
Hazardous Air Pollutant	Modeled Concentration	Cancer URF ⁽²⁾ (ug/m^3) ⁻¹	Cancer Risk ⁽³⁾	CNCREL ⁽⁶⁾ (ug/m^3)	CNCREL Hazard Quotient ⁽⁷⁾
Bromoform	1.38E-08	1.10E-06	1.51E-14	ND	NA
Carbon Tetrachloride	2.72E-08	1.50E-05	4.08E-13	1.90E+02	1.43E-10
Chloroform	2.59E-08	2.30E-05	5.95E-13	9.80E+01	2.64E-10
1,2-Dichloropropane ⁽⁴⁾	6.26E-07	1.90E-05	1.19E-11	4.00E+00	1.57E-07
Ethyl Benzene	7.64E-07	ND	ND	1.00E+03	7.64E-10
Naphthalene	5.5E-06	3.40E-05	1.87E-10	3.00E+00	1.83E-06
Tetrachloroethylene ⁽⁵⁾	1.91E-08	5.90E-06	1.13E-13	2.70E+02	7.08E-11
1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	5.22E-08	5.80E-05	3.03E-12	ND	NA
Toluene	2.19E-06	ND	ND	4.00E+02	5.48E-09
Vinylidene Chloride	3.37E-08	5.00E-05	1.68E-12	2.00E+02	1.68E-10
Xylene	1.04E-06	ND	ND	1.00E+02	1.04E-08
Total Risks	-----	-----	2.05E-10	-----	2.05E-10
A copy of the Screen View modeling conducted for this project is on file with the Department.					
(1) Source of chronic dose-response values is from Table 1: Prioritized Chronic Dose Response Values for Screening Risk Assessments (www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/toxsource/table1.pdf , 2/28/06).					
(2) Cancer Chronic Inhalation Risk Factor ($1/\text{ug}/\text{m}^3$).					
(3) Cancer Risk is unitless and is calculated by multiplying the predicted concentration by the URF.					
(4) AKA Propylene dichloride.					
(5) AKA Tetrachloroethene, Perchloroethylene.					
(6) Chronic Noncancer Reference Exposure Level.					
(7) The CNCREL hazard quotient is determined by calculating the modeled HAP concentration by the CNCREL.					

The Department determined that the risks estimated in the risk assessment for Unit #2 are in compliance with the requirement to demonstrate negligible risk to human health and the environment. As documented in the above table and in accordance with the negligible risk requirement, no single HAP concentration results in Cancer Risk greater than 1.00E-06 and the sum of all HAPs results in a Cancer Risk of less than 1.00E-05. Further, the sum of the Chronic Noncancer Reference Exposure Level (CNCREL) hazard quotient is 2.05E-10, which is less than 1.0 as required to demonstrate compliance with the negligible risk requirement.

VII. Taking or Damaging Implication Analysis

As required by 2-10-105, MCA, the Department conducted a private property taking and damaging assessment and determined there are no taking or damaging implications.

VIII. Environmental Assessment

An environmental assessment, required by the Montana Environmental Policy Act, was completed for this project. A copy is attached.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Permitting and Compliance Division
Air Resources Management Bureau
P.O. Box 200901, Helena, Montana 59620
(406) 444-3490

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued To: Yellowstone Valley Veterinary Inc.
50 Moore Lane
Billings, MT 59101

Air Quality Permit Number: 4195-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: 03/05/08

Department Decision Issued: 03/21/08

Permit Final: 04/08/08

1. *Legal Description of Site:* The legal description of the site is Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, in Yellowstone County, Montana.
2. *Description of Project:* YVV is proposing to operate a natural gas-fired 2004 model Power-Pak JR (1E43-PPJ) animal crematory (Unit #2) with a maximum incineration capacity of 75 pounds per hour (lb/hr) and associated equipment. In addition, YVV operates an existing natural gas-fired 1990 model 1E43-PPJ Power Pak JR animal crematory (Unit #1) with a maximum incineration capacity of 75 lb/hr, which predates the permitting requirements for incinerators under Section 75-2-215, MCA.
3. *Objectives of Project:* The project would allow YVV to safely dispose of animal remains while maintaining compliance with negligible risk requirements as discussed in Section VI of the permit analysis. Further, the project would result in business and revenue for the company.
4. *Alternatives Considered:* In addition to the proposed action, the Department also considered the “no-action” alternative. The “no-action” alternative would deny issuance of the air quality preconstruction permit to the proposed facility. However, the Department does not consider the “no-action” alternative to be appropriate because YVV demonstrated compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as required for permit issuance. Therefore, the “no-action” alternative was eliminated from further consideration.
5. *A Listing of Mitigation, Stipulations, and Other Controls:* A list of enforceable conditions, including a BACT analysis, would be included in Permit #4195-00.
6. *Regulatory Effects on Private Property:* The Department considered alternatives to the conditions imposed in this permit as part of the permit development. The Department determined that the permit conditions are reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements and demonstrate compliance with those requirements and do not unduly restrict private property rights.

7. The following table summarizes the potential physical and biological effects of the proposed project on the human environment. The “no-action” alternative was discussed previously.

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A	Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats			X			Yes
B	Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution			X			Yes
C	Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture			X			Yes
D	Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality			X			Yes
E	Aesthetics			X			Yes
F	Air Quality			X			Yes
G	Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources			X			Yes
H	Demands on Environmental Resource of Water, Air and Energy			X			Yes
I	Historical and Archaeological Sites				X		Yes
J	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			Yes

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats

Emissions from the proposed project would affect terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats in the proposed project area. However, as detailed in Section V and Section VI of the permit analysis, any emissions and resulting impacts from the project would be minor due to the low concentration of those pollutants emitted.

Further, the proposed crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes. Overall, any impact to the terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats of the proposed project area would be minor.

B. Water Quality, Quantity and Distribution

The proposed project would not affect water quantity or distribution in the proposed project area. The crematorium would operate within a building and would not discharge or use water as part of the project.

Emissions from the proposed project would affect water quality in the proposed project area. However, as detailed in Section V and Section VI of the permit analysis, any emissions and resulting deposition impacts from the project would be minor due to the low concentration of those pollutants emitted.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture

The proposed project would not affect the geology, soil quality, stability, and moisture of the proposed project area. The proposed crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes.

Further, as described in Section V and Section VI of the permit analysis, the crematorium would result in minor air pollution emissions to the outside ambient environment. These pollutants would deposit on the soils in the surrounding area. Any impact from deposition of these pollutants would be minor due to dispersion characteristics and the low concentration of those pollutants emitted.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Emissions from the proposed project would affect vegetation cover, quantity, and quality in the proposed project area. However, as detailed in Section V and Section VI of the permit analysis any emissions and resulting impacts from the project would be minor.

Further, the proposed project would not affect the vegetation cover, quantity, and quality of the proposed project area. The proposed crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes. Overall, any impact to the vegetation cover, quantity, and quality of the proposed project area would be minor.

E. Aesthetics

The proposed project would not impact the aesthetic nature of the proposed project area because the proposed crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes. Because the construction area is designated for commercial use, the project would not change the aesthetic nature of the area. Further, visible emissions from the source would be limited to 10% opacity and the permit would include emission control requirements. Also, the project would result in only a minor amount of noise from normal operations.

F. Air Quality

The proposed project would result in the emission of various criteria pollutants and HAPs to the ambient air in the proposed project area. However, as detailed in Section V and Section VI of the permit analysis, YVV demonstrated, through air dispersion modeling, that any air quality impacts from the proposed project would be minor and would constitute negligible risk to human health and the environment.

The Department conducted air dispersion modeling to determine the ambient air quality impacts from HAPs that would be generated by the crematorium. The SCREENVIEW model was selected for the air dispersion modeling. The full meteorology option was selected to provide a conservative result. Receptors were placed from 0 to 5000 meters in a simple terrain array.

Stack parameters and emission rates used in the SCREENVIEW model are contained in Section V of the permit analysis and are on file with the Department. Stack velocity and gas temperature were taken from data provided by the manufacturer of the crematorium. Due to the dispersion characteristics and low levels of pollutants that would be emitted from the proposed project the Department determined that any impacts to air quality would be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

During the permit action for Permit #4195-00, the Department contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) in an effort to identify any species of special concern that may be located within or near the YVV site (Section 5, Township 1 South, Range 26 East, in Yellowstone County, Montana). Search results concluded that there are five such species of

special concern on file for the area. The species of special concern located within the defined area include the *Euderma maculatum* (spotted bat), *Phrynosoma hernandesi* (Greater Short-horned Lizard), *Heterodon nasicus* (Western Hog-nosed Snake), *Sceloporus graciosus* (Common Sagebrush Lizard), and *Lampropeltis triangulum* (Milksnake).

While these species of special concern may be found in specific habitats within or near the defined area, the MNHP search did not indicate that these species of special concern would locate directly on or relatively near the existing industrial site. Given the existing industrial nature of the project area, it is unlikely that these species of special concern would locate on or near the project site and thus unlikely that these species of special concern would realize any impact from the wastewater treatment plant operations beyond minor air emission impacts discussed in greater detail below.

Emissions from the proposed project could impact the previously highlighted unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources located in the proposed project area. However, as detailed in Section VI of the permit analysis, any emissions and resulting impacts from the project would be minor due to the low concentration of those pollutants emitted and typical due to the existing industrial nature of the area. Overall, any impact to unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources of the proposed project area would be minor.

H. Demands on Environmental Resource of Water, Air and Energy

The proposed project would result in minor demands on environmental resources of water and air as discussed in Section 7.B and 7.F, respectively, of this EA. Further, as detailed in Section V and Section VI of the permit analysis, project impacts on air resources in the proposed project area would be minor due to dispersion characteristics and the low concentration of those pollutants emitted. Finally, because the project is small by industrial standards, little energy would be required for operation and the resulting impact on energy resources would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The proposed project would not result in any impacts to historical and archaeological sites in the proposed project area because the crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes. According to previous correspondence from the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, there is low likelihood of adverse disturbance to any known archaeological or historic site, given previous industrial disturbance within a given area. Therefore, the operation would have no effect on any known historic or archaeological site.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Overall, the cumulative and secondary impacts from this project on the physical and biological environment in the immediate area would be minor due to the relatively small size and potential environmental impact of the proposed operation. The Department believes that this facility could be expected to operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as outlined in Permit #4195-00.

8. The following table summarizes the potential economic and social effects of the proposed project on the human environment. The “no-action” alternative was discussed previously.

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A	Social Structures and Mores			X			Yes
B	Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity			X			Yes
C	Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue			X			Yes
D	Agricultural or Industrial Production				X		Yes
E	Human Health			X			Yes
F	Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities				X		Yes
G	Quantity and Distribution of Employment			X			Yes
H	Distribution of Population			X			Yes
I	Demands for Government Services			X			Yes
J	Industrial and Commercial Activity			X			Yes
K	Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals				X		Yes
L	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			Yes

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON POTENTIAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL EFFECTS: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

- A. Social Structures and Mores
- B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The proposed project would have only a minor impact on the social structures or mores and cultural uniqueness and diversity of the proposed area of operation because the crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes. The predominant use of the surrounding area would not change as a result of the proposed project.

- C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The proposed project would have a minor impact on the local and state tax base and tax revenue. The project is small by industrial standards thus any economic impact to the commercially zoned area would be minor. Further, the project would require only a minor amount of new construction and a limited amount of employees/operators for normal operations.

- D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

Because the crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes, the project would not affect or displace any land used for agricultural production. Further, the nature of the project would dictate that no additional industrial production would result from the proposed project.

E. Human Health

The peak annual ambient impact from the operation of the crematorium would be 0.2657E-01 $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$. The predicted annual ambient impact of each individual HAP was determined by multiplying the peak annual ambient concentration by the emission rate of the HAP. The impacts calculated for each HAP are compared to the cancer and non-cancer levels specified in Tables 1 and 2 of ARM 17.8.770. If the predicted ambient impact of a particular HAP is less than the level specified in the table and the inhalation pathway is the only appropriate pathway, that HAP can be excluded from the human health risk assessment. The table summarized in Section V of the permit analysis indicates the calculated ambient impacts of the HAPs, the cancer and non-cancer levels, and whether or not each HAP passes the screening criteria.

As detailed in Section VI of the permit analysis, a health risk assessment was conducted to determine if the proposed crematorium would comply with the negligible risk requirement of MCA 75-2-215 and ARM 17.8.770. The emission inventory did not contain sufficient quantities of any pollutant on the Department's list of pollutants for which non-inhalation impacts must be considered; therefore, the Department determined that inhalation risk would be the only necessary pathway to consider. As defined in ARM 17.8.740(10), negligible risk is "an increase in excess lifetime cancer risk of less than 1.0×10^{-6} for any individual pollutant, and 1.0×10^{-5} for the aggregate of all pollutants, and an increase in the sum of the non-cancer hazard quotients for all pollutants with similar toxic effects of less than 1.0 in order to determine negligible risk." For the purposes of determining the negligible risk of the crematorium, all pollutants were included in the human health risk assessment.

All of the individual pollutant concentrations for the ELCR meet the acceptable risk limit because they are less than $1.00\text{E}-06$ for each pollutant and less than $1.00\text{E}-05$ for the aggregate of all pollutants. Further, the sums of the chronic and acute non-cancer hazard quotients are less than 1.0. Therefore, the crematorium proposed for the YVV facility meets the criteria of ARM 17.8.770 and operation of the incinerator would be considered a negligible risk to public health, safety, welfare, and to the environment. Overall, any impacts to human health in the proposed project area would be minor.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

Because the crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes, the project would not affect any access to or quality of any recreation or wilderness activities in the area.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

H. Distribution of Population

The crematorium would require only a limited amount of construction and would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes; therefore, the proposed project would require a limited amount of new employment, if any, in the area. The proposed project would require only a single operator and possibly a support employee. Therefore, the proposed project would have only a minor impact on the quantity and distribution of population and employment in the area.

I. Demands for Government Services

Government services would be required for acquiring the appropriate permits from government agencies. In addition, the permitted source of emissions would be subject to periodic inspections by government personnel. Overall, demands for government services would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The proposed project would result in only a minor impact on local industrial and commercial activity because the crematorium would require only a limited amount of new construction, would operate within a building located in an area zoned as commercial and currently used for such purposes, and would not result in additional industrial production. Overall, any impacts to industrial and commercial activity in the proposed area of operation would be minor.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

The Department is not aware of any locally adopted environmental plans or goals in the immediate area affected by the proposed project. The state standards would be protective of the proposed project area.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts from this project would result in minor impacts to the economic and social environment in the immediate area due to the relatively small size of the operation. The Department believes that this facility could be expected to operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as would be outlined in Permit #4195-00.

Recommendation: No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required.

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: The current permitting action is for the construction and operation of a crematorium. Permit #4195-00 includes conditions and limitations to ensure the facility will operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. In addition, there are no significant impacts associated with this proposal.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Montana Historical Society – State Historic Preservation Office, Natural Resource Information System – Montana Natural Heritage Program

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: Department of Environmental Quality – Air Resources Management Bureau, Montana Historical Society – State Historic Preservation Office, Natural Resource Information System – Montana Natural Heritage Program

EA prepared by: Trista Glazier

Date: February 26, 2008