



Montana Department of
ENVIRONMENTAL **Q**UALITY

Brian Schweitzer, Governor

P. O. Box 200901

Helena, MT 59620-0901

(406) 444-2544

Website: www.deq.mt.gov

August 13, 2009

Dicki Gregg
Western Energy Company
138 Rosebud Lane
P.O. Box 99
Colstrip, MT 59323

Dear Ms. Gregg:

Montana Air Quality Permit #4436-00 is deemed final as of August 13, 2009, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). This permit is for a portable crushing facility. All conditions of the Department's Decision remain the same. Enclosed is a copy of your permit with the final date indicated.

For the Department,

Vickie Walsh
Air Permitting Program Supervisor
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-9741

Skye Hatten, P.E.
Environmental Engineer
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-5287

VW:sh
Enclosure

Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Permitting and Compliance Division

Montana Air Quality Permit #4436-00

Western Energy Company
138 Rosebud Lane
P.O. Box 99
Colstrip, MT 59323

August 13, 2009



MONTANA AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued To: Western Energy Company MAQP: #4436-00
138 Rosebud Lane Application Complete: 06/17/2009
P.O. Box 99 Preliminary Determination Issued: 07/10/2009
Colstrip, MT 59323 Department's Decision Issued: 07/28/2009
 Permit Final: 08/13/2009
 AFS #: 777-4436

A Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP), with conditions, is hereby granted to Western Energy Company (Western) pursuant to Sections 75-2-204 and 211 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

Western proposes to operate a portable crushing operation. A complete list of the permitted equipment is contained in Section I.A of the permit analysis.

B. Plant Location

Western operates a portable crushing facility, which will initially be located in the East ½ of Section 33, Township 2 North, Range 40 East, Rosebud County, Montana. However, MAQP #4436-00 applies while operating at any location in Montana, except those areas having a Department of Environmental Quality (Department)-approved permitting program, areas considered tribal lands, or areas in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana. An addendum will be required for locations in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.*

SECTION II: Conditions and Limitations

A. Emission Limitations

1. All visible emissions from any Standards of Performance for New Stationary Source (NSPS)-affected crusher shall not exhibit an opacity of 15% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO).
2. All visible emissions from any other NSPS-affected equipment, such as screens or conveyor transfers, shall not exhibit an opacity of 10% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO).
3. All visible emissions from any non-NSPS affected equipment shall not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.304).
4. Water and spray bars shall be available on site at all times and operated as necessary to maintain compliance with the opacity limitations in Sections II.A.1, II.A.2, and II.A.3 (ARM 17.8.749).

5. Western shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter (ARM 17.8.308).
6. Western shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, or the general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the reasonable precautions limitation in Section II.A.5 (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Western shall not operate more than one crusher at any given time and the maximum throughput of that crusher shall not exceed 650 tons per hour (TPH) (ARM 17.8.749).
8. Crushing production is limited to 5,694,000 tons during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.749).
9. Western shall not operate more than one diesel fuel-fired engine/generator at any given time and the minimum rated design capacity of the engine/generator shall not be below 600 horsepower (hp) and the maximum rated design capacity of the engine/generator shall not exceed 947 hp (ARM 17.8.749).
10. If the permitted equipment is used in conjunction with any other equipment owned or operated by Western, at the same site, production shall be limited to correspond with an emission level that does not exceed 250 tons during any rolling 12-month period. Any calculations used to establish production levels shall be approved by the Department (ARM 17.8.749).
11. Western shall comply with all applicable standards and limitations, and the reporting, recordkeeping, testing, and notification requirements contained in 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO, *Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants* (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO).
12. Western shall comply with all applicable standards and limitations, and the reporting, recordkeeping, and notification requirements contained in 40 CFR 60, Subpart III, *Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines* and 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ, *National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines*, for any applicable diesel engine (ARM 17.8.340; 40 CFR 60, Subpart III; ARM 17.8.342; and 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ).

B. Testing Requirements

1. Within 60 days after achieving maximum production, but no later than 180 days after initial start-up, an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 9 opacity test and/or other methods and procedures as specified in 40 CFR 60.675 must be performed on all NSPS affected equipment to demonstrate compliance with the emission limitations contained in Section II.A.1 and II.A.2 (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart A and Subpart OOO).
2. All compliance source tests shall conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (ARM 17.8.106).
3. The Department may require further testing (ARM 17.8.105).

C. Operational Reporting Requirements

1. If this crushing facility is moved to another location, an Intent to Transfer form must be sent to the Department and a Public Notice Form for Change of Location must be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the area to which the transfer is to be made, at least 15 days prior to the move. The proof of publication (affidavit) of the Public Notice Form for Change of Location must be submitted to the Department prior to the move. These forms are available from the Department (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.765).
2. Western 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 not be 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. This information may be used for calculating operating fees, based on actual emissions from the facility, and/or to verify compliance with permit limitations (ARM 17.8.505).

3. Western shall notify the Department of any construction or improvement project conducted, pursuant to ARM 17.8.745, that would include *the addition of a new emissions unit*, 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. The notice must be submitted to the Department, in writing, 10 days prior to startup 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).
4. Western shall maintain on-site records showing daily hours of operation and daily production rates for the last 12 months. The records compiled in accordance with this permit shall be maintained by Western 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).
5. Western shall document, by month, the crushing production from the facility. By the 25th day of each month, Western shall calculate the crushing production from the facility for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.8. The information for each of the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

D. Notification

1. Within 30 days of commencement of construction of any NSPS-affected equipment, Western shall notify the Department of the date of commencement of construction of the affected equipment (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart A and Subpart OOO).
2. Within 15 days of the actual start-up date of any NSPS-affected equipment, Western shall submit written notification to the Department of the initial start-up date of the affected equipment (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart A and Subpart OOO).

3. Within 15 days of the actual start-up date of any non-NSPS-affected equipment, Western shall submit written notification to the Department of the initial start-up date of the affected equipment (ARM 17.8.749).

SECTION III: General Conditions

- A. Inspection – Western 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 all the terms, conditions, and matters stated herein shall be deemed accepted if Western fails to appeal as indicated below.
- C. Compliance with Statutes and Regulations – Nothing in this permit shall be construed as relieving Western of the responsibility for complying with any applicable federal or Montana statute, rule, or standard, except as specifically provided for 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 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 Department personnel at the location of the permitted source.
- G. Permit Fee – Pursuant to Section 75-2-220, MCA, failure to pay the annual operation fee by Western may be grounds for revocation of this permit, as required by that section and rules adopted thereunder by the Board.
- H. Duration of Permit – Construction or installation must begin or contractual obligations entered into that would constitute substantial loss within 3 years of permit issuance and proceed with due diligence until the project is complete or the permit shall expire (ARM 17.8.762).
- I. The Department may modify the conditions of this permit based on local conditions of any future site. These factors may include, but are not limited to, local terrain, meteorological conditions, proximity to residences, etc.
- J. Western shall comply with the conditions contained in this permit while operating in any location in Montana, except within those areas that have a Department-approved permitting program or areas considered tribal lands.

Permit Analysis
Western Energy Company
MAQP #4436-00

I. Introduction/Process Description

Western Energy Company (Western) owns and operates a portable crushing facility.

A. Permitted Equipment

Permitted equipment at the facility consists of a portable jaw crusher with a maximum design capacity of up to 650 ton per hour (TPH); a diesel engine/generator with a minimum rated design capacity of 600 horsepower (hp) and a maximum rated design capacity of up to 947 hp; and associated conveyors and equipment.

B. Source Description

Western owns and operates a crushing facility used to crush rock into specific sized gravel for use on mine roads. The hopper, grizzly, reject belt and jaw crusher are all contained as one unit on a trailer. A radial stacker capable of stacking product up to 60 feet is also mounted on the trailer. For a typical operational setup, unprocessed material is loaded into a hopper to then pass through a grizzly used to screen out oversized material. The remaining material is crushed to the designated size and routed to the finished material conveyor and then deposited onto finished material stock piles.

Western will utilize a portable electrical generator powered by diesel engine to supply electricity to the plant. The diesel engine/generator will have a minimum design capacity of 600 hp and a maximum design capacity of up to 947 hp. The maximum combined plant throughput is expected to be 650 TPH.

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.*, Montana Code Annotated (MCA).

Western 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:

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 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Settled Particulate Matter
5. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM₁₀

Western must maintain compliance with the applicable ambient air quality standards.

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.
2. 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. (2) Under this rule, Western shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road, or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter.
3. ARM 17.8.309 Particulate Matter, Fuel Burning Equipment. This rule requires that no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter caused by the combustion of fuel in excess of the amount determined by this section.
4. ARM 17.8.310 Particulate Matter, Industrial Process. This rule requires that no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter in excess of the amount set forth in this section.
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 section.

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 truck or trailer 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. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 CFR Part 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS). Western is considered an NSPS affected facility under 40 CFR Part 60 and is subject to the requirements of the following subparts.
 - a. 40 CFR 60, Subpart A – General Provisions apply to all equipment or facilities subject to an NSPS Subpart as listed below:

 - b. 40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO – Standards of Performance for Nonmetallic Mineral Processing Plants. In order for a crushing plant to be subject to this subpart, the facility must meet the definition of an affected facility and, the affected equipment must have been constructed, reconstructed, or modified after August 31, 1983. Based on the information submitted by Western, the portable crushing equipment to be used under MAQP #4436-00 is subject to this Subpart because the facility meets the definition of an affected facility and was constructed or reconstructed after August 31, 1983.

 - c. 40 CFR 60, Subpart IIII, Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition (CI) Internal Combustion Engines (ICE), indicates that NSPS requirements apply to owners or operators of stationary CI ICE that commence construction, modification, or reconstruction after July 11, 2005, where the stationary CI ICE is manufactured after April 1, 2006, and is not a fire pump engine. Furthermore, CI ICE will be subject to this NSPS standard only if the engine remains or will remain at the permitted location for more than 12 months, or a shorter period of time for an engine located at a seasonal source. A seasonal source remains at a single location on a permanent basis (at least 2 years) and operates 3 months or more each year.

The 947-hp diesel fired engine proposed at this facility is a CI ICE manufactured before April 1, 2006, and is not a fire pump engine; therefore this engine is not subject to NSPS. However, because this permit is written in a de minimis-friendly manner, should the proposed diesel engine be replaced with an engine manufactured after April 1, 2006, NSPS requirements would apply to that engine.

8. ARM 17.8.342 Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 CFR Part 63, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP). The affected sources, as defined and applied in 40 CFR Part 63, shall comply with the requirements of 40 CFR Part 63, as described below.
 - a. 40 CFR 63, Subpart A – General Provisions apply to all equipment or facilities subject to a NESHAP Subpart as listed below:

 - b. 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines. As an area source, any diesel RICE engine operated by Western that is new or reconstructed after June 12, 2006, will be subject to this MACT standard if the engine remains or will remain at the permitted location for more than 12 months, or a shorter

period of time for an engine located at a seasonal source. A seasonal source remains at a single location on a permanent basis (at least 2 years) and operates 3 months or more each year.

The proposed 947-hp diesel generator engine is a CI ICE manufactured before June 12, 2006. Therefore, MACT requirements do not apply to this particular engine. However, since this permit is written in a de minimis-friendly manner, MACT requirements may apply to future engines.

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. Western 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 pro-rate 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 modification to construct, modify, or use any asphalt plant, crusher or screen that has the potential to emit (PTE) greater than 15 tons per year of any pollutant. Western has the potential to emit more than 15 tons per year of particulate matter (PM), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and sulfur dioxide (SO₂); therefore, a permit is required.
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, modification, or use of a source. Western 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. Western submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the May 14th and 21st, 2009, issues of the *Independent Press*, a newspaper of general circulation in Rosebud 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 Western 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 modified 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. (1) This rule states that an air quality permit may be transferred from one location to another if the Department receives a complete notice of intent to transfer location, the facility will operate in the new location for less than 1 year, the facility will comply with the FCAA and the Clean Air Act of Montana, and the facility complies with other applicable rules. (2) 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.

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 Modification--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 because it is not a listed source and the facility's PTE is less than 250 tons per year 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 stationary 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 Applicability. (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 MAQP #4436-00 for Western, 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 of all HAPs.
 - c. This source is not located in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.
 - d. This facility is subject to a current NSPS (40 CFR 60, Subpart OOO and potentially Subpart IIII).

- 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 has determined that Western will be a minor source of emissions as defined under Title V. However, if minor sources subject to NSPS are required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit, Western will be required to obtain a Title V Operating Permit.

III. BACT Determination

A BACT determination is required for each new or modified source. Western shall install on the new or modified source the maximum air pollution control capability which is technically practicable and economically feasible, except that BACT shall be utilized.

A. Area Source Fugitive PM/PM₁₀ Emissions and Crusher PM/PM₁₀ Emissions

Two types of emissions controls are readily available and used for dust suppression of fugitive emissions at the site, fugitive emissions for the surrounding area of operations, and for equipment emissions from the crushing operation. These two control methods are water and chemical dust suppressant. Chemical dust suppressant could be used for dust suppression on the area surrounding the crushing operation and for emissions from the crushing operation. However, because water is more readily available, is more cost-effective, is equally effective as chemical dust suppressant, and is more environmentally friendly, water has been identified as the most appropriate method of pollution control of particulate emissions for the general plant area. In addition, water suppression has been required of recently permitted similar sources. However, Western may use chemical dust suppressant to assist in controlling particulate emissions from the surrounding plant area where it would assist in reducing emissions of particulate matter.

Western shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from any equipment, any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes. Western must also take reasonable precautions to limit the fugitive emissions of airborne particulate matter from haul roads, access roads, parking areas, and the general area of operation.

Western is required to have water spray bars and water available on site (at all times) and to apply the water, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the opacity and reasonable precaution limitations. Western may also use chemical dust suppression to maintain compliance with emissions limitations in Section I.A of MAQP #4436-00. The Department determined that using water spray bars, water, and/or chemical dust suppressant to maintain compliance with the opacity requirements and reasonable precaution limitations constitutes BACT for the crushing operation.

B. Diesel Engines/Generators

Because of the limited amount of emissions produced by the diesel engines/generators and the lack of readily available and cost effective add-on controls, add-on controls would be cost prohibitive for the proposed diesel-fired engines/generators. Therefore, the Department determined that proper operation and maintenance with no additional controls constitutes BACT for the diesel engines/generators in this case.

The control options selected contain control equipment and control costs comparable to other recently permitted similar sources and are capable of achieving the appropriate emission standards.

IV. Emission Inventory

Source	Tons/Year					
	PM	PM ₁₀	NO _x	VOC	CO	SO _x
Jaw Crusher (up to 650 TPH)	3.42	1.54				
Truck Unloading	0.05	0.05				
Material Transfer	1.20	0.39				
Storage Piles	4.69	2.22				
Haul Roads	5.68	1.57				
Diesel Engine (up to 947 hp)	2.90	2.90	99.55	2.92	22.81	33.56
Total	17.94	8.67	99.55	2.92	22.81	33.56

Crushing [Jaw Crusher] (SCC 3-05-020-05)

Maximum Process Rate = 650 ton/hr (Application information)

Maximum Hours of Operation = 8,760 hr/yr

PM Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.0012 lb/ton (crushing, AP 42, Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04)

Control Efficiency = 0%

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.0012 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) = 3.42 ton/yr

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.0012 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1 - 0/100) = **3.42 ton/yr**

PM10 Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.00054 lb/ton (crushing, AP 42, Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04)

Control Efficiency = 0%

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.00054 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) = 1.54 ton/yr

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.00054 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1 - 0/100) = **1.54 ton/yr**

Truck Unloading (SCC-3-05-020-31)

Maximum Process Rate = 650 ton/hr (Maximum plant process rate)

Maximum Hours of Operation = 8,760 hr/yr

Number of Loads = 1 load (Company Information)

Total PM Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.000016 lb/ton (AP 42, Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04)

Control Efficiency = 0%

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.000016 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1 load) = 0.05 ton/yr

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.000016 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1 load) * (1 - 0/100) = **0.05 ton/yr**

Total PM10 Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.000016 lb/ton (0.00110 uncontrolled, 0.000046 controlled, AP 42, Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04)

Control Efficiency = 0%

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.000016 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1 load) = 0.05 ton/yr

Calculation: (650 ton/hr) * (8760 hr/yr) * (0.000016 lb/ton) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1 load) * (1 - 0/100) = **0.05 ton/yr**

Conveyor Transfer Point (SCC 3-05-020-06)

Maximum Process Rate = 650 ton/hr (Maximum plant process rate)

Maximum Hours of Operation = 8,760 hr/yr

Number of Transfers = 3 transfers (Company Information)

Total PM Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.00014 lb/ton (0.0030 uncontrolled, 0.00014 controlled, AP 42, Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04)

Control Efficiency = 0%

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.00014 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (3 \text{ transfer}) = 1.20 \text{ ton/yr}$

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.00014 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (3 \text{ transfer}) * (1 - 0/100) =$

1.20 ton/yr

Total PM10 Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.000046 lb/ton (0.00110 uncontrolled, 0.000046 controlled, AP 42, Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04)

Control Efficiency = 0%

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.000046 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (3 \text{ transfer}) = 0.39 \text{ ton/yr}$

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.000046 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (3 \text{ transfer}) * (1 - 0/100) =$

0.39 ton/yr

Aggregate Storage Piles

Maximum Process Rate = 650 ton/hr (Maximum plant process rate)

Maximum Hours of Operation = 8,760 hr/yr

Number of Piles = 1 piles

PM Emissions:

Predictive equation for emission factor provided per AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06.

Emission Factor = $k (0.0032) * (U/5)^{1.3} * (M / 2)^{-1.4} = 0.00330 \text{ lb/ton}$

Where: k = particle size multiplier = 0.74 (Value for PM < 30 microns per AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06)

U = mean wind speed = 8.2 mph (Average from values provided in AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06)

M = material moisture content = 2.5% (Average from values provided in AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06)

Control Efficiency = 50% (Water or chemical spray)

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.00330 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (1 \text{ piles}) = 9.38 \text{ ton/yr}$

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.00330 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (1 \text{ piles}) * (1 - 50/100) = \mathbf{4.69 \text{ ton/yr}}$

PM10 Emissions:

Predictive equation for emission factor provided per AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06.

Emission Factor = $k (0.0032) * (U/5)^{1.3} * (M / 2)^{-1.4} = 0.00156 \text{ lb/ton}$

Where: k = particle size multiplier = 0.35 (Value for PM < 10 microns per AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06)

U = mean wind speed = 8.2 mph (Average from values provided in AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06)

M = material moisture content = 2.5% (Average from values provided in AP 42, Sec. 13.2.4.3, 11/06)

Control Efficiency = 50% (Water or chemical spray)

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.00156 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (1 \text{ piles}) = 4.44 \text{ ton/yr}$

Calculation: $(650 \text{ ton/hr}) * (8760 \text{ hr/yr}) * (0.00156 \text{ lb/ton}) * (\text{ton}/2000 \text{ lb}) * (1 \text{ piles}) * (1 - 50/100) = \mathbf{2.22 \text{ ton/yr}}$

Haul Roads

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per Day = 5 VMT/day (Estimate)

VMT per hour = $(5 \text{ VMT/day}) * (\text{day}/24 \text{ hrs}) = 0.21 \text{ VMT/hr}$

Hours of Operation = 8,760 hr/yr

PM Emissions:

Predictive equation for emission factor for unpaved roads at industrial sites provided per AP 42, Ch. 13.2.2, 11/06.

$$\text{Emission Factor} = k * (s / 12)^a * (W / 3)^b = 12.46 \text{ lb/VMT}$$

Where: k = constant = 4.9 lbs/VMT (Value for PM30/TSP, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06)

s = surface silt content = 7.1 % (Mean value, sand/gravel processing, material storage area, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-1, 11/06)

W = mean vehicle weight = 54 tons (1994 average loaded/unloaded or a 40 ton truck)

a = constant = 0.7 (Value for PM30/TSP, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06)

b = constant = 0.45 (Value for PM30/TSP, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06)

Control Efficiency = 50% (Water spray or chemical dust suppressant)

Calculation: (8760 hr/yr) * (0.21 VMT/hr) * (12.46 lb/VMT) * (ton/2000 lb) = 11.37 ton/yr (Uncontrolled Emissions)

Calculation: (8760 hr/yr) * (0.21 VMT/hr) * (12.46 lb/VMT) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1-50/100) = **5.68 tons/yr** (Apply 50% control efficiency)

PM10 Emissions:

Predictive equation for emission factor for unpaved roads at industrial sites provided per AP 42, Ch. 13.2.2, 11/06.

$$\text{Emission Factor} = k * (s / 12)^a * (W / 3)^b = 3.43 \text{ lb/VMT}$$

Where: k = constant = 1.5 lbs/VMT (Value for PM10, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06)

s = surface silt content = 7.1 % (Mean value, sand/gravel processing, material storage area, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-1, 11/06)

W = mean vehicle weight = 54 tons (1994 average loaded/unloaded or a 40 ton truck)

a = constant = 0.9 (Value for PM10, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06)

b = constant = 0.45 (Value for PM10, AP 42, Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06)

Control Efficiency = 50% (Water spray or chemical dust suppressant)

Calculation: (8760 hr/yr) * (0.21 VMT/hr) * (3.43 lb/VMT) * (ton/2000 lb) = 3.13 ton/yr (Uncontrolled Emissions)

Calculation: (8760 hr/yr) * (0.21 VMT/hr) * (3.43 lb/VMT) * (ton/2000 lb) * (1-50/100) = **1.57 ton/yr** (Apply 50% control efficiency)

Diesel Engine

Note: Emissions are based on the power output of the engine (947 hp).

Operational Capacity of Engine = 947 hp

Hours of Operation = 8,760.00 hours

PM Emissions:

PM Emissions = **2.90 ton/yr** (Assume PM = PM10)

PM Emissions = 5,807.00 lb/yr (Assume PM = PM10)

PM-10 Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.0007 lbs/hp-hr (AP-42, Sec. 3.4, Table 3.4-1, 10/96)

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.0007 lbs/hp-hr) * (ton/2000 lb) = **2.90 ton/yr**

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.0007 lbs/hp-hr) = 5,807.00 lb/yr

NOx Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.024 lbs/hp-hr (AP-42, Sec. 3.4, Table 3.4-1, 10/96)

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.024 lbs/hp-hr) * (ton/2000 lb) = **99.55 ton/yr**

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.024 lbs/hp-hr) = 199,097.28 lb/yr

CO Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.0055 lbs/hp-hr (AP-42, Sec. 3.4, Table 3.4-1, 10/96)

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.0055 lbs/hp-hr) * (ton/2000 lb) = **22.81 ton/yr**

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.0055 lbs/hp-hr) = 45,626.46 lb/yr

VOC Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.000705 lbs/hp-hr (AP-42, Sec. 3.4, Table 3.4-1, TOC, 10/96)

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.000705 lbs/hp-hr) * (ton/2000 lb) = **2.92 ton/yr**

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.000705 lbs/hp-hr) = 5,848.48 lb/yr

SOx Emissions:

Emission Factor = 0.00809 lbs/hp-hr (AP-42, Sec. 3.4, Table 3.4-1, 10/96)

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.00809 lbs/hp-hr) * (ton/2000 lb) = **33.556 ton/yr**

Calculation: (8,760 hours) * (947 hp) * (0.00809 lbs/hp-hr) = 67,112.37 lb/yr

V. Air Quality Impacts

This permit is for a portable crushing facility to be located at various locations around Montana. This permit contains operational conditions and limitations that would protect air quality for this site and the surrounding area. Also, this facility is a portable source that would operate on an intermittent and temporary basis, so any effects to air quality will be minor and short-lived. Further, the amount of controlled particulate emissions generated by this project should not cause concentrations of PM₁₀ in the ambient air that exceed the set standard.

VII. Ambient Air Impact Analysis

The Department determined, based on ambient air modeling, that the impact from this permitting action will be minor. The Department believes it will not cause or contribute to a violation of any ambient air quality standard.

VIII. Taking or Damaging Implication Analysis

As required by 2-10-105, MCA, the Department conducted the following private property taking and damaging assessment.

YES	NO	
X		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights?
	X	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property?
	X	3. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? (ex.: right to exclude others, disposal of property)
	X	4. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?
	X	5. Does the action require a property owner to dedicate a portion of property or to grant an easement? [If no, go to (6)].
		5a. Is there a reasonable, specific connection between the government requirement and legitimate state interests?
		5b. Is the government requirement roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed use of the property?
	X	6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? (consider economic impact, investment-backed expectations, character of government action)
	X	7. Does the action damage the property by causing some physical disturbance with respect to the property in excess of that sustained by the public generally?
	X	7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?
	X	7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged or flooded?
	X	7c. Has government action lowered property values by more than 30% and necessitated the physical taking of adjacent property or property across a public way from the property in question?
	X	Takings or damaging implications? (Taking or damaging implications exist if YES is checked in response to question 1 and also to any one or more of the following questions: 2, 3, 4, 6, 7a, 7b, 7c; or if NO is checked in response to questions 5a or 5b; the shaded areas)

Based on this analysis, the Department determined there are no taking or damaging implications associated with this permit action.

IX. 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, MT 59620
(406) 444-3490

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued To: Western Energy Company
138 Rosebud Lane
P.O. Box 99
Colstrip, MT 59323

Montana Air Quality Permit number: 4436-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: 07/10/2009

Department Decision Issued: 07/28/2009

Permit Final: 08/13/2009

1. *Legal Description of Site:* Western proposes to operate a portable crushing facility, which will initially be located in the East ½ of Section 33, Township 2 North, Range 40 East, Rosebud County, Montana. However, MAQP #4436-00 applies while operating at any location in Montana, except those areas having a Department-approved permitting program, areas considered tribal lands, or areas in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* An addendum will be required for locations in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.
2. *Description of Project:* The Department received a permit application from Western for the operation of a portable crushing facility with a maximum rated design process rate of 650 TPH. Western proposes to utilize a portable electrical generator powered by diesel engine to supply electricity to the plant. The proposed diesel engine/generator will have a minimum design capacity of 600 hp and a maximum design capacity of up to 947 hp. Western requested that this permit be written in a de minimis friendly manner.
3. *Objectives of Project:* Western proposes to use this crushing facility to produce 2" minus road material for use on mine roads. The issuance of MAQP #4436-00 would allow Western to operate the permitted equipment at various locations throughout Montana, including the proposed initial site location.
4. *Alternatives Considered:* In addition to the proposed action, the Department considered the "no-action" alternative. The "no-action" alternative would deny issuance of the MAQP to the proposed facility. However, the Department does not consider the "no-action" alternative to be appropriate because Western 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 listing of the enforceable permit conditions and a permit analysis, including a BACT analysis, would be contained in MAQP #4436-00.
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 the permit conditions would be reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements and to demonstrate compliance with those requirements and would 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

This permitting action would have a minor effect on terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats, as the proposed project would affect an existing, industrial property that has already been disturbed. Furthermore, the air emissions would have only minor effects on terrestrial and aquatic life because facility emissions would be well dispersed in the area of the operations (see Section 7.F of this EA) and would have intermittent and seasonal operations. Therefore, only minor and temporary effects to terrestrial and aquatic life and habitat would be expected from the proposed project.

B. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution

Water would be required for dust suppression on the surrounding roadways and general facility area. This water use would only cause minor, if any, impacts to water resources because the facility is small and only a small volume of water would be required to be used. In addition, the facility would emit air pollutants, and corresponding deposition of pollutants would occur, as described in Section 7.F. of this EA. However, the Department determined that, due to dispersion characteristics of pollutants and conditions that would be placed in MAQP #4436-00, any impacts from deposition of pollutants on water quality, quantity, and distribution would be minor.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture

Only minor impacts from deposition of air pollutants on soils would result (as described in Section 7.F of this EA) and only minor amounts of water would be used for pollution control, and would be used, only as necessary, in controlling particulate emissions. Thus, only minimal water runoff would occur. Since only minor amounts of pollution would be generated and corresponding emissions would be widely dispersed before settling upon surrounding soils and vegetation (as described in Section 7.D of this EA), impacts would be minor. Therefore, any effects upon geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture from air pollutant emissions from equipment operations would be minor and short-lived.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Only minor impacts would occur on vegetative cover, quality, and quantity because the facility would operate in an area where vegetation has been previously disturbed. During operations, the facility would be a relatively minor source of emissions and the pollutants would be greatly dispersed (as described in Section 7.F of this EA); therefore, deposition on vegetation from the proposed project would be minor. Also, because the water usage would be minimal (as described in Section 7.B of this EA) and the associated soil disturbance from the application of water and water runoff would be minimal (as described in Section 7.C of this EA), corresponding vegetative impacts would be minor.

E. Aesthetics

The crushing facility would be visible and would create noise while operating at the proposed site. However, the project site is located approximately 3 miles from the nearest residence, and MAQP #4436-00 would include conditions to control emissions from the operation. The facility would be portable, would operate on an intermittent and seasonal basis, and would be a small industrial source. Therefore, any visual aesthetic impacts would be short-lived and minor.

F. Air Quality

Air quality impacts from the proposed project would be minor because the facility would be relatively small and operate on an intermittent and temporary basis. MAQP #4436-00 would include conditions limiting the facility's opacity; require water and water spray bars be available on site and used to ensure compliance with opacity standards; and limit the facility's crushing production.

Further, the Department determined that this crushing facility would be a minor source of emissions as defined under the Title V Operating Permit Program because the source's potential to emit is limited to below the major source threshold level of 100 TPY for any regulated pollutant. Pollutant deposition from the facility would be minimal because the pollutants emitted would be widely dispersed (from factors such as wind speed and wind direction) and would have minimal deposition on the surrounding area. Therefore, air quality impacts from operating the crushing facility in this area would be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

The Department, in an effort to assess any potential impacts to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the initial proposed area of operation (East ½ of Section 33, Township 2 North, Range 40 East, Rosebud County, Montana), contacted the Natural Resource Information System – Montana Natural Heritage Program. Search results concluded there are five species of concern within the area. The search area, in this case, is defined by the section, township, and range of the proposed site, with an additional 1-mile buffer. The known species of concern include five vertebrate animals: the Burrowing Owl (Sensitive), Pallid Bat (Sensitive), Greater Short-horned Lizard (Sensitive), Common Sagebrush Lizard, and Western Hog-nosed Snake (Sensitive).

While these species may be found within the search area, these animals may have many miles of potential habitat. Specific effects of operating the crushing facility in this area would be minor since the facility is relatively small in size, and would have only seasonal and intermittent operations in the area. Therefore, the Department determined that any effects upon these species would be minor and short-lived.

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

Due to the relatively small size of the project, only small demands on environmental resources would be required for proper operation. Only small quantities of water would be required for dust suppression of particulate emissions being generated at the site. In addition, impacts to air resources would be minor because the source is a minor industrial source of emissions, with intermittent and seasonal operations, and because air pollutants generated by the facility would be widely dispersed as described in Section 7.F of this EA. Energy requirements would also be small, as the diesel engines would use small amounts of fuel. Overall, any impacts to water, air, and energy resources would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The Department contacted the Montana Historical Society - State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) in an effort to identify any historical and/or archaeological sites that may be present in the proposed initial location of the facility. Search results concluded that there is one previously recorded site within the E ½ of Section 33. Site 24RB0549 is a large lithic scatter which covers a large portion of Section 33. In addition to the site, there have been a few previously conducted cultural resource inventories done in the area. SHPO has recommended that any impacts to this site be avoided. This site is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. SHPO has requested that they be contacted with information on any proposed ground disturbing activities, specifically within the S ½ of Section 33.

Based on information received from the applicant, the proposed project sites have been previously disturbed in accordance with current mining permits held by the applicant.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The operation of the crushing facility would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the facility would be limited in the amount of PM, PM₁₀, oxides of NO_x, CO, Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), and oxides of Sulfur (SO_x) emissions to be generated. Emissions and noise generated from the equipment would, at most, result in only minor impacts to the area of operations because the operation of the crushing facility would be seasonal and temporary. The proposed project would be short-term in nature, and have minor cumulative effects upon resources within the area. These resources include water, terrestrial and aquatic life, soils, and vegetation. Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment would be minor.

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

The operation of the crushing facility would cause no disruption to the social structures and mores in the area because the source would be a minor industrial source of emissions and would only have temporary and intermittent operations. Further, the facility would be required to operate according to the conditions that would be placed in MAQP #4436-00, which would limit the effects to social structures and mores.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The cultural uniqueness and diversity of this area would not be impacted by the operation of the proposed crushing facility because the facility is a portable source, with seasonal and intermittent operations.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The operation of the crushing facility would have little, if any, impact on the local and state tax base and tax revenue because the facility would be a minor industrial source of emissions and would have seasonal and intermittent operations. Western currently utilizes approximately 400 employees at the Rosebud Mine. There would be no change in employment as a result of this project. Therefore, no impacts to the local and state tax base and revenue would be expected from the employees and facility production.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The operation of the crushing facility would have only a minor impact on local industrial production since the facility would be a minor source of air emissions. Because minimal deposition of air pollutants would occur on the surrounding land (as described in Section 7.F

of this EA), only minor and temporary effects on the surrounding vegetation (i.e. agricultural production) would occur. In addition, the facility operations would be small and temporary in nature and would be permitted with operational conditions and limitations that would minimize impacts upon surrounding vegetation, as described in Section 7.D of this EA.

E. Human Health

MAQP #4436-00 would incorporate conditions to ensure that the crushing facility would be operated in compliance with all applicable air quality rules and standards. These rules and standards are designed to be protective of human health. As described in Section 7.F. of this EA, the air emissions from this facility would be minimized by the use of water spray and other operational limits that would be required by MAQP #4436-00. Also, the facility would be operating on a temporary basis and pollutants would disperse from the ventilation of emissions at this site (see Section 7.F of this EA). Therefore, only minor impacts would be expected on human health from the proposed project.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

Based on information received from Western, no recreational activities or wilderness areas are near the proposed project site. Therefore, no impacts to the access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities are anticipated.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

No impacts are anticipated on the quantity and distribution of employment as no new employees would be necessary as a result of this project.

H. Distribution of Population

The proposed crushing facility would be a portable industrial facility that would only require employees currently employed by Western to operate. No individuals would be expected to permanently relocate to the area as a result of operating the facility. Therefore, the crushing facility would not impact the normal population distribution in the initial area of operation or any future operating site.

I. Demands of Government Services

Minor increases may be seen in traffic on existing roadways in the area while the crushing facility is being operated. In addition, government services would be required for acquiring the appropriate permits for the proposed project and to verify compliance with the permits that would be issued. However, demands for government services would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The operation of the crushing facility would represent only a minor increase in the industrial activity in the proposed area of operation because the source would be a relatively small industrial source that would be portable and temporary in nature. No additional industrial or commercial activity would be expected as a result of the proposed operation.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

Western would be allowed, by MAQP #4436-00, to operate in areas designated by EPA as attainment or unclassified for ambient air quality. An Addendum would be required to operate in or within 10 km of a PM₁₀ nonattainment area. MAQP #4436-00 would contain operational restrictions for protecting air quality and to keep facility emissions in compliance with any applicable ambient air quality standards, as a locally adopted environmental plan or goal for operating at this proposed site. Because the proposed crushing facility would be a portable source and would have intermittent and seasonal operations, any impacts from the project would be minor and short-lived.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The operation of the crushing facility would cause only minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the social and economic aspects of the human environment in the immediate area of operation because the source would be a portable and temporary source. Minor increases in traffic would have minor effects on local traffic in the immediate area. Because the source is relatively small and temporary, only minor economic impacts to the local economy would be expected from operating the facility. Further, this facility may be operated in conjunction with other equipment owned and operated by Western, but any cumulative impacts upon the social and economic aspects of the human environment would be minor and short-lived. Thus, only minor and temporary cumulative effects would result to the local economy.

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 operation of a portable crushing facility with a maximum rated design process rate of 650 TPH. MAQP #4436-00 would include conditions and limitations to ensure the facility would 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

Prepared By: Skye Hatten
Date: June 22, 2009