

**MONTANA ALBERTA TIE LTD. (MATL)
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE AMENDMENT
for Diamond Valley South and Bullhead Coulee
North Amendments**

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Facility Siting Program
1520 East Sixth Avenue
Helena, MT 59620-0901**

June 28, 2011

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Project Background	4
2.0 Nature of the Proposed Amendment	4
2.1 Decisions to Be Made.....	5
2.2 Other Agencies.....	5
2.3 Public Involvement.....	6
3.0 Alternatives Considered.....	6
3.1 Proposed Action.....	6
3.2 No Action	6
4.0 Existing Environment	6
5.0 EA Checklist.....	7
5.1 Diamond Valley South Amendment.....	14
5.2 Bullhead Coulee North Amendment.....	14
6.0 Cumulative Impacts	16
6.1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	16
6.2 Irreversible and Irretrievable Impacts	16
7.0 List of Preparers	16
8.0 REFERENCES	17
FIGURES 1 and 2.....	18
LIST OF TABLES	
Table 1.....	15
Table2.....	15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. and MATL LLP (MATL) propose to amend the Certificate of Compliance (Certificate) for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an international 230-kV (kilovolt) alternating current merchant transmission line. The Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) issued the Certificate for the MATL project on October 22, 2008.

The transmission line is approved to originate at the existing NorthWestern Energy (NWE) 230-kV Switchyard near Great Falls, Montana, and extend north to a new substation to be constructed northeast of Lethbridge, Alberta, crossing the U.S.-Canada international border north of Cut Bank, Montana. In Montana, the length of the line is approximately 130 miles. The transmission line will be part of the Western Interconnection (Western grid).

MATL's proposed amendment would change the language in the Certificate and Environmental Specifications to allow the relocation of two segments of the approved facility location to address landowner concerns which were raised after the Certificate had been issued.

The Proposed Action (Certificate Amendment) and No Action Alternative are analyzed in this Environmental Assessment.

Under the proposed amendment, DEQ would modify two portions of the approved location as depicted in Figures 1 and 2. MATL has requested the following conditions to the proposed amendments:

- (1) If the Department approves the amendment and an appeal is timely filed under Section 75-20-223(2), MCA, by any person, then the amendment(s) shall be void and the approved location of the transmission line corridor shall be that set forth in the Certificate as issued on October 22, 2008.

- (2) If the Department approves the amendment and the United States Department of Energy has not issued on or before August 17, 2011, a determination under 10 CFR 1021.314(c)(2)(iii) that no further NEPA documentation is required on account of the requested realignment of the transmission line corridor, then the amendment(s) shall be void and the approved location of the transmission line corridor shall be that set forth in the Certificate as issued on October 22, 2008.

Under the No Action Alternative, no changes to the current Certificate would be made.

1.0 Introduction

This Environmental Assessment (EA) provides supplemental analysis of impacts examined in the draft, supplemental draft, and final environmental impact statement for the Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. (MATL) 230-kV Transmission line (DOE and DEQ, 2007, 2008, and 2008a). It also contains the information to support DEQ's determination to grant, deny, or modify the proposed amendment. The DEQ is using the environmental assessment format because the short timeframe required by statute for the determination does not allow sufficient time for preparation of a full or supplemental environmental impact statement and an EA is an appropriate level of environmental review for the proposed amendment. This approach is provided for in ARM 17.4.607(2)(e).

1.1 Project Background

The Montana Alberta Tie transmission line project is jointly owned by Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. and MATL LLP. The 230-kV transmission line is permitted to originate at the existing NorthWestern Energy (NWE) 230-kV Switchyard near Great Falls, Montana, and extend north to a new substation to be constructed northeast of Lethbridge, Alberta, crossing the U.S.-Canada international border north of Cut Bank, Montana. In Montana the length of the line is approximately 130 miles. The transmission line would be part of the Western Interconnection (Western grid).

Following publication of a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) (DEQ and DOE, March 2007), a supplemental draft EIS (February 2008), and a final EIS (September 2008), DEQ issued a Certificate of Compliance (Certificate) for the 230-kV transmission line on October 22, 2008. Descriptions of the transmission line and associated facilities are given in detail in the final EIS (DEQ and DOE September 2008) and are incorporated by reference.

On August 11, 2010, MATL filed a notice of amendment with DEQ allowing construction in and near wetlands (Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. and MATL LLP. 2010). Following publication of an environmental assessment (DEQ 2010), DEQ issued an amendment with conditions on September 22, 2010 that allowed MATL to conduct temporary construction activities in and near wetlands.

2.0 Nature of the Proposed Amendment

On June 16, 2011 Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. and MATL LLP, co-permittees for the Montana Alberta Tie Transmission Line, submitted a second application to DEQ for an amendment to the Certificate. MATL requests the following amendments to the Certificate.

A. Diamond Valley South – Laubach Amendment:

At the Laubachs' request, the transmission line corridor would be modified from milepost 30/2 to 31/4 as depicted in Figure 1. This proposed alignment amendment shifts the transmission line away from a planned, future home site. This proposed alignment amendment also reduces the number of drainage crossings and reduces the potential impacts to wetlands and to wildlife habitat associated with unfarmed coulees.

B. Bullhead Coulee North - Swanson Amendment:

At the Swansons' request, the transmission line corridor would be modified from milepost 84/5 to 85/3 as depicted in Figure 2. This proposed alignment amendment allows for future pivot irrigation in the southeast quarter of Section 5 in T30N, R4W, by placing the alignment on property boundaries and/or established crop edges. This proposed alignment amendment also eliminates the need for a guyed structure in a cultivated field at milepost 85/3.

MATL has requested the following conditions to the proposed amendment:

“(1) If the Department approves the amendment and an appeal is timely filed under Section 75-20-223(2), MCA, by any person, then the amendment(s) shall be void and the approved location of the transmission line corridor shall be that set forth in the Certificate as issued on October 22, 2008.

- (3) If the Department approves the amendment and the United States Department of Energy has not issued on or before August 17, 2011, a determination under 10 CFR 1021.314(c)(2)(iii) that no further NEPA documentation is required on account of the requested realignment of the transmission line corridor, then the amendment(s) shall be void and the approved location of the transmission line corridor shall be that set forth in the Certificate as issued on October 22, 2008.”

If approved, the certificate amendment would allow modification of the location for the line in two areas: a 1.3-mile relocation roughly 8.7 miles east of Dutton, MT (T24N, R2E, sections 6, 7, and 8) and second 1- mile relocation about 6.5 miles northeast of Valier, MT (T30N, R4W, sections 5 and 8).

2.1 Decisions to Be Made

Based on the information submitted by MATL in its notice to amend the Certificate, information presented in the final EIS and additional information presented in this EA, the Department will determine, pursuant to 75-20-219, MCA, whether the proposed amendment:

- would result in a material increase in any environmental impact of the transmission line, or
- would result in a substantial change in the location of all or a portion of the transmission line.

If DEQ finds that the proposed amendment would not result in a material increase in any environmental impact or a substantial change in the location of the transmission line, DEQ is required to automatically grant the amendment either as applied for or upon terms or conditions that the department considers appropriate. If DEQ determines the proposed amendment would result in a material increase in any environmental impact or a substantial change in the location of the transmission line, DEQ is required to grant, deny or modify the amendment with conditions it considers appropriate.

These determinations must be made within 30 days following notice by MATL of an application to amend a Certificate. MATL filed its notice with DEQ on June 16, 2011.

In order for DEQ to determine that an amendment to a certificate should be granted or modified, DEQ must find that the amendment would not materially alter the findings that were the basis for granting the certificate. DEQ’s determination is limited to consideration of effects that the proposed change or addition to the facility may produce.

A person aggrieved by a final decision by DEQ on an application for amendment to a certificate may within 15 days appeal the decision to the Board of Environmental Review.

2.2 Other Agencies

A decision to amend the Certificate may alter the location of the transmission line near a missile silo operated by the United States Air Force (USAF). USAF has a 1,200-foot wide easement around a missile silo south of the proposed location shown in Figure 1. No other known state or federal lands would be affected by the proposed amendment.

2.3 Public Involvement

This EA is being posted to DEQ's website for public comment. It may be revised based on public comment. Comments may be mailed to:

Tom Ring
Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Facility Siting Program
PO Box 200901
Helena, MT 59602-0901
or emailed to tring@mt.gov

Comments will be accepted no later than July 8, 2011.

3.0 Alternatives Considered

This section describes the alternatives that DEQ has considered during its review of the proposed amendment. MATL's proposed action and a No Action Alternative are considered.

3.1 Proposed Action

The amendment proposed by MATL described in Section 2.0 would be granted with three modifications. For the Diamond Valley South amendment, the following language from the Environmental Specifications (Appendix A, Land Use) would not apply: "Whenever reasonably possible, structures should be located along field boundaries." In addition, the west side of the Diamond Valley South amendment would be entirely located on Ronald and Debbie Laubach's property in the E1/2 of Section 7 in T24N R2E and the Diamond Valley South amendment would be located within the irregularly shaped corridor depicted in Figure 1; and outside the easement held by the USAF restricting above ground structures near its missile silo unless allowed by the USAF (Wanke 2010) Finally, the Bullhead Coulee North amendment would be located within the irregularly shaped corridor depicted in Figure 2.

3.2 No Action

The No Action Alternative would mean that the language in the Certificate and Environmental Specifications would remain unchanged.

4.0 Existing Environment

Existing environmental conditions were described in the final EIS for the project (DEQ and DOE 2008a). DEQ staff conducted a field review in June 2011 of the two areas proposed for amendment, and found existing conditions described in the final EIS are still considered valid and are incorporated herein by reference. The final EIS may be viewed in DEQ's office at 1520 East Sixth Avenue, Helena, Montana during regular business hours not including holidays. The final EIS, Certificate of Compliance, and Wetlands Amendment also may be viewed at the following web site:

<http://deq.mt.gov/MFS/MATL.mcp.x>.

MATL provided no additional baseline information pertaining to this amendment since publication of the final EIS.

5.0 EA Checklist

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
<p>1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are soils present which are fragile, erosive, susceptible to compaction, or unstable? Are there unusual or unstable geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?</p>	<p>Soils in these two areas are loams to clay loams derived from glacial till or fine grained alluvial material. As described in the final EIS, soil compaction and rutting would occur during construction. With implementation of storm water controls, soil erosion is expected to be minor in these areas.</p>	<p>Slightly less land may be affected due to an approximate 0.06 mile decrease in the length of the approved location for the Diamond Valley South amendment. For the Bullhead Coulee North amendment, there would be more ground disturbance due to approximately an additional 0.12 mile of line from the proposed amendment. In the Bullhead Coulee North area, access trails or roads along the ROW may be slightly longer than MATL's approved location, due to the presence of the creek and canal. Soil erosion and compaction are expected to be similar to that along the approved location.</p>
<p>2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?</p>	<p>As described in the final EIS and the EA for the amendment allowing construction in wetlands, streams and water quality could be affected by streambank alteration and sediment entering streams. Required mitigation would reduce the potential for sediment reaching a stream.</p>	<p>The proposed Diamond Valley South amendment would result in crossing three fewer intermittent streams and potentially associated wetlands than the approved location. This would likely reduce the potential for sediment to reach the stream. The Bullhead Coulee North amendment would result in two additional stream crossings but because of the span lengths, it is likely that these stream crossings would be spanned and that access trails would avoid these additional stream crossings.</p>
<p>3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I air shed)?</p>	<p>Few air quality impacts are expected.</p>	<p>Additional air quality impacts are not expected.</p>

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
<p>4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?</p>	<p>Potential impacts to vegetative species are described in the Final EIS and the EA for the amendment allowing construction in wetlands. Mostly common species would be affected along the proposed alignment. Potentially more wetland habitat would be affected on the approved location in the Diamond Valley South area.</p>	<p>On the Diamond Valley South amendment, less vegetation associated with the streambanks and mapped wetland would be potentially impacted by construction and maintenance activities. The Diamond Valley South amendment would be located mostly on cultivated land and less than 0.1 mile of low growing riparian vegetation would be crossed at a single intermittent stream crossing. The Bullhead Coulee North amendment would likely cross more riparian and potential wetland vegetation.</p>
<p>5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?</p>	<p>Sediment production could affect aquatic life despite implementation of best management practices to control storm water runoff.</p>	<p>Sediment production could affect aquatic life despite implementation of best management practices to control storm water runoff. The Bullhead Coulee North modified location would cross two more streams. Therefore more sediment related impacts may occur as a result of construction related disturbances than on the approved location.</p>
<p>6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?</p>	<p>Potential impacts to these species are described in the Final EIS and the EA for the amendment allowing construction in wetlands. Potentially more wetland habitat would be affected on the approved location in the Diamond Valley South area. There are no known species of special concern in the affected areas.</p>	<p>Less potential wetland habitat would be affected by the modified location in the Diamond Valley South area compared to the previously approved location. On the Bullhead Coulee North amendment, slightly more rangeland and riparian habitat would be crossed. There are no known species of special concern in the affected areas.</p>

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
<p>7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?</p>	<p>A Class III cultural resource inventory was conducted in 2007 (GCM 2010). One NRHP eligible (Criterion A) site was identified, the AN Canal (24PN109). The project will have no adverse effect on the canal with the avoidance of features.</p>	<p>DEQ staff walked the proposed new locations and did not find any additional cultural, archaeological or paleontological resources beyond those described in the final EIS. The AN Canal (24PN109) will still be crossed by the proposed amendment but with no adverse effect on the canal with the spanning of the features and maintaining the integrity of the canal.</p>
<p>8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?</p>	<p>The project is located in a rural agricultural area. In the Diamond Valley South area, the approved location is adjacent to a planned building site near a little used farm house and associated outbuildings. At the north end of the Diamond Valley South area the approved location crosses an area used for recreational hunting and a structure is planned for the middle of this recreational use area. Aesthetics of the planned house site and recreational hunting area would be adversely affected if the project were built as proposed. In the Bullhead Coulee North area the approved location traverses agricultural land, and is located within approximately 0.26 mile of a residence.</p>	<p>In the Diamond Valley South area the proposed amendment would reduce aesthetic impacts by being located approximately 1000 feet away from a planned house site and avoid being located in the middle of a recreational hunting area. In the Bullhead Coulee North area the proposed amendment would move the alignment farther from the nearest residence from an approximate distance of 0.26 mile to a distance of 0.41 mile.</p>

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area?	Impacts on land, water, air, and energy are described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	The Diamond Valley South amendment would be approximately 0.06 mile shorter than the currently approved location. The Bullhead Coulee North amendment would be 0.12 mile longer than the approved location.
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	No impacts are expected beyond those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetland for MATL's approved location.	The impacts to other environmental resources would be similar to those described for MATL's approved location.
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	The impacts would be similar to those generally described in the Final EIS.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	See the more detailed discussion of potential land use impacts that follows this table in Sections 5.1 and 5.2.
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	No substantial change is expected in the employment numbers described in the Final EIS.

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	No substantial change is expected in the tax base or tax revenue from that described in the Final EIS.
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	There would be no substantial change to the need for government services for fire, police, or schools from those described in the final EIS and the EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands.
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	No changes to plans or goals are expected from those described in the Final EIS.
17. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	Along the approved location in the Diamond Valley South, an affected landowner has indicated that a structure would be located in an area used for recreational hunting. This area would be avoided by the proposed amendment. No change to recreation is expected along the proposed Bullhead Coulee amendment.
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	No population changes are expected beyond those described in the Final EIS.

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	No changes are expected beyond those described in the Final EIS.
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	Impacts would be the same as those described in the final EIS and EA prepared for the amendment addressing construction activities in wetlands for MATL's approved location.	No changes are expected beyond those described in the Final EIS.
21. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Are we regulating the use of private property under a regulatory statute adopted pursuant to the police power of the state? (Property management, grants of financial assistance, and the exercise of the power of eminent domain are not within this category.) If not, no further analysis is required.	On those areas where MATL has obtained easements, the proposed amendment could affect MATL's property rights.	On those areas where MATL has obtained easements, the proposed amendment could affect MATL's property rights.
22. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Does the proposed regulatory action restrict the use of the regulated person's private property? If not, no further analysis is required.	No changes are expected from those effects described in the Final EIS.	Selection of the Proposed Action would not result in any additional regulation of MATL's private property rights. The regulatory restrictions set forth in MATL's current Certificate of Compliance would remain in effect.

Resource	No Action	Proposed Action
<p>23. PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Does the agency have legal discretion to impose or not impose the proposed restriction or discretion as to how the restriction will be imposed? If not, no further analysis is required. If so, the agency must determine if there are alternatives that would reduce, minimize or eliminate the restriction on the use of private property, and analyze such alternatives.</p>	<p>No further analysis is required.</p>	<p>No further analysis is required.</p>
<p>24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:</p>	<p>Since the Certificate of Compliance was approved, DEQ met with landowners at their request and learned about concerns over facility location that had not been raised in comments on the draft or supplemental draft EIS. DEQ staff subsequently met with representatives from MATL and relayed these concerns. The landowner on the Diamond Valley South amendment made it clear that he supported MATL's proposed amendment.</p>	

5.1 Diamond Valley South Amendment

The Proposed Action would potentially double the distance to a planned home site compared to the existing approved location. The Diamond Valley South Amendment would be about 0.2 mile away from the home site whereas the approved location corridor is about 0.1 mile away. The amendment would utilize slightly more non-irrigated cropland/Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) land and less rangeland than the approved location. The proposed amendment would diagonally cross cultivated land while the existing corridor would be parallel to cultivated land and some uncultivated land in drainages. The diagonal crossing through cropland on the amendment would be done at the request of the affected landowner. It would also avoid being in the 1,200 foot easement that precludes above ground structures around the Air Force missile site located south of this parcel. In addition, the amendment is slightly shorter in overall length by 0.06 mile. Overall, the Diamond Valley South Amendment would result in a small increase of non-irrigated cropland/CRP crossed, uses less rangeland, and is further away from a future home site compared to the existing approved location (Table 1). Land use information from MATL's application also is presented in Table 2. This information relating to land use is presented because MATL referenced this information in this notice to amend.

5.2 Bullhead Coulee North Amendment

The proposed amendment for Bullhead Coulee North would allow for the development of a center pivot irrigation system in the southeast quarter of Section 5 in T30N, R4W. It could eliminate a diagonal field crossing and instead could place structures along the edge of a field strip. The existing approved location could prevent the development of the center pivot irrigation system at this location. The amendment would cross more rangeland and less non-irrigated cropland/CRP in comparison to the existing approved location. Both alignments would cross the same road and canal but at different locations. The Bullhead Coulee North Amendment would be about 0.12 mile longer than the approved location.

Table 1. Land Use as Calculated by DEQ

Types of Land Use Crossed by Alternatives Calculated by DEQ in 2011 (Approximate Miles)					
	Existing Corridor	Diamond Valley South		Existing Corridor	Bullhead Coulee North
Irrigated cropland	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Non-irrigated cropland/CRP	1.18	1.22		0.72	0.64
Rangeland	0.1	0.03		0.16	0.33
Riparian	0.07	0.04		0.01	0.04
Road/ROW	0.00	0.01		0.02	0.02
Water	0.00	0.00		0.01	0.02
Total Miles	1.35	1.29		0.92	1.04

Source: 2009 NAIP Imagery, 2011 field checking.

Table 2. Types of Land Use provided by MATL.

Types of Land Use Crossed by Alternatives Using Data from MATL's MFSA Application (Approximate Miles)					
	Existing Corridor	Diamond Valley South		Existing Corridor	Bullhead Coulee North
Mechanically Irrigated	0.00	0.00		0.40	0.58
Dryland Cropland	0.00	0.00		0.26	0.46
Grassland/Rangeland	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Conservation Reserve Program	1.35	1.29		0.26	0.00
Total Miles	1.35	1.29		0.92	0.92

Source: MATL's MFSA Application, 2005.

6.0 Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts would be similar to those described in the final EIS.

6.1 Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Except for the changes indicated in the EA checklist and Sections 5.1 and 5.2, unavoidable adverse impacts would be similar to those described in the final EIS. There would be no change in unavoidable adverse impacts under the No Action Alternative.

6.2 Irreversible and Irretrievable Impacts

Except for the changes indicated in the EA checklist and Sections 5.1 and 5.2, irreversible and irretrievable impacts would be similar to those described in the final EIS. There would be no change in irreversible and irretrievable impacts under the No Action Alternative.

7.0 List of Preparers

Tom Ring - Environmental Science Specialist
Nancy Johnson – Environmental Science Specialist
Craig Jones – Environmental Science Specialist
James Strait - Environmental Science Specialist

Reviewers:

Warren McCullough – Bureau Chief
Ed Hayes – Attorney

8.0 REFERENCES

Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. and MATL LLP. 2010. Application to Amend Certificate of Compliance for the Montana Alberta Tie 230-kV International Transmission Line. Lethbridge, Alberta – Great Falls, Montana.

Montana Major Facility Siting Act (MFSA) Application Revised August 2006. Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. Project 230-kV AC Power Transmission Line. Lethbridge, Alberta – Great Falls, Montana.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and United States Department of Energy (DOE). 2007. Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Montana-Alberta Tie Ltd. (MATL) 230-kV Transmission Line.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and United States Department of Energy (DOE). 2008. Federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement and State of Montana Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Montana-Alberta Tie Ltd. (MATL) 230-kV Transmission Line.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) and United States Department of Energy (DOE). 2008a. Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Montana-Alberta Tie Ltd. (MATL) 230-kV Transmission Line.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).2010. Decision Amendment in the Matter of the Application of Montana Alberta Tie Ltd. and MATL LLP. To Amend their Certificate of Compliance under the Major Facility Siting Act. September 22, 2010.

USDA/ Natural Resource Conservation Service 2003. Soil Survey of Choteau-Conrad Area; Parts of Teton and Pondera Counties, Montana.

Wanke, Floyd G. 2010. Power line near missile site. Personal Communication between Craig Jones, GIS and Environmental Scientist, Montana DEQ and Floyd G. Wanke, Chief, Missile Engineer at Malmstrom Air Force Base.

Figure 2: Bullhead Coulee North Amendment

