Montana Department of
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Brian Schweitzer, Governor
P. O. Box 200901 Helena, MT 59620-0901 (406) 444-2544 Website: www.deq.mt.gov

February 25, 2010

Mr. Dave Bren
Fisher Sand and Gravel Co
91 Swingley Road
Livingston, MT 59047

Dear Mr. Bren:

Montana Air Quality Permit #4506-00 is deemed final as of February 25, 2010, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). This permit is for a portable truck mix concrete batch plant. 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

Shawn Juers
Environmental Engineer
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-2049

VW:SJ
Enclosure

Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Permitting and Compliance Division

Montana Air Quality Permit #4506-00

Fisher Sand and Gravel Co
91 Swingley Road
Livingston, MT 59047

February 25, 2010

MONTANA AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued To: Fisher Sand and Gravel Co.
91 Swingley Road
Livingston, MT 59047

MAQP: #4506-00
Application Complete: 1/6/2010
Preliminary Determination Issued: 1/22/2010
Department's Decision Issued: 2/09/2010
Permit Final: 2/25/2010
AFS #:777-4506

A Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP), with conditions, is hereby granted to Fisher Sand and Gravel Company (Fisher) 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

Fisher proposes to install and operate a portable truck mix concrete batch plant.

B. Plant Location

Fisher proposes to operate a portable truck mix concrete batch plant, which will initially be located at Section 9, Township 2 South, Range 10 East in Park County, near Livingston, Montana. However, MAQP #4506-00 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 (PM_{10}) 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 PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

SECTION II: Conditions and Limitations

A. Emission Limitations

1. Fisher shall install, operate, and maintain a fabric filter dust collector, with a device to measure pressure drop, and a rubber boot load-out spout as specified in their MAQP and all supporting documentation (ARM 17.8.752):

    a. Fisher shall install, operate, and maintain the fabric filter dust collector to control particulate emissions on every cement and cement-supplement silo ventilation opening. Fisher shall ensure proper operation of the fabric filter dust collector during operation including ensuring a proper pressure drop is present.

    b. Fisher shall install, operate, and maintain a rubber boot load-out spout to control particulate emissions on every product loadout opening where cementatious and aggregate materials are transferred for mixing.

2. Fisher shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from the portable concrete batch plant:

    a. Any vent emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.304).

b. Any fugitive emissions from the source or from any material transfer operations, emissions which exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.308).

3. The maximum capacity of the portable truck mix cement batch plant shall be 200 cubic yards per hour. Total concrete plant production is limited to 1,752,000 cubic yards during any rolling 12 month time period (ARM 17.8.749).

4. Fisher 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).

5. Fisher 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.4 (ARM 17.8.752).

6. If the permitted equipment is used in conjunction with any other equipment owned or operated by Fisher, 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).

B. Testing Requirements

1. All compliance source tests shall conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (ARM 17.8.106).

2. The Department may require testing (ARM 17.8.105).

C. Recordkeeping and Operational Reporting Requirements

1. Fisher shall keep records of maintenance performed on the fabric filter dust collection system. Records shall be kept for a minimum of 5 years and must be made available on-site. The records shall be submitted to the Department upon request (ARM 17.8.749).

2. If this plant 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).

3. Fisher 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).

4. Fisher 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(l)(d) (ARM 17.8.745).

5. Fisher 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 Fisher 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).

D. Notification

Fisher shall provide the Department with written notification of the actual startup date of the plant postmarked within 15 days after the actual start-up date (ARM 17.8.749).

SECTION III: General Conditions

A. Inspection – Fisher 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 (Continuous Emissions Monitoring System (CEMS), Continuous Emissions Rate Monitoring System (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 Fisher fails to appeal as indicated below.

C. Compliance with Statutes and Regulations – Nothing in this permit shall be construed as relieving Fisher 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 Fisher 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. Fisher 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
Fisher Sand and Gravel Company
Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) #4506-00

I. Introduction/Process Description

Fisher Sand and Gravel Company (Fisher) owns and operates a portable truck-mix concrete batch plant.

A. Permitted Equipment

1. Portable Truck Mix Concrete Batch Plant with a maximum rated design process rate of 400 tons per hour (TPH) (currently a 2005 Con-E-Co Lo Pro 12 portable ready-mix plant).

2. Fabric Filter Collection System / Baghouse Venting System (currently a 2005 Con-E-Co Model PJ-980)

3. Associated equipment and operations including conveyors, transfer points, and truck and front loader related particulate matter emissions as described in the Emissions Inventory of this Permit Analysis.

B. Source Description

Fisher proposes to use this concrete batch plant and associated equipment to provide concrete for use in various construction operations. For a typical operational setup, stockpiles of sand and other aggregates for concrete production are stored on site. A front-end loader transfers the aggregates from the stockpiles to a feed hopper and the material is then conveyed into the concrete batch plant. The cement silo transfers cement into the batch plant where water is added. The sand (fine aggregate), coarse aggregate, cement, and water are then fed into mixing trucks where the materials are mixed together to form concrete. The concrete is transported to the job site via mixing trucks.

The initial location has sufficient landline power and Fisher does not anticipate having to install a generator for this site location.

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).

   Fisher 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 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Settled Particulate Matter
2. ARM 17.8.221 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Visibility
3. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM_{10}

Fisher 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, Fisher 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 17.8.310 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.

4. 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). This facility is not an NSPS-affected source because it does not meet the definition of any NSPS subpart defined in 40 CFR Part 60.

D. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 5 – Air Quality Permit Application, Operation, and Open Burning Fees, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.504 Air Quality Permit Application Fees. This rule requires that an applicant submit an air quality permit application fee concurrent with the submittal of an air quality permit application. A permit application is incomplete until the proper application fee is paid to the Department. Fisher 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. Fisher has a PTE greater than 15 tons per year of particulate matter; therefore, an air quality 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. Fisher 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. Fisher submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the December 29th, 2009 issue of *The Livingston Enterprise*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Livingston in Park County, as proof of compliance with the public notice requirements. Fisher also submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the January 4th, 2010 issue of *The Bozeman Daily Chronicle*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Bozeman in Gallatin County, and an affidavit of publication of public notice for the January 7th, 2010 issue of the *Big Timber Pioneer*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Big Timber in Sweet Grass County.

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 Best Available Control Technology (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 Fisher 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.

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 (PM_{10}) in a serious PM_{10} 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 #4506-00 for Fisher, 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 PM_{10} nonattainment area.

d. This facility is not subject to any current NSPS.

e. This facility is not subject to any current NESHAP standards.

f. This source is not a Title IV affected source or a solid waste combustion unit.

g. This source is not an EPA designated Title V source.

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

III. BACT Determination

A BACT determination is required for each new or modified source. Fisher 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.

Particulate Matter

Particulate matter, consisting primarily of cement and pozzolan dust but including some aggregate and sand dust emissions, is the primary pollutant of concern. Most of the emissions are fugitive in nature. The only point sources for which this source category typically has add-on controls are the transfer of cement and pozzolan material to silos, and these are usually a fabric filter. Fugitive sources include the transfer of sand and aggregate, truck loading, mixer loading, vehicle traffic, and wind erosion from sand and aggregate storage piles. The amount of fugitive emissions generated during the transfer of sand and aggregate depends primarily on the surface moisture content of these materials.

Two types of emissions controls are readily available and used for dust suppression of fugitive emissions at the site, and fugitive emissions for the surrounding area of 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 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. Fisher may, however, use chemical dust suppressant to assist in controlling particulate emissions from the surrounding plant area.

Fisher shall use a fabric filter dust collector for the cement silo and Fisher shall install, operate, and maintain a rubber boot load-out spout to control particulate emissions on every product loadout opening where cementatious and aggregate materials are transferred for mixing. The Department determined that using a fabric filter dust collector and a load-out spout, in addition to the fugitive emission controls discussed above, constitutes BACT for these sources. 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

A complete emissions inventory and corresponding calculations are presented in the following pages. The following terms apply:

PTE = potential to emit
TPY = ton per year
PM = particulate matter
PM_{10} = particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less
$PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 microns or less
lb = pound
yd^3 = cubic yard which the applicant has estimated equals 4,000 lb of finished concrete
HAP = hazardous air pollutant
yr = year

Fisher Sand and Gravel Company
Livingston Batch Concrete Plant
MAQP #4506-00 PTE

Source	TPY PM	TPY PM_{10}	TPY $PM_{2.5}$
Delivery to Ground Storage			
Aggregate:	5.61	2.72	0.77
Sand:	1.31	0.61	0.23
Transfer to Conveyor			
Aggregate:	5.61	2.72	0.77
Sand:	1.31	0.61	0.23
Transfer to Elevated Storage			
Aggregate:	5.61	2.72	0.77
Sand:	1.31	0.61	0.23
Cement Unloading to Elevated Silo	0.18	0.09	0.05
Weigh Hopper Loading	6.92	3.33	2.08
Transit Mix Truck Loading	24.88	14.02	2.64
Haul Roads	5.68	1.57	0.16
TOTAL:	**58.42**	**28.99**	**7.92**

Applicant confirmed a max aggregate mix of </= 46 wt%
and average ~4,000 lb/ cubic yard concrete

HAP calculation results were less than 0.1 TPY

Delivery to Ground Storage

Aggregate: SCC 3-05-011-21

Production Rate: 200 yd^3/hr assuming = max production rate for calc purposes

Operating Hours: 8760 hr/yr

PM

Emissions Factor: 0.0064 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0064 lb/yd^3 * 200yd^3/hr = 1.28 lb/hr

1.28 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **5.61 TPY**

PM_{10}

Emissions Factor: 0.0031 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0031 lb/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr = 0.62 lb/hr

0.62 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **2.72 TPY**

$PM_{2.5}$
Emissions Factor Calculations:

$$E = k(0.0032) \frac{\left(\frac{U}{5}\right)^{1.3}}{\left(\frac{M}{2}\right)^{1.4}} \text{ (pound [lb]/ton)}$$

where:

E = emission factor
k = particle size multiplier (dimensionless)
U = mean wind speed, meters per second (m/s) (miles per hour [mph])
M = material moisture content (%)

k =	0.053	(AP-42 13.2.4.3, 11/2006)	
U =	9.10	MPH	statewide average : http://met-www.cit.cornell.edu/ccd/wndspd98.html
M =	1.77	(see note a of AP-42 Table 11.12-1, 06/2006)	

E = 0.000438 lb/ton

Calculations:

0.000438326848850341 lb/ton * 2 ton/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr =	0.18	lb/hr
0.175330739540136 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	**0.77**	TPY

Sand: SCC 3-05-011-22

PM
Emissions Factor: 0.0015 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)
Calculations:

0.0015 lb/yd^3 * yd^3/hr =	0.3	lb/hr
0.3 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	**1.31**	**TPY**

PM_{10}
Emissions Factor: 0.0007 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)
Calculations:

0.0007 lb/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr =	0.14	lb/hr
0.14 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb =	**0.61**	**TPY**

$PM_{2.5}$
Emissions Factor Calculations:

$$E = k(0.0032) \frac{\left(\frac{U}{5}\right)^{1.3}}{\left(\frac{M}{2}\right)^{1.4}} \text{ (pound [lb]/ton)}$$

where:

E = emission factor
k = particle size multiplier (dimensionless)
U = mean wind speed, meters per second (m/s) (miles per hour [mph])
M = material moisture content (%)

k =	0.053	(AP-42 13.2.4.3, 11/2006)
U =	9.10	MPH statewide average : http://met-www.cit.cornell.edu/ccd/wndspd98.html
M =	4.17	(see note a of AP-42 Table 11.12-1, 06/2006)

E = 0.000132 lb/ton

Calculations:

0.000132059658315744 lb/ton * 2 ton/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr = 0.05 lb/hr
0.0528238633262974 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **0.23** TPY

Calculations for Transfer to Conveyor and Transfer to Elevated Storage are identical (see AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006).

Cement Delivery to Silo

Cement SCC 3-05-011-07

Production Rate: 200 yd^3/hr

Operating Hours: 8760 hr/yr

PM - controlled

Emissions Factor: 0.0002 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0002 lb/yd^3 * 200yd^3/hr = 0.04 lb/hr

0.04 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **0.18** **TPY**

PM_{10} - controlled

Emissions Factor: 0.0001 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0001 lb/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr = 0.02 lb/hr

0.02 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **0.09** **TPY**

$PM_{2.5}$ - controlled

Note: the manufacturer's control efficiency does not indicate control efficiency of $PM_{2.5}$ or control efficiency of PM_{10}, only total PM.

AP-42 Appendix B.2-3 illustrates typical control efficiencies of Fabric Filters. The control efficiency for PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ is 99.5% and 99% respectively

Furthermore,
AP-42 Appendix B-2.14 (reformatted 1/1995) estimates particle size distributions of processed Ores and Nonmetallic Minerals. This table estimates that 30% is $PM_{2.5}$ and 85% is PM_{10}. This is the only information available.

Therefore, total uncontrolled PM_{10} was back-calculated to total PM, of which 30% assumed $PM_{2.5}$, and then 99% control efficiency applied:

Calculations:

0.0876 ton/yr controlled PM10 / (1-0.995) = 17.52 TPY

0.30 * 17.52 TPY= 5.256 TPY uncontrolled PM2.5

(1-0.99) * 5.256 TPY= **0.05** **TPY**

Weigh Hopper Loading

Cement SCC 3-05-011-08

Production Rate: 200 yd^3/hr assuming = max production rate for calc purposes

Operating Hours: 8760 hr/yr

PM

Emissions Factor: 0.0079 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0079 lb/yd^3 * 200yd^3/hr = 1.58 lb/hr

1.58 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **6.92** **TPY**

PM_{10}

Emissions Factor: 0.0038 lb/yd^3 (AP-42 Table 11.12-6, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0038 lb/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr = 0.76 lb/hr

0.76 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **3.33** **TPY**

$PM_{2.5}$

AP-42 Table 11.12-6 gives uncontrolled PM emissions.
AP-42 Appendix B-2.14 (reformatted 1/1995) estimates particle size distributions of processed Ores and Nonmetallic Minerals. This table estimates that 30% of the PM is $PM_{2.5}$

Calculations:

$PM_{2.5}$ = 30% * PM

$PM_{2.5}$ = 0.30 * 6.9204 ton/hr = **2.08** **TPY**

Truck Loading

SCC 3-05-011-10

Production Rate: 200 yd^3/hr assuming = max production rate for calc purposes

Operating Hours: 8760 hr/yr

PM

Emissions Factor: 0.0568 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 11.12-2, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.0568 lb/ton * 2 ton/yd^3 * 200yd^3/hr = 5.68 lb/hr

5.68 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **24.88** **TPY**

PM_{10}

Emissions Factor: 0.016 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 11.12-2, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.016 lb/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr = 3.20 lb/hr

3.2 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **14.02** **TPY**

$PM_{2.5}$

$$E = k\,(0.0032)\left[\frac{U^a}{M^b}\right] + c$$ Equation 11.12-1

E	=	Emission factor in lbs./ton of cement and cement supplement
k	=	Particle size multiplier (dimensionless)
U	=	Wind speed at the material drop point, miles per hour (mph)
M	=	Minimum moisture (% by weight) of cement and cement supplement
a, b	=	Exponents
c	=	Constant

The parameters for Equation 11.12-1 are summarized in Tables 11.12-3 and 11.12-4.

Table 11.12-3. Equation Parameters for Truck Mix Operations

Condition	Parameter Category	k	a	b	c
Controlled[1]	Total PM	0.8	1.75	0.3	0.013
	PM_{10}	0.32	1.75	0.3	0.0052
	$PM_{10-2.5}$	0.288	1.75	0.3	0.00468
	$PM_{2.5}$	0.048	1.75	0.3	0.00078
Uncontrolled[1]	Total PM	0.995			
	PM_{10}	0.278			
	$PM_{10-2.5}$	0.228			
	$PM_{2.5}$	0.050			

k =	0.048	
a =	1.75	
b =	0.3	
c =	0.00078	
U =	9.10	MPH
M =	52.6	
E =	0.003	lb/ton

Calculations:

Emissions Factor: 0.003 lb/ton (AP-42 Table 11.12-2, 06/2006)

Calculations:

0.00301058064270285 lb/yd^3 * 200 yd^3/hr = 0.602116 lb/hr

0.602116128540571 lb/hr * 8760 hr/yr * 0.0005 ton/lb = **2.64** **TPY**

V. Existing Air Quality

This facility would be allowed to operate at Section 9, Township 2 South, Range 10 East in Park County and any other areas designated as attainment or unclassified for all National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); excluding counties that have a Department-approved permitting program, areas considered tribal lands, or areas in or within 10 km of certain nonattainment areas. The permit contains operational conditions and limitations that would protect air quality for this site and the surrounding area.

VI. Air Quality Impacts

The Department has an emissions modeling threshold of 50 tons per year for PM_{10}. This facility has allowable PM_{10} emissions less than this level. The Department believes the amount of controlled particulate emissions generated by this project should not cause concentrations of PM_{10} in the ambient air that exceed any set standard.

VII. Ambient Air Impact Analysis

The Department determined that the impact from this permitting action is expected to 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	
xx		1. Does the action pertain to land or water management or environmental regulation affecting private real property or water rights?
	xx	2. Does the action result in either a permanent or indefinite physical occupation of private property?
	xx	3. Does the action deny a fundamental attribute of ownership? (ex.: right to exclude others, disposal of property)
	xx	4. Does the action deprive the owner of all economically viable uses of the property?
	xx	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?
	xx	6. Does the action have a severe impact on the value of the property? (consider economic impact, investment-backed expectations, character of government action)
	xx	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?
	xx	7a. Is the impact of government action direct, peculiar, and significant?
	xx	7b. Has government action resulted in the property becoming practically inaccessible, waterlogged or flooded?
	xx	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?
	xx	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: Fisher Sand and Gravel Company
91 Swingley Road
Livingston, MT 59047

Montana Air Quality Permit number: 4506-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: January 22, 2010
Department Decision Issued: February 9, 2010
Permit Final: February 25, 2010

1. *Legal Description of Site*: Fisher proposes to operate a portable batch concrete plant, which will initially be located at Section 9, Township 2 South, Range 10 East in Park County, near Livingston, Montana.

2. *Description of Project:* Fisher proposes to install and operate a portable truck mix batch concrete plant.

3. *Objectives of Project*: To install a portable concrete plant to help service the communities of Livingston and Bozeman and other surrounding communities.

4. *Alternatives Considered*: In addition to the proposed action, the Department also considered the "no-action" alternative. The "no-action" alternative would deny issuance of the air quality preconstruction permit to the proposed facility. However, the Department does not consider the "no-action" alternative to be appropriate because Fisher has demonstrated compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as required for permit issuance. Therefore, the "no-action" alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

5. *A Listing of Mitigation, Stipulations, and Other Controls*: A list of enforceable conditions, including a BACT analysis, would be included in MAQP #4506-00.

6. *Regulatory Effects on Private Property*: The Department considered alternatives to the conditions imposed in this permit as part of the permit development. The Department determined that the permit conditions are reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements and demonstrate compliance with those requirements and do not unduly restrict private property rights.

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

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

The project would result in emissions of particulate matter. However, MAQP #4506-00 would require controls to reduce these emissions. Overall, impacts to terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats would be expected to be minor.

B. Water Quality, Quantity and Distribution

Water may be required for fugitive dust control; however, impacts to the water quality, quantity, and distribution in the area would be expected to be minor.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture

The initial location of MAQP #4506-00 would be within a location in which an open cut permit has been obtained. MAQP #4506-00 would require the use of a fabric filter collection system and rubber loadout boot. Water may be required for fugitive dust control. Minor deposition of pollutants and water use for dust suppression would be expected as a result of this project. Minor impacts to soil quality, stability, and moisture would be expected as a result of this project.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Deposition of pollutants would be expected to be minor due to the controls and limitations on particulate matter emissions which would be placed in MAQP #4506-00. Therefore, only minor effects to vegetation cover, quantity, and quality would be expected as a result of this project.

E. Aesthetics

The initial location of MAQP #4506-00 would be within a location in which an open cut permit has been obtained. Conditions in MAQP #4506-00 limit visible emissions to 20% opacity. Minor effects to aesthetics would be expected to result from this project.

F. Air Quality

Air quality impacts from the proposed project would be minor because MAQP #4506-00 would limit the facility's opacity, as well as requiring a fabric filter dust collector and a rubber boot load-out spout to control facility emissions. The permit would also require dust suppression to control fugitive emissions. Furthermore, operations would be expected to be intermittent and, as a portable source, potentially temporary in nature. Therefore, impacts to air quality would be expected to be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

The Department, in an effort to assess any potential impacts to unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in this initial proposed area of operation, contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP). MNHP search results concluded there are three such environmental resources found within the surrounding area. The defined area of concern, in this case, includes the Section, Township, and Range where the proposed facility would locate with an additional 1-mile buffer. Species of concern include the Bald Eagle, the Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout, and the Gray Wolf.

The Bald Eagle has a listed state conservation status of S3, signifying a state-level rank of vulnerable. The global conservation status is G5, signifying a global-level rank of "secure." "Secure" is defined by NatureServe.org as common; widespread and abundant. The bald eagle is found primarily in forested areas along rivers and lakes, especially during breeding season. However, nesting site selection is dependent upon food availability and disturbance from human activity. The MNHP identified a bald eagle nest located within 3.0 miles of the proposed batch concrete plant. To aid in determining potential impacts to the local Bald Eagle population, the Department consulted the U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Reclamation Montana Bald Eagle Management Plan (MBEMP). With the identified nests being greater than 0.5 mile away from the proposed facility, the site would fall into an MBEMP "Zone III" classification, representing home range for bald eagles. Zone III is classified as the area from 0.5 mile to 2.5 miles in radius from the nest site (Zone II from 0.25 to 0.5 miles, Zone I from 0 to 0.25 miles). Zone III represents most of the home range used by eagles during nesting season, usually including all suitable foraging habitat within 2.5 miles of all nest sites in the breeding area that have been active within 5 years. The objectives in Zone III areas include maintaining suitability of foraging habitat, minimizing disturbance within key areas, minimizing hazards, and maintaining the integrity of the breeding area.

As described in Section 7.D of this environmental assessment, impacts to Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality from pollutant deposition would be expected to be minor. Because the concrete batch plant would be installed in an already existing and permitted open cut area, the project would not be expected to significantly increase disturbance within the area. As described in Section 7.F, the Department determined that impacts to air quality would be minor.

Furthermore, the facility's proposed location would potentially be just within the 2.5 mile radius (Zone III) of a potentially present bald eagle nest. A more precise analysis of the facility location after installation may show the facility is greater than 2.5 miles away (outside the Zone III area). The impact on bald eagles from this project is expected to be minor. These considerations of impacts to bald eagles are made using the facility's potential-to-emit as presented in the permit, based on 8,760 hours of operation per year.

The gray wolf has a listed state conservation status of S3, signifying a state-level rank of vulnerable. Vulnerable is defined by NatureServe.org as at moderate risk of extinction or elimination in the jurisdiction due to a restricted range, relatively few populations, recent and widespread declines, or other factors making it vulnerable to extirpation. The global conservation status is G4, signifying a global-level rank of apparently secure. Apparently secure is defined by NatureServe.org as uncommon but not rare; some cause for long-term concern due to declines or other factors. In the mid-to-late 1980s, in an effort to restore wolf populations, the gray wolf was reintroduced into three recovery areas – Northwestern Montana, Central Idaho, and the Greater Yellowstone.

The wolf exhibits no particular habitat preference except wolves usually occupy areas with few roads or human disturbance. The initial location of this facility is within an area in which an open-cut permit has been obtained. The Department would not expect the facility to have an impact on the local gray wolf population.

The Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout has a listed state conservation status of S2, signifying a state level rank of imperiled. Imperiled is defined by NatureServe.org as rarity due to very restricted range, very few populations, steep declines, or other factors making it very vulnerable to extirpation from jurisdiction.

The facility's initial location would be greater than 1 mile from the Yellowstone River. As described in Section 7.B of this environmental assessment, water may be used on site to control fugitive dust emissions. As described in Section 7.F of this environmental assessment, effects to air quality are expected to be minor. With a facility location greater than 1 mile from Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout habitat, any impacts to this species would be expected to be minor.

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

As described in Section 7.B of this environmental assessment, water may be used on site to control fugitive dust emissions. The water usage would be needed to reduce fugitive particulate matter emissions. As a result, as described in Section 7.F of this environmental assessment, effects to air quality are expected to be minor. The initial location would have sufficient landline power and Fisher does not anticipate having to install a generator for the initial site location. Overall, the demands on environmental resource of water, air, and energy are expected to be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The Department contacted the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to request a cultural resource file search for the project location to aid the Department in the assessment of impacts to historical and archeological sites. The SHPO file search reported no previously recorded sites within the designated search area. The Department would expect minor, if any, impacts to any sites present in the area.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

No individual consideration above was determined to present any more than a minor impact. Cumulatively, the proposed project would cause minor impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the facility would generate emissions, however, the cumulative and secondary impacts are expected to 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			xx			Yes
B	Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity			xx			Yes
C	Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue			xx			Yes
D	Agricultural or Industrial Production			xx			Yes
E	Human Health			xx			Yes
F	Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities			xx			Yes
G	Quantity and Distribution of Employment			xx			Yes
H	Distribution of Population			xx			Yes
I	Demands for Government Services			xx			Yes
J	Industrial and Commercial Activity			xx			Yes
K	Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals			xx			Yes
L	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			xx			Yes

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

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

The project would not be expected to change the predominant use of the land in the surrounding area, as the facility would be located within an open cut permit area. The project would include the addition of up to three additional employees. Minor effects to social structures and mores or cultural uniqueness and diversity would be expected as a result of this project.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

This project would be permitted as a portable source. As a portable source, any taxes and revenue generated would potentially be temporary and wide spread. The project would include the addition of up to three additional employees. Effects to local and state tax base and revenue would be expected to be minor.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The project would not be expected to change the predominant use of the land in the surrounding area, as the facility would be located within an open cut permit area. As described in section 7.D, effects to vegetation cover, quantity, and quality would be expected to be minor. Effects to agricultural or industrial production would be expected to be minor.

E. Human Health

MAQP #4506-00 would contain limitations and conditions derived from rules designed to protect human health. Overall, any impacts to human health would be expected to be minor.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

The facility would be located within an open cut permit area, therefore, no change to the access of recreational and wilderness activities would be expected. MAQP #4506 would contain limitations and conditions limiting emissions and opacity from the source. Minor effects to the quality of recreational and wilderness activities would be expected as a result of this project.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The project would include the addition of up to three additional employees. This small number of new employees would not be expected to have any significant effect to the quantity and distribution of employment.

H. Distribution of Population

The project would include the addition of up to three additional employees. This small number of new employees would not be expected to have any significant effect to the quantity and distribution of population. Because the facility is proposing to operate within an existing open cut permit area, and conditions and limitations would be placed in MAQP 4506-00 to limit opacity, minor effects if any would be expected to distribution of population would be expected.

I. Demands for Government Services

It would be expected that there would be demand for government services associated with compliance activities and acquiring the proper permits related to this project. Overall, demands for government services would be minor due to the size/classification of this facility.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The facility would be located within an open cut permit area. A minor increase in industrial and commercial activity would be expected as a result of this project.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

The Department is not aware of any locally adopted environmental plans and goals affected by the issuance of MAQP #4506-00. The MAQP would contain limits for protecting air quality and keeping facility emissions in compliance with state and federal air quality standards.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Potential economic and social effects of any individual considerations above would be expected to be minor. The Department has determined that collectively, the potential cumulative and secondary impacts would be expected to be minor.

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

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: The current permitting action is for the construction and operation of a portable concrete batch plant. MAQP #4506-00 includes conditions and limitations to ensure the facility will operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations. In addition, there are no significant impacts associated with this proposal.

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

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

EA prepared by: Shawn Juers
Date: 1/05/2009