



Montana Department of
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Brian Schweitzer, Governor

P. O. Box 200901

Helena, MT 59620-0901

(406) 444-2544

Website: www.deq.mt.gov

September 17, 2012

Ms. Beth Pierson
Gavilon Grain, LLC
Eleven Con-Agra Drive
Omaha, NE 68102

Dear Ms. Pierson:

Montana Air Quality Permit #4752-00 is deemed final as of September 15, 2012, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). This permit is for a Truck and Rail Grain Elevator. 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,

Charles Homer
Manager, Air Permitting, Compliance and Registration
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-5279

Craig Henrikson, P.E.
Environmental Engineer
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-6711

CH:CH
Enclosure

Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Permitting and Compliance Division

Montana Air Quality Permit #4752-00

Gavilon Grain, LLC
Eleven Con-Agra Drive
Omaha, NE 68102

September 15, 2012



MONTANA AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued to: Gavilon Grain, LLC
Eleven Con-Agra Drive
Omaha, NE 68102

MAQP: #4752-00
Application Complete: 07/30/2012
Preliminary Determination Issued: 08/14/2012
Department's Decision Issued: 08/30/2012
Permit Final: 09/15/2012
AFS #:111-0043

A Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP), with conditions, is hereby granted to Gavilon Grain, LLC (Gavilon), 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

Gavilon is proposing to permit an existing truck and rail grain handling elevator and storage facility. The facility will have a grain storage capacity of approximately 1,530,000 bushels (bu) of permanent storage, 24,000 bu/hour (bu/hr) receiving and 70,000 bu/hr loadout capacity. A complete list of the permitted equipment is included in Section I.A of the permit analysis. The facility was previously not permitted but under a request by Gavilon was determined by the Department to be in need of an MAQP based on the most recent facility expansion and current facility throughput.

B. Plant Location

Gavilon's grain handling facility is operating in a commercial/industrial area in Billings, Montana and immediately south of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad tracks. The legal description of the facility is the SE ¼ of Section 4, Township 1 South, Range 28 East, Yellowstone County, Montana.

SECTION II: Conditions and Limitations

A. Emission Limitations

1. Gavilon shall install, operate, and maintain the following emission control equipment in accordance with manufacturer's instructions to provide maximum pollution control (ARM 17.8.752):
 - a. Receiving pit baffles on both the 12,000 bu/hr pit and the 6,000 bu/hr pit (grain receiving);
 - b. Enclosure on internal grain handling equipment including elevator legs and bucket conveyors, bin fill conveyors, reclaim conveyors and distribution system (internal grain handling).
 - c. Telescoping loadout spout (railcar loading).
2. Gavilon shall not receive by truck more than 7,000,000 bushels of grain less the quantity of grain received by rail per rolling 12-month period (ARM 17.8.749).

3. Gavilon shall not receive by rail more than 1,000,000 bushels of grain per rolling 12- month period (ARM 17.8.749).
4. Gavilon shall receive by way of straight truck into the grain elevator no more than 1,750,000 bushels of grain per rolling 12-month period (ARM 17.8.749).
5. Gavilon shall not clean more than 500,000 bushels of grain per rolling 12-month period (ARM 17.8.749).
6. Gavilon shall not ship more than 500,000 bushels by truck per rolling 12-month period (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Gavilon shall ship by rail not more than 7,000,000 bushels of grain less the quantity of grain shipped by truck per rolling 12-month period (ARM 17.8.749).
8. Gavilon shall not cause or authorize emissions to be discharged into the outdoor atmosphere from any sources installed after November 23, 1968, that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.304).
9. Gavilon 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).
10. Gavilon shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, or general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant as necessary to maintain compliance with the reasonable precautions limitation in Section II.A.9 (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 Montana Department of Environmental Quality (Department) may require further testing (ARM 17.8.105).

C. Operational Reporting Requirements

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

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

2. Gavilon 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 or the

addition of a new emission unit. The notice must be submitted to the Department, in writing, 10 days prior to start-up or use of the proposed de minimis change, or as soon as reasonably practicable in the event of an unanticipated circumstance causing the de minimis change, and must include the information requested in ARM 17.8.745(1)(d) (ARM 17.8.745).

3. All records compiled in accordance with this permit must be maintained by Gavilon 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).
4. Gavilon shall document, by month, the total amount of grain received by straight truck and by hopper truck by the grain elevator. By the 25th of each month, Gavilon shall total the grain handled for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.2 and II.A.4. The information for the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
5. Gavilon shall document, by month, the total amount of grain received by rail by the grain elevator. By the 25th of each month, Gavilon shall total the grain handled for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.3. The information for the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
6. Gavilon shall document, by month, the total amount of grain cleaned. By the 25th of each month, Gavilon shall total the grain cleaned for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.5. The information for the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Gavilon shall document, by month, the total amount of grain shipped by way of truck or rail at this facility. By the 25th of each month, Gavilon shall total the grain shipped by way of truck or rail for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.6 and II.A.7. The information for the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory (ARM 17.8.749).

D. Notification

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

1. A proposed schedule for installation of the truck receiving baffles submitted to the Department within 90 days of final permit issuance.
2. Actual start-up date of the truck receiving baffles located on the two truck receiving pits within 15 days after the actual start-up; and
3. All compliance source tests, as required by the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual.

SECTION III: General Conditions

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

Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) Analysis
Gavilon Grain, LLC
MAQP #4752-00

I. Introduction/Process Description

Gavilon Grain, LLC (Gavilon) is proposing to permit an existing truck and railcar grain elevator. The facility is located in Billings, Montana and immediately south of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad tracks. The legal description of the facility is the SE ¼ of Section 4, Township 1 South, Range 28 East, Yellowstone, County, Montana.

A. Permitted Equipment

Gavilon is proposing to permit an existing a truck and rail grain handling elevator and storage facility. The facility has a grain storage capacity of approximately 1,530,000 bushels (bu) of permanent storage, 24,000 bu/hour (bu/hr) receiving and 70,000 bu/hr loadout capacity. Equipment used at this facility includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- Two grain truck receiving pits - 18,000 bu/hr total;
- One grain railcar receiving pit – 6,000 bu/hr total;
- Grain handling equipment (elevator legs & conveyors)
- Grain silo storage bin(s) – 1,530,000 bu capacity total;
- Grain railcar loading equipment - 50,000 bu/hr;
- Grain truck loading equipment- 20,000 bu/hr;
- Grain Cleaning 15,000 bu/hr;
- Dust control systems – Existing cyclone for grain cleaning operation
- Associated grain handling equipment;

B. Source Description

The truck and rail grain handling facility is designed to receive grain from local farms and country elevators and then store and clean the grain until it is shipped to market. The storage capacity of the facility is 1,530,000 bu. Locally grown grains are hauled to the facility via truck and also by railcar, whereby the unloading takes place in one of the three receiving pits.

Trucks directed to the elevator would discharge grain into one of the two truck receiving pits, equipped with baffles. The single railcar receiving pit is not often used and does not contain baffles with a railcar receiving limitation to minimize potential emissions. All transferring of grain is done using enclosed conveyors from the point of the receiving pits to the storage bins. The main elevator legs and conveyor system is fully enclosed to minimize the release of dust to the atmosphere. The grain is shipped out most often by railcar and occasionally by truck.

C. Response to Public Comments

Permit Reference	Permittee Comment	Department Response
Section II.A.1.b.	To be consistent with the air permit issued to the Gavilon facility in Chester, Montana, Gavilon proposes to replace the phrase “closed loop” with the following: “Enclosure on internal grain handling equipment including; elevator legs and bucket conveyors, bin fill conveyors, reclaim conveyors, and distribution system (internal grain handling).”	Condition will be modified as requested.
Section II.A.2.	Gavilon needs to retain the flexibility to receive all grain by truck. Gavilon proposes replacing this permit condition with: “Gavilon shall receive by truck no more than 7,000,000 bushels of grain less the quantity of grain received by rail per rolling 12-month period.”	Condition will be modified as requested.
Section II.A.4.	Gavilon intended the permit limit request for straight trucks to reflect 25% of total receipts instead of limiting straight trucks receipts to 25% of 6,000,000 bushels. Gavilon needs to retain the flexibility to receive 25% of all grain by straight truck. Gavilon proposes replacing this permit condition with “Gavilon shall receive by way of straight truck into the grain elevator no more than 1,750,000 bushels of grain per rolling 12-month period.”	Condition will be modified as requested.
Section II.A.7	Gavilon needs to retain the flexibility to ship all grain by rail. Gavilon proposes replacing this permit condition with “Gavilon shall ship by rail no more than 7,000,000 bushels of grain less the quantity shipped by truck per rolling 12-month period.”	Condition will be modified as requested.
Section II.A.10	Gavilon identified a potential typographical error. Should permit condition A.10. refer to the reasonable precautions limitation in permit condition A.9. instead of A.7.?	Yes, the correction will be made.
MAQP Analysis I.B.	Gavilon requests that the term “closed loop” be deleted from the second paragraph in Section B.	Deletion will be made.
MAQP Analysis III.B	Gavilon requests that the term “closed loop” be deleted from item 1 in the Grain Handling section on page 7.	Department interpreted this item to be MAQP III. D .Grain Handling item 1. Deletion will be made.
MAQP Analysis IV.	Gavilon requests review of the PTE summary table specific to PM _{2.5} emissions, emissions from storage bin vents on page 9, shipping grain by truck.	The emission inventory results have been updated and are no longer truncated.

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 Montana 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).

Gavilon 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 Testing 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 which, without resulting in reduction in the total amount of air contaminant emitted, conceals or dilutes an emission of air contaminant that would otherwise violate an air pollution control regulation. (2) No equipment that may produce emissions shall be operated or maintained in such a manner as to create a public nuisance.

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

1. ARM 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Settled Particulate Matter (PM)
2. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM₁₀

Gavilon 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 an 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 20% for all fugitive emission sources and that reasonable precautions be taken to control emissions of airborne particulate. (2) Under this rule, Gavilon 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, allow, or permit to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter caused by the combustion of fuel in excess of the amount determined by this rule.
 4. ARM 17.8.310 Particulate Matter, Industrial Process. This rule requires that no person shall cause, allow, or permit to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter in excess of the amount set forth in this rule.
 5. ARM 17.8.340 Standard of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Emission Guidelines for Existing Sources. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS). Subpart DD, Standards of Performance for Grain Elevators, indicates that grain terminal elevators that have a permanent storage capacity of more than 2.5 million U.S. bushels are subject to the requirements of this subpart. Gavilon does not have a permanent storage capacity of 2.5 million bushels or more; therefore, NSPS Subpart DD does not apply to this facility.
- 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. Gavilon 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; and 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, alter, or use any air contaminant sources that have the potential to emit (PTE) greater than 25 tons per year of any pollutant. Gavilon has PTE greater than 25 tpy of particulate matter (PM) and 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. Gavilon 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. Gavilon submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the May 10, 2012, issue of the *Billings Gazette*, a newspaper of general circulation in the Town of Billings in Yellowstone County, as proof of compliance with the public notice requirements.
 6. ARM 17.8.749 Conditions for Issuance or Denial of Permit. This rule requires that the permits issued by the Department must authorize the construction and operation of the facility or emitting unit subject to the conditions in the permit and the requirements of this subchapter. This rule also requires that the permit must contain any conditions necessary to assure compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA), the Clean Air Act of Montana, and rules adopted under those acts.
 7. ARM 17.8.752 Emission Control Requirements. This rule requires a source to install the maximum air pollution control capability, which 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 Gavilon 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. 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 chapter.
 2. ARM 17.8.818 Review of Major Stationary Source and major Modifications – Source Applicability and Exemptions. The requirements contained in ARM 17.8.819 through 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 chapter would otherwise allow.

This facility is not a major stationary source because it is not a listed source and does not have the PTE more than 250 tons tpy or more of any air pollutant from point sources of emissions.

- G. ARM 17.8 - Subchapter 12, Operating Permit Program Applicability, including, but not limited to:
1. ARM 17.8.1201 Definitions. (23) Major Source under Section 7412 of the FCAA is defined as any source having:
 - a. PTE > 100 tpy of any pollutant;
 - b. PTE > 10 tpy of any one hazardous air pollutant (HAP), PTE > 25 tpy of a combination of all HAPs, or lesser quantity as the Department may establish by rule; or
 - c. PTE > 70 tpy of PM₁₀ in a serious PM₁₀ non-attainment area.
 2. ARM 17.8.1204 Air Quality Operating Permit Program Applicability. 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 #4752-00 for Gavilon, the following conclusions were made:
 - a. The facility's PTE is less than 100 tpy for all criteria pollutants.
 - b. The facility's PTE is less than 10 tpy of any one HAP and less than 25 tpy of all HAPs.
 - c. This source is not located in a serious PM₁₀ non-attainment area.
 - d. This facility is not subject to any current NSPS.
 - e. This facility is not subject to any current NESHAP standards.
 - f. This source is not a Title IV affected source or a solid waste combustion unit.
 - g. This source is not an EPA designated Title V source.

Based on these facts, the Department determined that Gavilon would 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. Gavilon 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.

For previously permitted sources similar to Gavilon, the Department has reviewed the following particulate matter control options during review of the BACT analysis.

A. Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP)

An ESP ionizes the contaminated air flowing between oppositely charged electrodes. These charged particles migrate towards the oppositely charged plates, which are eventually removed and collected at the bottom of the ESP. An ESP can handle large gas volumes and are very efficient at removing small particles with high removal efficiencies

ranging from approximately 90% to 99%. While an ESP can achieve high removal efficiencies, the installation and operation costs of the ESP are considerably higher than other similar control technologies. For this reason, an ESP has not constituted BACT in previously permitted sources similar to Gavilon.

B. Baghouse

Fabric dust filtration equipment (baghouse) is used to collect dry particles from a gas stream. As the gas stream passes through the fabric dust filter, the dust particles are collected and retained by the fabric. A baghouse is very efficient at removing small particles and high particulate mass loadings, with removal efficiencies commonly ranging from 95% to 99%. A baghouse can achieve high removal efficiencies and the installation and operation costs of a baghouse are considerably less than an ESP. Therefore, the Department determined that the installation, operation, and maintenance of a baghouse constituted BACT in previously permitted sources where throughputs are much higher than those as compared to Gavilon.

C. Process Enclosure

Enclosing grain handling activities, including receiving, loading, and conveyors, serves to isolate these activities from wind disturbance which could mobilize dust generated during transfer activities. The effectiveness of enclosure is difficult to quantify, however control efficiencies are documented to achieve at least 50%. Enclosures can be comparatively inexpensive add-on control methods depending upon the site details; therefore, the Department determined that the installation of enclosures around grain handling activities constituted BACT in previously permitted sources where throughputs are much higher than those as compared to Gavilon.

D. Receiving Pit Baffles

Baffles installed in grain receiving pits are gravity-activated mechanical dust control gates that inhibit airborne dust from escaping the confines of the pit. Each baffle consists of a hinged plate that is vertically aligned when closed. The baffles are supported on angled stationary plates; each stationary plate is set adjacent to a baffle so that the bottom of the baffle in the closed position hangs near the bottom of the stationary plate. A small gap exists between the plates to allow air flow into the pit to support aspiration. Grain impacts the hinged baffle during unloading, opening the baffle and allowing grain to fall into the pit. Pit baffle have demonstrated control efficiencies at approximately 30% to 40% and are an inexpensive add-on control as compared to other methods. Therefore, the Department determined that the installation of baffles within receiving pits constituted BACT in previously permitted sources similar to Gavilon.

A BACT analysis was submitted by Gavilon in permit application #4752-00, with follow-up information submitted by Gavilon addressing available methods of controlling PM emissions from the truck and rail grain elevator and storage facility as well as proposing permit limitations to limit emissions. The Department reviewed these methods, as well as previous BACT determinations to determine the appropriate BACT for this facility. Gavilon proposed the use of the following particulate matter control options for each emitting unit.

Grain Receiving

1. Installation of baffles in truck receiving pits #1 and #2.
2. Permit limitation on railcar unloading throughput.

Grain Handling

1. Maintenance of the enclosures around internal grain handling conveyors.

Grain Cleaning

1. Use of the existing cyclone on the grain cleaning process
2. Permit limitation on cleaning throughput.

Grain Loadout

1. Use of existing simple telescoping loadout spout for railcar loading.
2. Permit limitation on truck loading throughput.

Based on consideration of previous BACT determinations discussed above and those controls established within Gavilons’s BACT analysis, the Department concurs with the proposed the emissions control methods. The Department determined that installation, operation, and maintenance of the proposed emissions control methods constitute BACT.

IV. Emissions Inventory

Emission Source	PTE Tons Per Year			
	PM	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	
Grain Receiving	18.9	6.2	1.1	
Headhouse and General Handling	12.8	7.1	1.2	
Storage Bin Vent	5.3	1.3	0.2	
Truck Loadout	9.0	3.0	0.5	
Cleaner	7.9	2.0	0.3	
Unpaved Roadways (Haul Roads)	15.4	4.2	0.5	
	TOTAL EMISSIONS >	69.3	23.9	3.9

PM, particulate matter

PM₁₀, 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

Grain Receiving Straight Truck Assumed for All Operations SCC-3-02-005-51

Current Annual Totals 210,000 Tons Per Year As Submitted by Gavilon Grain with Permit Application
All Calculations assume 7,000,000 bushels per year and 60 lbs per bushel per application

Operating Schedule:

Particulate Emissions: Emission Factor Determination (Uncontrolled)

PM Emissions

Emission Rate 0.18 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
Calculations (0.18 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lb/ton= 18.90 tpy

PM10 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.059 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
Calculations (0.059 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lb/ton= 6.20 tpy

PM2.5 Emissions
 Emission Rate 0.01 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.01 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lb/ton= 1.05 tpy

Headhouse and General Handling SCC-3-02-005-30 (Uncontrolled)

Current Annual Totals 420,000 Tons Per Year as Submitted by Gavilon Grain
 (Equal to Twice the annual receiving rate)

PM Emissions

Emission Rate 0.061 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.061 lb/ton) * 420000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton= 12.81 tpy

PM10 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.034 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.034 lb/ton) * 420000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton= 7.14 tpy

PM2.5 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.0058 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.0058 lb/ton) * 420000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton= 1.22 tpy

Storage Bin Vent SCC-3-02-005-40 (Uncontrolled)

Current Annual Totals 420,000 Tons Per Year as Submitted by Gavilon Grain
 (Equal to Twice the annual receiving rate)

PM Emissions

Emission Rate 0.025 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.025 lb/ton) * 420000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton= 5.25 tpy

PM10 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.0063 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.0063 lb/ton) * 420000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton= 1.32 tpy

PM2.5 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.0011 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.0011 lb/ton) * 420000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton= 0.23 tpy

Grain Shipping Truck Loadout SCC-3-02-005-60 (Uncontrolled)

Current Annual Totals 210,000 Tons Per Year as Submitted by Gavilon Grain
 Assumes all loaded out using Trucks

PM Emissions

Emission Rate 0.086 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.086 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton = 9.03 tpy

PM10 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.029 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.029 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton = 3.05 tpy

PM2.5 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.0049 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.0049 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton = 0.51 tpy

Grain Cleaning SCC-3-02-005-37

Controlled

Current Annual Totals 210,000 Tons Per Year as Submitted by Gavilon Grain

PM Emissions

Emission Rate 0.075 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.075 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton = 7.88 tpy

PM10 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.019 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.019 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton = 2.00 tpy

PM2.5 Emissions

Emission Rate 0.0032 lb/ton [AP-42 Table 9.9.1-1 4/03]
 Calculations (0.0032 lb/ton) * 210000 tons/year * 0.0005 lbs/ton = 0.34 tpy

Unpaved Roadways (Haul Roads)

Emission Factor $EF = k(s/12)^a * (W/3)^b$ [AP-42 13.2.2.2, 11/06]
 EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted Per Vehicle Mile Traveled (VMT)
 k, Empirical Constant PM = 4.9 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
 k, Empirical Constant PM₁₀ = 1.5 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
 k, Empirical Constant PM_{2.5} = 0.15 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
 s, Surface Material Silt Content (%) = 7.1 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-1, 11/06]
 W, Mean Vehicle Weight Loaded (tons) = 27 Application
 =
 a, Empirical Constant PM = 0.7 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
 a, Empirical Constant PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} = 0.9 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
 b, Empirical Constant PM, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} = 0.45 [AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]

PM Emissions(uncontrolled): PM30 Miles/Day taken from Permit Application

Emission Factor $EF = 4.9 * (7.1/12)^{0.7} * (27/3)^{0.45} = 9.12$ lbs/VMT
 Calculations (9.12 lbs/VMT) * (18.5 miles/day) = 168.74 lbs/day
 (168.74 lbs/day) * (365 days/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) = 30.80 TPY
 50% Control Applied 15.40 TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions(uncontrolled):

Emission Factor $EF = 1.5 * (7.1/12)^{0.9} * (27/3)^{0.45} = 2.51$ lbs/VMT
 Calculations (2.51 lbs/VMT) * (18.5 miles/day) = 46.51 lbs/day
 (46.51 lbs/day) * (365 days/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) = 8.49 TPY
 50% Control Applied 4.24 TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions(uncontrolled):

Emission Factor $EF = 0.15 * (7.1/12)^{0.9} * (27/3)^{0.45} = 0.33$ lbs/VMT
 Calculations (0.33 lbs/VMT) * (18.5 miles/day) = 6.03 lbs/day
 (1.63 lbs/day) * (365 days/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) = 1.10 TPY
 50% Control Applied 0.55 TPY

V. Existing Air Quality

Gavilon’s grain handling facility is located in the SE ¼ of Section 4, Township 1 South, Range 28 East, Yellowstone, County, Montana. The air quality of this area is classified as unclassifiable/attainment for National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) criteria pollutants, including particulate matter (PM₁₀/PM_{2.5}).

VI. Ambient Air Impact Analysis

The area surrounding the proposed facility is predominantly agricultural and rural in nature. The emissions from the proposed facility would be intermittent and seasonal in nature with generally good dispersion characteristics in the area. Therefore, in the view of the Department, the amount of controlled emissions from this facility will not cause an exceedance of any ambient air quality standard.

VII. 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.

VIII. Environmental Assessment

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

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Permitting and Compliance Division
Air Resources Management Bureau
1520 East Sixth Avenue
P.O. Box 200901
Helena, Montana 59620-0901
(406) 444-3490

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued To: Gavilon Grain, LLC
3815 1ST Avenue South,
Billings, MT 59101

MAQP Number: #4752-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: 08/14/2012

Department Decision Issued: 08/30/2012

Permit Final: 09/15/2012

1. *Legal Description of Site:* Gavilon's grain handling facility under the subject permit is operating in Billings, MT, and is just south of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad tracks. The legal description of the facility is the SE ¼ of Section 4, Township 1 South, Range 28 East, Yellowstone County, Montana.
2. *Description of Project:* Gavilon is proposing to permit and operate a truck and rail grain handling elevator and grain storage facility. The facility has a grain storage capacity of approximately 1,530,000 bushels of permanent storage and approximately 24,000 bu/hr receiving and 70,000 bu/hr loadout. A complete list of the permitted equipment is included in Section I.A of the permit analysis
3. *Objectives of Project:* Permit an existing source that has undergone capacity increases over the last decade which based on most recent throughput history is in excess of the permitting threshold. The facility was previously not permitted but under a request by Gavilon was determined by the Department to be in need of an MAQP based on the most recent facility expansion and current facility throughput. The facility receives, stores, and ships grain for the area farms. The facility will continue to provide area producers and local country grain elevators with a regional site for high speed loading of locally produced grains.
4. *Alternatives Considered:* In addition to the proposed action, the Department also considered the "no action" alternative. The "no action" alternative would deny the issuance of the MAQP to the proposed facility. However, the Department does not consider the "no action" alternative to be appropriate because Gavilon 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 #4752-00.
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.

Potential Physical and Biological Effects							
		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 Resource				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

As the facility is existing, no changes from any current effects are expected. Conditions requiring control mechanisms have been placed within MAQP #4752-00 to ensure that only minor air quality impacts would occur. Additionally, limitations established within MAQP #4752-00 would minimize air pollution. Overall, any adverse impact on terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats is anticipated to be minor.

B. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution

This permitting action would have little or no affect on the water quality, water quantity, and distribution, as there would be no discharge to groundwater or surface water associated with the completed project. Water and sewer services are available, therefore eliminating the need for additional surface or groundwater use. Minor pollutant deposition on surface waters near the project area may occur. Therefore, the project would have minor, if any, impacts to water quality, quantity or distribution in the area.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture

This permitting action would have little or no affect on geology and soil properties as the facility is already existing. PM, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions from this permitting action would have no little or no affect on the soil quality; however, the air quality permit associated with this project would contain limitations and conditions to minimize the effect of the emissions on the surrounding environment. The Department determined that any impacts from deposition would be minor due to dispersion characteristics of pollutants, the atmosphere, and conditions that would be placed in MAQP #4752-00.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

This permitting action would have no new impacts on the surrounding vegetation because the facility is existing. The existing surrounding land is currently commercial and industrial in nature with little or no vegetation present. The PM, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions from this project would have no affect on the surrounding vegetation; however, the air quality permit associated with this project would contain limitations to minimize the effect of the emissions on the surrounding area. Overall, this project would have no affect on the vegetation cover, quantity and quality.

E. Aesthetics

Continued operation of the truck and rail grain elevator would have minor impacts on the surrounding property from both the visual perspective, as well as noise pollution. The facility operates within an area that is predominately of commercial and industrial use. The Department determined no impacts in the aesthetic value of the site would be experienced with continued operation.

F. Air Quality

The air quality of the area would realize minor impacts from the existing facility because the facility would continue to emit the following air pollutants: PM, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. These emissions would be minimized by limitations and conditions that would be included in MAQP #4752-00. While deposition of pollutants would occur as a result of operating the facility, the Department determined that the impacts from deposition of pollutants would be minor due to dispersion characteristics of pollutants, the atmosphere (wind speed, wind direction, ambient temperature, etc.), and conditions that would be placed in MAQP #4752-00. The air concentration of pollutants would be relatively small, and the corresponding deposition of those air pollutants would be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

In an effort to identify any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the area, the Department contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program, Natural Resource Information System (NRIS). In this case, the area was defined by the section, township, and range of the proposed location with an additional 1-mile buffer zone. Search results identified two (2) species of concern; The Spiny Softshell and the Common Sagebrush Lizard. Because the facility is existing and within a commercial/industrial area, the Department has determined that there is not likely any disturbance to unique, endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the area.

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

The proposed project would have minor impacts on the demands for the environmental resources of air and water because the facility would continue to be a source of air pollutants. Deposition of pollutants would occur as a result of operating the facility; however, as explained in Section 7.F of this EA, the Department determined that any impacts on air and water resources from the pollutants (including deposition) would be minor. The Department determined that controlled emissions from the source would not cause or contribute to a violation of any ambient air quality standard. Therefore, any impacts to air quality from the proposed facility would be minor.

The proposed project would be expected to have no new impacts on the demand for the environmental resource of energy because the site is already existing. The impact on the demand for the environmental resource of energy would be minor because the facility is relatively small by industrial standards. Overall, the impacts for the demands on the environmental resources of water, air, and energy would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

In an effort to identify any historical and archaeological sites located near the present facility area, the Department contacted the Montana Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). According to SHPO records, there are no previously recorded sites within the designated search area. Also because this permitting action does not provide facility expansion, no cultural properties would be impacted by this project. Therefore, the Department determined that there is no likelihood of the project impacting any historical and archaeological sites in the area.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The current facility would cause minor effects on the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the continued operation would create emissions of PM, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} in the area. However, conditions have been placed in MAQP #4752-00 to ensure that only minor air quality impacts would occur. Limitations would be established in the permit to minimize air pollution. Overall, any impacts to the physical and biological environment would be minor.

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

Potential Social and Economic Effects							
		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 SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EFFECTS: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Social Structures and Mores

The proposed project would not cause disruption to any native or traditional lifestyles or communities (social structures or mores) in the area because the facility is existing in a commercial/industrial area. This permitting action would not change the predominant use of the surrounding area and the facility is not undergoing an expansion under this permitting action.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

No impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area would be anticipated as the facility location is in a commercial/industrial area. Operation of the truck and rail grain elevator would continue to employ the same number of employees, and therefore does not change the present cultural or diversity of the area. In addition, because the permitting action does not provide for facility expansion, the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area would not likely be affected.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

This permitting action does not change the local and state tax base and tax revenue. Therefore, no impacts to the local and state tax base and tax revenue would occur.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The land at the current location is currently commercial/industrial. This permitting action would have no impact on agricultural production at the site but the permitting action does allow area farmers to access a local facility to receive, store, and ship their grain products. The proposed project would result in no impacts to industrial production at the site

E. Human Health

The continued operation at the facility would result in minor, if any, impacts to human health. As explained in Section 7.F of this EA, deposition of pollutants would continue to occur; however, the Department determined that the proposed project would comply with all applicable air quality rules, regulations, and standards. These rules, regulations, and standards are designed to be protective of human health. Overall any impacts to public health would be minor.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

The continued operation at the site is within an area currently utilized for commercial/industrial use. No impacts to access and quality of recreational and wilderness activities in the project area are anticipated.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The continued operation at the site would have no impacts on the quantity and distribution of employment as the facility is existing and additional employees are not expected to be added under this permitting action.

H. Distribution of Population

This permitting action would have no impacts on the employment and population of the area as the facility is existing and no facility expansion is occurring under this action.

I. Demands of Government Services

There would be minor impacts on the demands for government services because additional time would be required by government agencies to issue MAQP #4752-00 and, in the future, to assure compliance with applicable rules, standards, and conditions that would be contained in MAQP #4752-00. Overall, any demands for government services to regulate the facility or activities associated with the facility would be minor due to the relatively small size of the facility.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

No new impacts would be expected on local industrial and commercial activity because this permitting action allows the continued operation of the existing facility.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

The Department is not aware of any locally adopted environmental plans and goals affected by issuing MAQP #4752-00. This permit would contain limits for protecting air quality and keeping facility emissions in compliance with any applicable ambient air quality standards. Because the facility is existing, any impacts from the facility would be minor.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts from this project would result in minor impacts to the economic and social aspects of the human environment in the immediate area. Due to the facility already existing, the industrial production, employment, and tax revenue (etc.) impacts resulting from the proposed project should not change from the current level. In addition, the Department believes that this facility could be expected to operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as would be outlined in MAQP #4752-00.

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

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: The current permitting action is for the continued operation of a truck and rail grain handling facility. MAQP #4752-00 would include conditions and limitations to ensure the facility would operate in compliance with all applicable air quality rules and regulations. In addition, there are no major or unknown effects associated with this proposal.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Montana Natural Heritage Program and the Montana Historical Society.

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Montana Natural Heritage Program, Montana Historical Society.

EA prepared by: C. Henrikson

Date: July 31, 2012