



Montana Department of
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Steve Bullock, Governor
Tracy Stone-Manning, Director

P. O. Box 200901

Helena, MT 59620-0901

(406) 444-2544

Website: www.deq.mt.gov

April 18, 2014

Andy Stratman
Nickelback, Asphalt Plant #1
P.O. Box 526423
Salt Lake City, UT 84152

Dear Mr. Stratman:

Montana Air Quality Permit #5022-00 is deemed final as of April 18, 2014, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). This permit is for a portable asphalt 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,

Julie A. Merkel
Air Permitting Program Supervisor
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-3626

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

JM:CH
Enclosure

Montana Department of Environmental Quality
Permitting and Compliance Division

Montana Air Quality Permit #5022-00

Andy Stratman
Nickelback, Asphalt Plant #1
P.O. Box 526423
Salt Lake City, UT 84152

April 18, 2014



MONTANA AIR QUALITY PERMIT

Issued to: Nickelback Asphalt Plant #1
P.O. Box 526423
Salt Lake City, UT 84152

MAQP: #5022-00
Application Complete: 03/05/2014
Preliminary Determination Issued: 03/17/2014
Department's Decision Issued: 04/02/2014
Permit Final: 04/18/2014
AFS: #777-5022

A Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP), with conditions, is hereby granted to Nickelback, Asphalt Plant #1 (Nickelback) pursuant to Sections 75-2-204 and 211 of the Montana Code Annotated (MCA), as amended, and the Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 17.8.740, *et seq.*, as amended, for the following:

SECTION I: Permitted Facilities

A. Permitted Equipment

Nickelback proposes to install and operate a portable drum mix-asphalt plant and associated equipment up to a 225 ton per hour (TPH) maximum production capacity. A complete list of permitted equipment is contained in Section I.A of the permit analysis.

B. Plant Location

The Nickelback hot-mix asphalt plant will initially be located Township 4 South, Range 18 East, in Section 24 in Stillwater County, Montana. However, MAQP #5022-00 applies while operating at any location in Montana, except those areas having a Department of Environmental Quality (Department) approved permitting program, areas considered tribal lands, or areas in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* An addendum will be required for locations in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas.

SECTION II: Conditions and Limitations

A. Emission Limitations

1. Asphalt plant particulate matter emissions shall be limited to 0.04 grains per dry standard cubic feet (gr/dscf) (ARM 17.8.752; ARM 17.8.340 and 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 60 Subpart I).
2. Nickelback shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from the asphalt plant stack any visible emissions that exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60 Subpart I).
3. Nickelback shall not cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere from dryers; systems for screening, handling, storing, and weighing hot aggregate; systems for loading, transferring, and storing mineral filler; transferring and storing lime, systems for mixing hot mix asphalt; and the loading, transfer, and storage systems associated with emission control systems, any visible emissions that exhibit opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.340, ARM 17.8.752, and 40 CFR 60, Subpart I).

4. All visible emissions from any non-New Source Performance Standard (NSPS) affected equipment shall not exhibit an opacity of 20% or greater averaged over 6 consecutive minutes (ARM 17.8.304).
5. Nickelback shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road, or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter (ARM 17.8.308).
6. Nickelback shall treat all unpaved portions of the haul roads, access roads, parking lots, and the general plant area with water and/or chemical dust suppressant, as necessary, to maintain compliance with the reasonable precautions limitation in Section II.A.5 (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Nickelback shall install, operate, and maintain a baghouse for control of particulate matter. A device to measure the pressure drop (magnehelic gauge, manometer, etc.) on the control device (baghouse) must be installed and maintained. Pressure drop must be measured in inches of water (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.752).
8. Nickelback shall be limited to a maximum of 1,170,000 tons of asphalt production during any rolling 12-month period (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.1204).
9. The asphalt production rate shall be limited to the average production rate during the last source test demonstrating compliance (ARM 17.8.749).
10. Nickelback shall not operate, or have on site, more than one diesel-fired engine/generator set at any given time and the maximum rated design capacity of the diesel engine driving the generator set shall not exceed 1150 brake-horsepower (bhp) (ARM 17.8.1204).
11. Operation of the hot-mix asphalt plant, including the diesel-fired engine/generator set, shall not exceed 5,200 hours during any rolling 12-month time period (ARM 17.8.1204).
12. Nickelback shall comply with all applicable standards and limitations, and the reporting, recordkeeping, testing, and notification requirements contained in 40 CFR 60, Subpart I, *Standards of Performance for Hot Mix Asphalt Facilities* (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart I).
13. Nickelback shall comply with all applicable standards and limitations, and the reporting, recordkeeping, testing, and notification requirements contained in 40 CFR 60, Subpart III, *Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines* and 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ, *National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines*, for any applicable diesel-fired engine (ARM 17.8.340, 40 CFR 60, Subpart III; ARM 17.8.342 and 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ).
14. If the permitted equipment is used in conjunction with any other equipment owned or operated by Nickelback, at the same site, production shall be limited to correspond with an emission level that does not exceed 250 tons of emissions during any rolling 12-month time period. Any calculations used to establish production levels shall be approved by the Department (ARM 17.8.749).

B. Testing Requirements

1. Within 60 days after achieving maximum production, but no later than 180 days after initial start-up, an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Methods 1-5 source test shall be performed on the asphalt drum mix dryer exhaust stack to demonstrate compliance with Section II.A.1. An EPA Method 9 opacity test shall be performed in conjunction with all particulate tests to demonstrate compliance with the conditions specified in Section II.A.2 and II.A.3. Testing shall continue on an every 4-year basis or according to another testing/monitoring schedule as may be approved by the Department (ARM 17.8.105, ARM 17.8.340, ARM 17.8.749, and 40 CFR 60 Subpart I).
2. Since asphalt production will be limited to the average production rate during the compliance source test, it is suggested that the test be performed at the highest practical production rate (ARM 17.8.749).
3. Pressure across the baghouse must be recorded daily and kept on site according to Section II.C.7 (ARM 17.8.749).
4. Pressure drop across the baghouse must be recorded during the compliance source test and reported as part of the test results (ARM 17.8.749).
5. Nickelback may retest at any time in order to test at a higher production rate (ARM 17.8.749).
6. All compliance source tests shall conform to the requirements of the Montana Source Test Protocol and Procedures Manual (ARM 17.8.106).
7. The Department may require further testing (ARM 17.8.105).

C. Operational Recordkeeping and Reporting Requirements

1. 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. The facility shall not operate in the new location for more than one year (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.765).
2. Nickelback shall maintain on-site records showing daily hours of operation, daily production rates, and daily pressure drop readings from the baghouse for the last 12 months. The records compiled in accordance with this permit shall be maintained by Nickelback as a permanent business record for at least 5 years following the date of the measurement, shall be submitted to the Department upon request, and shall be available at the plant for inspection by the Department (ARM 17.8.749).
3. Nickelback 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, and/or to verify compliance with permit limitations (ARM 17.8.505).

4. Nickelback 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. Nickelback shall document, by month, total asphalt production from the asphalt plant. By the 25th day of each month, Nickelback shall total the asphalt production for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.8. The information for each of the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
6. Nickelback shall document, by month, the hours of operation of the asphalt plant and the diesel-fired engine/generator set. By the 25th day of each month, Nickelback shall total the hours of operation for the previous month. The monthly information will be used to verify compliance with the rolling 12-month limitation in Section II.A.11. The information for each of the previous months shall be submitted along with the annual emission inventory (ARM 17.8.749).
7. Nickelback shall annually certify that its emissions are less than those that would require the facility to obtain an air quality operating permit as required by ARM 17.8.1204(3)(b). The annual certification shall comply with the certification requirements of ARM 17.8.1207. The annual certification shall be submitted along with the annual emissions inventory information (ARM 17.8.749 and ARM 17.8.1204).

D. Notification

1. Within 30 days of commencement of construction of any New Source Performance Standard (NSPS)-affected equipment, Nickelback shall notify the Department of the date of commencement of construction of the affected equipment (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart A and Subpart I).
2. Within 15 days of the actual start-up date of any NSPS-affected equipment, Nickelback shall submit written notification to the Department of the initial start-up date of the affected equipment (ARM 17.8.340 and 40 CFR 60, Subpart A and Subpart I).
3. Within 15 days of the actual start-up date of any non-NSPS-affected equipment, Nickelback shall submit written notification to the Department of the initial start-up date of the affected equipment (ARM 17.8.749).

SECTION III: General Conditions

- A. Inspection – Nickelback 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 Nickelback fails to appeal as indicated below.
- C. Compliance with Statutes and Regulations – Nothing in this permit shall be construed as relieving Nickelback 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. Air Quality Operation Fees – Pursuant to Section 75-2-220, MCA, failure to pay the annual operation fee by Nickelback 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. Nickelback 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.

Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) Analysis
Nickelback, Asphalt Plant #1
MAQP #5022-00

I. Introduction/Process Description

Nickelback, Asphalt Plant #1 (Nickelback) proposes to install and operate a portable rotary drum mix asphalt plant with a maximum rated design capacity up to 225 tons per hour (TPH) of asphalt production.

A. Permitted Equipment

The following list of permitted equipment is provided for reference, as portions of MAQP #5022-00 are written de minimis friendly, whereby operational flexibility is provided so that alternate equipment may be utilized as long as maximum permitted capacities are not exceeded. See Section II of the MAQP for specific equipment limitations and/or conditions. Equipment permitted under this action includes, but is not limited to the following:

- Counter-flow portable asphalt plant with baghouse for particulate control
- 5-Bin Cold Feed Skid
- Asphalt Surge and Storage System
- Asphalt Storage Silo and Load-Out System
- Asphalt Storage Tank Heater
- 1,150 brake-horse power (bhp) diesel-fired engine/generator set
- 30,000 Gallon Asphalt Cement Tank
- Pugmill with 500 barrel lime silo
- Portable Fuel Tank (Diesel Fuel or Spent Oil Fuel Options)
- Reclaimed Asphalt Pavement (RAP) Skid
- Aggregate handling equipment; conveyors, aggregate bins, etc.
- Associated Equipment

B. Source Description

For a typical operational set-up, aggregate materials are taken from the on-site aggregate stockpiles and dumped via a front end loader and dumped into the cold aggregate feed bins. The cold aggregate is then transferred from the cold aggregate feed bins via conveyor to the rotary drum. The cold aggregate is dried and heated within the drum mixer. The dryer exhaust vents to the baghouse. A single diesel-fired engine/generator set powers the operation.

After heating and mixing is completed, the asphalt product is transferred from the drum mixer to the asphalt product silo via a conveyor. The asphalt remains in the asphalt silo until it is loaded into trucks for transport to a given job location.

The initial location for this plant is Township 4 South, Range 18 East, in Section 24 in Stillwater County, Montana.

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).

Nickelback 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 17.8.204 Ambient Air Monitoring
2. ARM 17.8.210 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)
3. ARM 17.8.211 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)
4. ARM 17.8.212 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Carbon Monoxide (CO)
5. ARM 17.8.211 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone (O₃)
6. ARM 17.8.220 Ambient Air Quality Standards for Settled Particulate Matter (PM)
7. ARM 17.8.221 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Visibility
8. ARM 17.8.223 Ambient Air Quality Standard for Particulate Matter with an Aerodynamic Diameter of Ten Microns or less (PM₁₀)

Nickelback 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 are taken to control emissions of airborne particulate matter. (2) Under this rule, Nickelback shall not cause or authorize the use of any street, road, or parking lot without taking reasonable precautions to control emissions of airborne particulate matter.
3. ARM 17.8.309 Particulate Matter, Fuel Burning Equipment. This rule requires that no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter caused by the combustion of fuel in excess of the amount determined by this section.
4. ARM 17.8.310 Particulate Matter, Industrial Process. This rule requires that no person shall cause or authorize to be discharged into the atmosphere particulate matter in excess of the amount set forth in this section.
5. ARM 17.8.322 Sulfur Oxide Emissions--Sulfur in Fuel. This rule requires that no person shall burn liquid, solid, or gaseous fuel in excess of the amount set forth in this section.
6. ARM 17.8.324 Hydrocarbon Emissions--Petroleum Products. (3) No person shall load or permit the loading of gasoline into any stationary tank with a capacity of 250 gallons or more from any tank truck or trailer, except through a permanent submerged fill pipe, unless such tank truck or trailer is equipped with a vapor loss control device as described in (1) of this rule.
7. ARM 17.8.340 Standard of Performance for New Stationary Sources. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 60, Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS). Based on the information submitted by Nickelback the portable drum mix-asphalt plant and associated equipment are subject to NSPS (40 CFR 60), as follows:
 - a. 40 CFR 60, Subpart A – General Provisions. This subpart applies to all equipment or facilities subject to an NSPS subpart as listed below:
 - b. 40 CFR 60, Subpart I – Standards of Performance of Hot Mix Asphalt Facilities. In order for an asphalt plant to be subject to this subpart, the facility must meet the definition of an affected facility and, the affected equipment must have been constructed, reconstructed, or modified after August 31, 1983. Based on the information submitted by Nickelback, the asphalt plant equipment to be used under MAQP #5022-00 is subject to this subpart because the facility is a hot mix asphalt facility.
 - c. 40 CFR 60, Subpart III – Standards of Performance for Stationary Compression Ignition Internal Combustion Engines (CI ICE). Owners and operators of stationary CI ICE that commence construction after July 11, 2005, where the stationary CI ICE are manufactured after April 1, 2006, and are not fire pump engines, and owners and operators of stationary CI ICE that modify or reconstruct their stationary CI ICE after July 11, 2005, are subject to this subpart. As the permit is written de minimis-friendly, the CI ICE equipment to be used by Nickelback under MAQP #5022-00 is potentially subject to this Subpart if it stays in a location for twelve consecutive months. Nickelback may substitute compression ignition internal combustion engine(s), therefore applicability to this subpart may apply to engines in the future and shall be dependent upon the date of construction and/or manufacture of the diesel-fired engine utilized.

8. ARM 17.8.342 Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories. This rule incorporates, by reference, 40 CFR Part 63, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for Source Categories. Based on the information submitted by Nickelback the diesel-fired engine associated with MAQP #5022-00 is applicable to NESHAP (40 CFR 63), as follows:
 - a. 40 CFR 63, Subpart A – General Provisions. This subpart applies to all equipment or facilities subject to a NESHAP subpart as listed below:
 - b. 40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ – National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAPs) for Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (RICE). An owner or operator of a stationary reciprocating internal combustion engine (RICE) at a major or area source of HAP emissions is subject to this rule except if the stationary RICE is being tested at a stationary RICE test cell/stand. An area source of HAP emissions is a source that is not a major source. A RICE is considered stationary if it remains or will remain at the permitted location for more than 12 months, or a shorter period of time for an engine located at a seasonal source. A seasonal source remains at a single location on a permanent basis (at least 2 years) and operates 3 months or more each year. Based on the information submitted by Nickelback, the RICE equipment to be used under this permit may be subject to this subpart because they are an area source of HAP emissions and the engine may remain at the same home pit location for more than 12 consecutive months.

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. Nickelback submitted the appropriate 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.

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 MAQP 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 (TPY) of any pollutant. Nickelback has a PTE greater than 15 TPY of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), PM, CO, SO₂ and volatile organic compounds (VOC); therefore, an MAQP is required.
3. ARM 17.8.744 Montana Air Quality Permits--General Exclusions. This rule identifies the activities that are not subject to the MAQP 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 MAQP program.
5. ARM 17.8.748 New or Modified Emitting Units--Permit Application. (1) This rule requires that a permit application be submitted prior to installation, modification, or use of a source. Nickelback 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. Nickelback submitted an affidavit of publication of public notice for the March 13, 2014, issue of the *Stillwater County News*, a newspaper of general circulation in the town of Columbus, Stillwater 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 MAQPs 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 Nickelback 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 MAQP 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 MAQP 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 MAQP 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 MAQP 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 MAQP may be transferred from one person to another if written notice of intent to transfer, including the names of the transferor and the transferee, is sent to the Department.

F. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 8 – Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.801 Definitions. This rule is a list of applicable definitions used in this subchapter.
2. ARM 17.8.818 Review of Major Stationary Sources and Major Modification--Source Applicability and Exemptions. The requirements contained in ARM 17.8.819 through ARM 17.8.827 shall apply to any major stationary source and any major modification with respect to each pollutant subject to regulation under the FCAA that it would emit, except as this subchapter would otherwise allow.

This facility is not a major stationary source because it is not a listed source and the facility's PTE is less than 250 tons per year of any pollutant (excluding fugitive emissions).

G. ARM 17.8, Subchapter 12 – Operating Permit Program Applicability, including, but not limited to:

1. ARM 17.8.1201 Definitions. (23) Major Source under Section 7412 of the FCAA is defined as any stationary source having:
 - a. PTE > 100 TPY of any pollutant;
 - b. PTE > 10 TPY of a single hazardous air pollutant (HAP), PTE > 25 TPY of combined HAPs, or lesser quantity as the Department may establish by rule; or
 - c. PTE > 70 TPY of PM₁₀ in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.

2. ARM 17.8.1204 Air Quality Operating Permit Program Applicability. (1) Title V of the FCAA Amendments of 1990 requires that all sources, as defined in ARM 17.8.1204 (1), obtain a Title V Operating Permit. In reviewing and issuing MAQP #5022-00 for Nickelback, the following conclusions were made:

- a. The facility's PTE is less than 10 TPY for any single HAP and less than 25 TPY of combined HAPs.
- b. This source is not located in a serious PM₁₀ nonattainment area.
- c. This facility is subject to a current NSPS (40 CFR 60, Subpart I and potentially subject to 40 CFR 60, Subpart IIII).
- d. This facility is potentially subject to a current NESHAP Standard (40 CFR 63, Subpart ZZZZ).
- e. This source is not a Title IV affected source
- f. This source is not a solid waste combustion unit.
- g. This source is not an EPA designated Title V source.

Nickelback has requested that federally-enforceable permit operating limits be established to maintain the facility's PTE to less than an 80 TPY threshold. Based on these limitations, the Department determined that this facility is a minor source of emissions and therefore, is not subject to the Title V Operating Permit Program. However, in the event that the EPA makes minor sources that are subject to NSPS obtain a Title V Operating Permit; this source may be subject to the Title V Operating Permit Program.

- h. ARM 17.8.1204(3). The Department may exempt a source from the requirement to obtain an air quality operating permit by establishing federally enforceable limitations which limit that source's PTE.
 - i. In applying for an exemption under this section the owner or operator of the facility shall certify to the Department that the source's PTE does not require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit.
 - ii. Any source that obtains a federally enforceable limit on PTE shall annually certify that its actual emissions are less than those that would require the source to obtain an air quality operating permit.

3. ARM 17.8.1207 Certification of Truth, Accuracy, and Completeness. The compliance certification submittal by ARM 17.8.1204(3) shall contain certification by a responsible official of truth, accuracy, and completeness. This certification and any other certification required under this subchapter shall state that, based on information and belief formed after reasonable inquiry, the statements and information in the document are true, accurate, and complete.

III. BACT Determination

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

A. Asphalt Drum Mixer

The Department reviewed relevant control options, as well as previous BACT determinations. The following control options were reviewed by the Department in order to make the following BACT determinations:

- Fabric Filter Baghouse
- Electrostatic Precipitator
- Cyclone
- Wet Scrubber

All of the listed technologies are deemed technically feasible for this application. Technical feasible control options, in order the highest control efficiency to the lowest control efficiency base on PM control are as follows:

1. Fabric Filter Baghouse (99 – 99.9% efficient) (EPA Fact Sheet EPA-452/F-03-025, 07/15/03)
2. Electrostatic Precipitator (99 – 99.9% efficient) (EPA Fact Sheet EPA-452/F-03-028, 07/15/03)
3. Cyclone (up to 99% efficient) (EPA Fact Sheet EPA-452/F-03-005, 07/15/03)
4. Wet Scrubber (70 – greater than 99% efficient) (EPA Fact Sheet EPA-452/F-03-0017, 07/15/03)

Nickelback has proposed to use a baghouse for the control of PM from the exhaust of the asphalt drum mixer. Because Nickelback proposes to use the highest rated control device (baghouse), no further economic analysis is needed. The control option selected has control technology and a control cost comparable to other recently permitted similar sources and is capable of achieving the appropriate emissions standards. Operating and maintaining a baghouse will constitute BACT for the asphalt drum mixer. All asphalt drum mixer emissions are limited to 0.04 grains per dry standard cubic foot (gr/dscf) for particulate and 20 percent opacity in accordance with 40 CFR 60, Subpart I. Nickelback shall install and operate a device to measure the pressure drop (magnehelic gauge, manometer, etc.) across the baghouse.

B. Diesel Generators

Due to the limited amount of emissions produced by the diesel-fired engine used in association with MAQP #5022-00 and the lack of cost effective add-on controls, such add-on controls would be cost prohibitive. Therefore, the Department determined that proper operation and maintenance with no add-on controls would constitute BACT for the diesel-fired engine.

In addition, any existing and new diesel-fired engine would likely be required to comply with the federal engine emission limitations including, EPA Tiered emission standards for non-road engines (40 CFR Parts 89 and 1039), NSPS emission limitations for stationary compression ignition engines (40 CFR 60, Subpart IIII), or National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Sources for Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines (40

Air Flow[Volume] 40,000.00 ACFM (Source: Application)
 Temp = 150 Deg F, Rankine = 610, Pressure at 2000 Feet = 27.8 inches STP = 29.92 at 528 R,
 Std. Volumetric Flow rate Correction (acfm → scfm) $V1 = V2 * (P2/P1) * (T1/T2)$ 32169.7 scfm (wet)
 Particulate Emissions: Dryer Stack NSPS Based 28952.75 dscfm

PM Emissions (controlled):

Emission Rate 0.04 gr/dscf [40 CFR 60 Subpart I, NSPS Limit]
 Calculations $(0.04 \text{ gr/dscf}) * (28,952.75 \text{ dscfm}) * (60 \text{ min/hr}) * (0.000143 \text{ lb/gr}) = 9.93 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(9.93 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) = 25.81 \text{ TPY}$

Particulate Emissions: Emission Factor Determination

PM Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor 0.045 lbs/ton Processed [AP-42 Table 11.1-3, 3/04]
 Calculations $(0.045 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hour}) = 10.13 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(10.13 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hours/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lbs}) = 26.33 \text{ TPY}$

PM₁₀ Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor 0.023 lbs/ton Processed [AP-42 Table 11.1-3, 3/04 Used PM10 for Fabric Filter]
 Calculations $(0.023 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hour}) = 5.18 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(5.18 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hours/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lbs}) = 13.46 \text{ TPY}$

(Corrected to Match PM_{2.5} Calculation)
 (Since PM_{2.5} cannot exceed PM₁₀)

Filterable PM (Controlled)

Emission Factor 0.014 lbs/ton Processed [AP-42 Table 11.1-3, 3/04]
 Calculations $(0.014 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hour}) = 3.15 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(3.15 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hours/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lbs}) = 8.19 \text{ TPY}$

Condensable PM (Controlled)

Emission Factor 0.0194 lbs/ton Processed [AP-42 Table 11.1-3, 3/04]
 Calculations $(0.0194 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hour}) = 4.37 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(4.37 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hours/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lbs}) = 11.35 \text{ TPY}$

PM_{2.5} Emissions (controlled): = (21 Percent of Filterable Plus Condensables) 21% From Fabric Filter Table 11.1-4

Emission Factor 0.02234 lbs/ton Processed [AP-42 Table 11.1-3, 3/04]
 Calculations $(0.02234 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hour}) = 5.03 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(5.03 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hours/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lbs}) = 13.07 \text{ TPY}$

CO Emissions:

Emission Factor 0.13 lbs/ton processed [AP-42 Table 11.1-7, 3/04; EF based on Waste Oil]
 Calculations $(0.13 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) = 29.25 \text{ lbs/hr}$
 $(29.25 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) = 76.05 \text{ TPY}$

NO_x Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.055 lbs/ton processed	[AP-42 Table 11.1-7, 3/04; EF based on Waste Oil]	
Calculations	(0.055 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		12.38 lbs/hr
	(12.38 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		32.18 TPY

SO₂ Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.0580 lbs/ton processed	[AP-42 Table 11.1-7, 3/04; EF based on Waste Oil]	
Calculations	(0.058 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		13.05 lbs/hr
	(13.05 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		33.93 TPY

VOC Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.032 lbs/ton processed	[AP-42 Table 11.1-8, 3/04; EF based on Waste Oil]	
Calculations	(0.032 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		7.20 lbs/hr
	(7.20 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		18.72 TPY

CH₄ Emissions (Uncontrolled):

Emission Factor	0.012 lbs/ton Asphalt Product	[AP-42 Table 11.1-8, 3/04]	
Calculations	(0.012 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		2.70 lbs/hr
	(2.70 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		7.02 TPY

CO₂ Emissions (Uncontrolled):

Emission Factor	33.000 lbs/ton Asphalt Product	[AP-42 Table 11.1-7, 3/04]	
Calculations	(33 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		7425.00 lbs/hr
	(7,425.00 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		19305.00 TPY

CO₂e Emissions (Uncontrolled):

Emission Factor	21.000 Global Warming Potential	(USEPA 40 CFR 98, Subpart A - Table A-1)	
Calculations	(21 GWP) * (7.02 TPY) =		147.42 TPY
CO ₂ e Total	(19305 tpy) + (147.42 tpy) =		19452.42 TPY

HAP Emissions (Controlled)

Emission Factor	0.009 lbs/ton Asphalt Product	AP-42 Table 11.1-10, 3/04 - #2 Fabric Filter Factor	
Calculations	(0.0087 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		1.96 lbs/hr
	(1.96 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		5.09 TPY

Aggregate Handling & Storage Piles

Process Rate:	225 tons/hour
Number of Piles:	2 pile Transfers [Pile formation Load-in & Pile Load-out to bins]
Operating Hours:	5200 hour/year

Particulate Emissions:

[AP-42 13.2.4, 11/06]

Emission Factor $EF = k (0.0032) * (U/5)^{1.3} / (M / 2)^{1.4}$

where:	EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted / ton Processed		
	k, Dimensionless Particle Size Multiplier PM =	0.74	[AP-42 13.2.4, 11/06]
	k, Dimensionless Particle Size Multiplier PM ₁₀ =	0.35	[AP-42 13.2.4, 11/06]
	k, Dimensionless Particle Size Multiplier PM _{2.5} =	0.053	[AP-42 13.2.4, 11/06]
	U, Mean Wind Speed (mph) =	9.3	[estimate]
	M, Material Moisture Content (%) =	2.1	[AP-42 13.2.4-1, 11/06]

PM Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.74 * (0.0032) * (9.3/5)^{1.3} / (2.1 / 2)^{1.4} =$	0.0050	lbs/ton
Calculations	$(0.0050 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) * (2 \text{ pile}) =$	2.24	lbs/hr
	$(2.24 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	5.82	TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.35 * (0.0032) * (9.3/5)^{1.3} / (2.1 / 2)^{1.4} =$	0.0024	lbs/ton
Calculations	$(0.0024 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) * (2 \text{ pile}) =$	1.06	lbs/hr
	$(1.06 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	2.75	TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.053 * (0.0032) * (9.3/5)^{1.3} / (2.1 / 2)^{1.4} =$	0.0004	lbs/ton
Calculations	$(0.0004 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) * (2 \text{ pile}) =$	0.16	lbs/hr
	$(0.16 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.42	TPY

Aggregate Conveying [SCC 3-05-020-06]

Process Rate:	225	tons/hour
Number of Transfers:	2	Conveyor Transfers [Based on process flow diagram]
Operating Hours:	5200	hours/year

PM Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor	0.00014	lbs/ton transferred	[AP-42 Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04]
Calculations	$(0.00014 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) * (2 \text{ Transfers}) =$	0.06	lbs/hr
	$(0.06 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.16	TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor	0.00005	lbs/ton transferred	[AP-42 Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04]
Calculations	$(0.000046 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) * (2 \text{ Transfers}) =$	0.02	lbs/hr
	$(0.02 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.05	TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor	0.00001 lbs/ton transferred	[AP-42 Table 11.19.2-2, 8/04]	
Calculations	(0.000013 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) * (2 Transfers) =		0.01 lbs/hr
	(0.01 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) =		0.02 TPY

Lime Silo Product transfer & Conveying **SCC 3-05-016-24**

Process Rate: 225 tons/hour
 Operating Hours: 5200 hours/year

PM Emissions (controlled): (Fabric Filter on Lime Silo Assumed)

Emission Factor	0.000088 lbs/ton transferred	[AP-42 Table 11.17.-4-2, 8/04]	
Calculations	(0.000088 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =		0.02 lbs/hr
	(0.02 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) =		0.05 TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor	0.000088 lbs/ton transferred	[AP-42 Table 11.17.-4, 8/04]	
Calculations	(0.000088 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) * (2 Transfers) =		0.02 lbs/hr
	(0.02 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) =		0.05 TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions (controlled):

Emission Factor	0.000088 lbs/ton transferred	[AP-42 Table 11.17.-2, 8/04]	
Calculations	(0.000088 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) * (2 Transfers) =		0.02 lbs/hr
	(0.02 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) =		0.05 TPY

Asphalt Storage & Silo Filling [SCC 3-05-002-13]

Process Rate: 225 tons/hour
 Operating Schedule: 5200 tons/year

Particulate Emissions: [AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000332 + 0.00105(-V)e^{((0.0251)(T+460)-20.43)}$		
	where:	EF, Emission Factor = lbs emitted / ton HMA produced	
		V, Asphalt Volatility = -0.05 [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]	
		T, HMA temperature = 325°F [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]	

PM Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000332 + 0.00105 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)}$ =	0.00059 lbs/ton HMA
Calculations	(0.00059 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =	0.13 lbs/hr
	(0.13 lbs/hr) * (5200 tons/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) =	0.34 TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000332 + 0.00105 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)}$ =	0.00059 lbs/ton HMA
Calculations	(0.00059 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) =	0.13 lbs/hr
	(0.13 lbs/hr) * (5200 tons/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) =	0.34 TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000332 + 0.00105 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)} =$	0.00059	lbs/ton
			HMA
Calculations	$(0.00059 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) =$	0.13	lbs/hr
	$(0.13 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ tons/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.34	TPY

CO Emissions:

[AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.00488(-V)e^{((0.0251)(T+460)-20.43)}$		
where:	EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted / ton Processed		
	V, Asphalt Volatility = -0.05 [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]		
	T, HMA temperature = 325°F [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]		

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.00488 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)} =$	0.0012	lbs/ton
			HMA
Calculations	$(0.0012 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) =$	0.27	lbs/hr
	$(0.27 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ tons/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.69	TPY

VOC Emissions:

[AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.0504(-V)e^{((0.0251)(T+460)-20.43)}$		
where:	EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted / ton Processed		
	V, Asphalt Volatility = -0.05 [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]		
	T, HMA temperature = 325°F [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]		

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.0504 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)} =$	0.0122	lbs/ton
			HMA
Calculations	$(0.0122 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) =$	2.74	lbs/hr
	$(2.74 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ tons/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	7.13	TPY

Asphalt Heater [SCC 3-05-002-08]

Fuel Type: #2 Diesel, Natural Gas, or Propane

Burner Firing Rate:	1.41 mmBtu/hr (Maximum Design)
Fuel Rate (Diesel)	73.0 lb/hr 10.3 gallons/hr

PM Total

PM(Filterable) plus Condensable PM	0.03	lbs/hr
	0.09	TPY

PM (Filterable PM)

Emission Factor	2.00 lb/1000 gallons [AP-42 Table 1.3-1, 5/10; EF based on Distillate oils]		
Calculations	$(2 \text{ lbs/1000 gal}) * (10.3 \text{ gals/hr}) =$	0.02	lbs/hr
	$(0.02 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) =$	0.05	TPY

Condensable PM

Emission Factor	1.30 lb/1000 gallons [AP-42 Table 1.3-1, 5/10; EF based on Distillate oils]		
Calculations	$(1.3 \text{ lbs/1000 gal}) * (10.3 \text{ gals/hr}) =$	0.01	lbs/hr
	$(0.01 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) =$	0.03	TPY

CO Emissions (uncontrolled)

Emission Factor	5.00 lb/1000 gallons [AP-42 Table 1.3-1, 5/10; EF based on Distillate oils]		
Calculations	$(5 \text{ lbs/1000 gal}) * (10.3 \text{ gals/hr}) =$	0.05	lbs/hr
	$(0.05 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) =$	0.13	TPY

NO_x Emissions (uncontrolled)

Emission Factor	20.00 lb/1000 gallons [AP-42 Table 1.3-1, 5/10; EF based on Distillate oils]		
Calculations	$(20 \text{ lbs/1000 gal}) * (10.3 \text{ gals/hr}) =$	0.21	lbs/hr
	$(0.21 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) =$	0.54	TPY

SO₂ Emissions (uncontrolled)

Emission Factor	142.00 lb/1000 gallons [AP-42 Table 1.3-1, 5/10; EF based on Distillate oils]		
Calculations	$(142 \text{ lbs/1000 gal}) * (0.05\% \text{ S}) * (10.3 \text{ gals/hr}) =$	1.46	lbs/hr
	$(1.46 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) =$	3.80	TPY

VOC Emissions (uncontrolled)

Emission Factor	0.20 lb/1000 gallons [AP-42 Table 1.3-3, 5/10; EF based on Distillate oils]		
Calculations	$(0.2 \text{ lbs/1000 gal}) * (10.3 \text{ gals/hr}) =$	0.00	lbs/hr
	$(0.00 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ hrs/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) =$	0.01	TPY

Asphalt Plant Load-Out [SCC 3-05-002-14]

Process Rate:	225 tons/hour
Operating Schedule:	5200 hours/year

Particulate Emissions: [AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000181 + 0.00141(-V)e^{(0.0251)(T+460)-20.43}$		
where:	EF, Emission Factor = lbs emitted / ton HMA produced		
	V, Asphalt Volatility = -0.05 [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]		
	T, HMA temperature = 325°F [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]		

PM Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000181 + 0.00141 * (0.05) * e^{(0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43} =$	0.00052	lbs/ton HMA
Calculations	$(0.00052 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) =$	0.12	lbs/hr
	$(0.12 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ tons/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.31	TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000181 + 0.00141 * (0.05) * e^{(0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43} =$	0.00052	lbs/ton HMA
Calculations	$(0.00052 \text{ lbs/ton}) * (225 \text{ tons/hr}) =$	0.12	lbs/hr
	$(0.12 \text{ lbs/hr}) * (5200 \text{ tons/year}) * (0.0005 \text{ lbs/ton}) =$	0.31	TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions:

Emission Factor	$EF = 0.000181 + 0.00141 * (0.05) * e^{(0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43} =$	0.00052	lbs/ton HMA
-----------------	---	---------	-------------

Calculations (0.00052 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) = 0.12 lbs/hr
 (0.12 lbs/hr) * (5200 tons/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) = 0.31 TPY

CO Emissions: [AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

Emission Factor $EF = 0.00558(-V)e^{((0.0251)(T+460)-20.43)}$
 where: EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted / ton Processed
 V, Asphalt Volatility = -0.05 [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]
 T, HMA temperature = 325°F [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

CO Emissions:

Emission Factor $EF = 0.00558 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)} = 0.00135$ lbs/ton HMA
 Calculations (0.00135 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) = 0.30 lbs/hr
 (0.30 lbs/hr) * (5200 tons/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) = 0.79 TPY

VOC Emissions: [AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

Emission Factor $EF = 0.0172(-V)e^{((0.0251)(T+460)-20.43)}$
 where: EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted / ton Processed
 V, Asphalt Volatility = -0.05 [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]
 T, HMA temperature = 325°F [Default value AP-42 Table 11.1-14, 3/04]

VOC Emissions:

Emission Factor $EF = 0.0172 * (0.05) * e^{((0.0251) * (325 + 460) - 20.43)} =$ lbs/ton HMA produced
 Calculations (0.00416 lbs/ton) * (225 tons/hr) = 0.94 lbs/hr
 (0.94 lbs/hr) * (5200 tons/year) * (0.0005 lbs/ton) = 0.00416 2.43 TPY

Diesel Engines:

Diesel Generators (Total 1150 bhp)

Engine Rating: 1150 bhp
 Operating Hours: 5200 hrs/yr 2.45 MMBtu/hr

Particulate Emissions:

PM Emissions:

Emission Factor 0.000165 lb/hp-hr [CAT Spec Sheet]
 Calculations (0.000165 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) = 0.19 lbs/hr
 (0.19 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) = 0.49 TPY

PM₁₀ Emissions:

Emission Factor 0.000165 lb/hp-hr [Cat Spec Sheet]
 Calculations (0.000165 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) = 0.19 lbs/hr
 (0.19 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) = 0.49 TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions (filterable):

Emission Factor	0.0001650 lb/hp-hr	[Cat Spec Sheet]	
Calculations	(0.000165 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) =		0.19 lbs/hr
	(0.19 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		0.49 TPY

PM_{2.5} Emissions (condensable):

Emission Factor	0.0077 MMBtu	[AP-42 3.4-1, 10/96]	
Calculations	(0.0077 lb/mmBtu) * (2.45mmBtu/hr) =		0.02 lbs/hr
	(0.02 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		0.05 TPY

CO Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.00024 lb/hp-hr	[Cat Spec Sheet]	
Calculations	(0.00024 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) =		0.28 lbs/hr
	(0.28 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		0.72 TPY

NO_x Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.0057 lb/hp-hr	[Cat Spec Sheet]	
Calculations	(0.00573 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) =		6.59 lbs/hr
	(6.59 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		17.13 TPY

SO_x Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.00205 lb/hp-hr	[AP-42 3.3-1, 6/06]	
Calculations	(0.0021 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) =		2.36 lbs/hr
	(2.36 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		6.13 TPY

VOC Emissions:

Emission Factor	0.00251 lb/hp-hr	[AP-42 3.3-1, 6/06]	
Calculations	(0.0025 lb/hp-hr) * (1150 hp) =		2.89 lbs/hr
	(2.89 lbs/hr) * (5200 hrs/yr) * (0.0005 tons/lb) =		7.51 TPY

Unpaved Roadways (Haul Roads)

Miles Travelled: 5 Miles/Day [Estimate]
 Vehicle Weight: < 50 Tons [AP-42 13.2.2.2, 11/06]

Emission Factor	EF = k(s/12) ^a * (W/3) ^b	4.9	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
	where: EF, Emission Factor = lbs Emitted Per Vehicle Mile Traveled (VMT)	1.5	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
	k, Empirical Constant PM =	0.15	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
	k, Empirical Constant PM ₁₀ =	7.1	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-1, 11/06]
	k, Empirical Constant PM _{2.5} =	50	[Provided Data]
	s, Surface Material Silt Content (%) =	0.7	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
	W, Mean Vehicle Weight (tons) =	0.9	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
	a, Empirical Constant PM =	0.45	[AP-42 Table 13.2.2-2, 11/06]
	a, Empirical Constant PM ₁₀ /PM _{2.5} =		
	b, Empirical Constant PM - PM _{2.5} =		

PM Emissions: 12.04 lbs/VMT

Emission Factor $EF = 4.9 * (7.1/12)^{0.7} * (50/3)^{0.45} =$

Calculations $(12.04 \text{ lbs/VMT}) * (5 \text{ miles/day}) = 60.18 \text{ lbs/day}$
 $(60.18 \text{ lbs/day}) * (365 \text{ days/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) = 10.98 \text{ TPY}$

PM₁₀ Emissions: 3.32 lbs/VMT

Emission Factor $EF = 1.5 * (7.1/12)^{0.9} * (50/3)^{0.45} =$

Calculations $(3.32 \text{ lbs/VMT}) * (5 \text{ miles/day}) = 16.59 \text{ lbs/day}$
 $(16.59 \text{ lbs/day}) * (365 \text{ days/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) = 3.03 \text{ TPY}$

PM_{2.5} Emissions: 0.33 lbs/VMT

Emission Factor $EF = 0.15 * (7.1/12)^{0.9} * (50/3)^{0.45} =$

Calculations $(0.33 \text{ lbs/VMT}) * (5 \text{ miles/day}) = 1.66 \text{ lbs/day}$
 $(1.66 \text{ lbs/day}) * (365 \text{ days/yr}) * (0.0005 \text{ tons/lb}) = 0.30 \text{ TPY}$

II. Existing Air Quality

The initial location of this portable source is Township 4 South, Range 18 East, in Section 24 in Stillwater County, Montana. The initial location and those areas for which this facility is permitted to operate under MAQP #5022-00 has been designated unclassified/attainment with all ambient air quality standards and there are no major air pollution sources in the surrounding area.

III. Air Quality Impacts

MAQP #5022-00 covers operation of this asphalt plant while operating in areas within Montana that are classified as attainment or unclassifiable with federal ambient air quality standards, excluding counties that have a Department-approved permitting program and areas that are tribal lands. This air quality permit contains conditions and limitations that would protect air quality, and would limit the facility’s emissions below the major source threshold. Furthermore, this facility is a portable source that would operate on an intermittent and temporary basis, so any effects to air quality will be minor and of limited duration.

VII. Ambient Air Impact Analysis

Based on the information provided and the conditions established in MAQP #5022-00, the Department determined that the impact from this permitting action will be minor. The Department believes it will not cause or contribute to a violation of any ambient air quality standard.

VIII. Taking or Damaging Implication Analysis

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

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

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

IX. Environmental Assessment

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

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

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued To: Nickelback, Asphalt #1

Montana Air Quality Permit number: 5022-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: 03/17/2014

Department Decision Issued: 04/02/2014

Permit Final: 04/18/2014

1. *Legal Description of Site:* Nickelback, Asphalt Plant #1, (Nickelback) would operate a portable drum mix asphalt plant, which would initially be located in Township 4 South, Range 18 East, in Section 24 in Stillwater County, Montana. However, Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) #5022-00 would apply while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department-approved permitting program, those areas considered to be tribal lands, or those areas in or within 10 kilometers (km) of certain particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM₁₀) nonattainment areas. An addendum to this air quality permit would be required if Nickelback intends to locate in or within 10 km of certain PM₁₀ nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit would be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana*
2. *Description of Project:* Nickelback would operate a portable drum mix asphalt plant and associated equipment with a 225 ton per hour (TPH) maximum production capacity and a single diesel-fired generator set with a capacity of up to 1,150 brake horsepower (bhp) at various locations throughout Montana.
3. *Objectives of Project:* The objective of this project would be to produce revenue for Nickelback through the sale and use of asphalt. The issuance of the permit would allow Nickelback to operate the permitted equipment at various locations throughout Montana, including the initial site location.
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 Nickelback 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 #5022-00.
6. *Regulatory Effects on Private Property:* The Department considered alternatives to the conditions imposed in this permit as part of the permit development. The Department determined that the permit conditions are reasonably necessary to ensure compliance with applicable requirements and demonstrate compliance with those requirements and do not unduly restrict private property rights.

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

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

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

A. Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats

Impacts on terrestrials and aquatic life could result from storm water runoff and pollutant deposition, but such impacts would be minor because the asphalt plant would be considered a minor source of emissions and would have intermittent and seasonal operations. Furthermore, the air emissions would have only minor effects on terrestrial and aquatic life because facility emissions would have good pollutant dispersion in the area of operations and the operation will initially be set-up in an existing gravel pit (see Section 7.F). Therefore, only minor and temporary effects to terrestrial and aquatic life and habitat would be expected from the proposed project.

B. Water Quality, Quantity and Distribution

Water would be required for dust suppression on the surrounding roadways and the area of operation. Typical application of water spray for dust suppression typically results in the water being evaporated to the atmosphere shortly after its application. Due to evaporation, water’s dust suppression effects are temporary. Heavy applications of water can create soft mud or penetrate a road to the sub-base which can cause major road failure; therefore, heavy applications are typically not utilized. Consequently, several light applications are preferable to one heavy application. Pollutant deposition and water use would cause minor impacts to water resources because the facility is relatively small with seasonal and intermittent operations. The benefits of using water to control emissions outweigh the potential minor impacts to the surroundings.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture

The proposed project would have minor impacts on geology, soil quality, stability, and moisture of soils. Minor impacts from deposition of air pollutants on soils would result (as described in Section 7.F of this EA) and minor amounts of water would be used for pollution

control and only as necessary in controlling particulate emissions. Thus, minimal water runoff would occur. Since a small amount of pollution would be generated and corresponding emissions would be widely dispersed before settling upon vegetation and surrounding soils (as described in Section 7.D of this EA), impacts would be minor. Therefore, any effects upon geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture from air pollutant emissions from equipment and operation would be minor.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

The facility would be considered a minor source of emissions by industrial standards and would typically operate in areas previously designated and used for this type of operation. The overall footprint of the facility would be small, so the affect to quantity and quality of vegetative cover in the area would be minimal. There are no occurrence reports of plant species of concern within sections located near the proposed project section.

In addition, water use at the facility, soil disturbance from water application, and the associated runoff would also be minimal. Overall, impacts to vegetation from the project would be minor.

E. Aesthetics

The asphalt plant would be visible and would create noise in the areas where it would operate. MAQP #5022-00 would include conditions to control emissions (including visible emissions) from the equipment and the surrounding work area. The diesel-fired equipment would be moderately sized by industrial standards and would be used to power permitted equipment operated by Nickelback. The proposed project site is within a previous gravel pit site and therefore, any aesthetic impact would be minor.

F. Air Quality

Air quality impacts from the proposed project would be minor because the facility would be relatively small and comparable in nature to other similar sources permitted by the Department. MAQP #5022-00 would include conditions limiting the facility's opacity and particulate matter emissions. The permit would also limit total emissions from the portable asphalt plant and any additional equipment operated at the site to 250 tons per year or less of any individual pollutant, excluding fugitive emissions.

Further, the Department determined that the portable asphalt plant would be a minor source of emissions as defined under the Title V Operating Permit Program because the source's potential emissions are below the major source threshold level of 100 tons per year for any regulated pollutant due to federally enforceable permit conditions which limit the total annual hours of operation and annual asphalt production. Pollutant deposition from the project would be minimal because the emissions would be well controlled, widely dispersed (from factors such as wind speed and wind direction), and would have minimal deposition on the surrounding area. Therefore, air quality impacts from the project in this area would be minor. The applicant has indicated that the source would operate on an intermittent and seasonal basis; therefore, actual emissions may be lower than accounted for in the potential emissions calculations.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

In an effort to identify species of special concern that may be present in the proposed areas of operation, the Department contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) for a review of species of special concern. Four species of concern were identified within the area where the asphalt facility is proposed. These include the Great Blue Heron, the Bald Eagle, Bobolink and the Greater Short-horned Lizard. Issuance of this permit would increase

emissions to the atmosphere near any location proposed for the operation of the asphalt facility. However, as explained in Section 7.F. of this EA, because of the nature of the asphalt facility, and conditions placed in MAQP #5022-00, any impacts to unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources from the deposition of pollutants would not be expected given the location of the proposed facility at the existing gravel pit site.

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

The portable asphalt plant would provide its own energy for operation from the portable diesel generator engine. Water would be required for control of fugitive particulate matter emissions in the plant area and surrounding roads. Impacts to air resources would be minimal because the source would be considered a minor industrial source of emissions, with intermittent and seasonal operations. Because air pollutants generated by the plant would be widely dispersed (see Section 8.F of this EA), energy requirements would be provided by a portable generator, and water use would be minimal, any impacts to water, air, and energy resources would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

According to correspondence with the Montana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), there have been previously recorded sites in the same section of the proposed site location. However, given the proposed site is an existing gravel pit, no impact to historical or archaeological sites would likely occur. Therefore, it is unlikely that the project would affect any historic or archaeological site and no resulting impacts would be expected.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Operation of the portable asphalt plant would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because it would be located at an existing gravel pit and would be limited in the amount of air emissions generated. Emissions and noise generated from the equipment would, at most, result in only minor impacts to the area of operation because it would be seasonal and temporary in nature. Additionally, this facility, in combination with other emissions from equipment operations would not be permitted to exceed 250 tons per year of non-fugitive emissions of an individual pollutant. Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment would be minor.

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

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A	Social Structures and Mores				X		Yes
B	Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity				X		Yes
C	Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue			X			Yes
D	Agricultural or Industrial Production			X			Yes
E	Human Health			X			Yes
F	Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities			X			Yes
G	Quantity and Distribution of Employment			X			Yes
H	Distribution of Population				X		Yes

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
I	Demands for Government Services			X			Yes
J	Industrial and Commercial Activity			X			Yes
K	Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals			X			Yes
L	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts			X			Yes

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

A. Social Structures and Mores

The portable asphalt plant would cause no disruption to the social structures and mores of the area because the source would be considered a minor industrial source and emissions and would have temporary and intermittent operations. The proposed initial location is within an existing industrial site with no existing social structures or mores.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The cultural uniqueness and diversity of this area would not be impacted by the operation of the portable asphalt plant because the facility would be a portable source, with seasonal and intermittent operations. The predominant use of this area would not change as a result of the proposed operation. Therefore, the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area would not be impacted.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

Only minor impacts to the local and state tax base and revenue could be expected from the employees and facility production. Because the facility would be portable and temporary, it is unlikely that people would move to the area as a result of this project. Impacts to local tax base and revenue would be minor and short-term because the source would be portable and the money generated for taxes would be widespread.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The proposed project would have a minor impact on local industrial production since the facility would increase local asphalt production and air emissions slightly. The facility would be located in an existing gravel pit on private land. Because minimal deposition of air pollutants would occur on the surrounding land (as described above in Section 7.F), only minor effects on the surrounding vegetation or agricultural production would occur. In addition, the facility operations would be small and temporary in nature and would be permitted with operational conditions and limitations that would minimize impacts upon surrounding vegetation, as described in Section 7.D above. Pollutant deposition from the project would be minimal because the emissions would be well controlled, widely dispersed (from factors such as wind speed and wind direction), and would have minimal deposition on the surrounding area.

E. Human Health

Conditions would be incorporated into MAQP #5022-00 to ensure that the asphalt plant would operate in compliance with all applicable air quality rules and standards. These rules and standards are designed to be protective of human health. As described in Section 7.F of this

EA, the air emissions from this project would be minimized by the use of a baghouse, water spray for fugitive emissions, and other process limits that would be required by MAQP #5022-00. Furthermore, the applicant has stated that they plan to operate on an intermittent and seasonal basis and therefore only minor impacts would be expected on human health from the proposed facility.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

Access to recreational opportunities would not be limited or modified by this facility. The equipment would be located within an existing industrial site that has been established for similar use. All recreational opportunities, if available in the area, would still be accessible. Noise from the facility would be minimal to surroundings because of the facility size, expected hours of operation, and rural location. The applicant has stated that the facility would operate on a seasonal and intermittent basis. The pit is on private land and the Department has determined that the project would be a minor industrial source of emissions. Therefore, any changes in the quality of recreational and wilderness activities created by operating the equipment at this site are expected to be minor.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The portable asphalt plant would be relatively small. Nickelback has stated that they plan to add some new employees to run the proposed asphalt plant. Because the operation would be seasonal, no individuals would be expected to permanently relocate as a result of operating the portable asphalt plant. Therefore, there would be minor effects on the quantity and distribution of employment in this area.

H. Distribution of Population

The proposed project would be considered a portable industrial facility and would require few employees to operate. No individuals would be expected to permanently relocate to this area. Therefore, the operation would not impact the normal population distribution in the initial area of operation or any future operating site.

I. Demands for Government Services

The operation of the portable asphalt plant would cause minimal demand for government services. This project would result in an increase in traffic on existing roadways. Government services would be required for acquiring the appropriate permits for the proposed project and to verify compliance with the permits that would be issued. However, any increase or demand for government services would be minor given the temporary and portable nature of the project.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The proposed project would represent only a minor increase in the industrial activity in the proposed area of operation because the facility would be a small industrial source, portable and temporary in nature. Some additional industrial or commercial activity would be expected as a result of the proposed operation; however, these impacts to the industrial and commercial activity would be minor.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

The Department is unaware of any locally adopted environmental plans and goals in the proposed initial project location. MAQP #5022-00 contains conditions and limits for protecting air quality and to keep facility emissions in compliance with any applicable ambient air quality standards. Because the facility would have intermittent and seasonal operations any impacts from the facility would be minor and short-lived.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Overall, the proposed project would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the social and economic aspects of the human environment in the immediate area of operation because the source would be portable and the footprint of the facility would remain relatively small. Furthermore, no other industrial operations are expected to result from this permitting action. Any increase in traffic would have minor effects on local traffic in the immediate area.

This facility may be operated in conjunction with other equipment owned and operated by Nickelback, but any cumulative impacts or secondary impacts are expected to be minor and short-term. In conclusion, the source is relatively small, the facility emissions would be minimal, and the project would have only minor cumulative and secondary impacts.

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 portable asphalt plant. MAQP #5022-00 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: Craig Henrikson

Date: March 5, 2014