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

RECEIVED
MAR 1 7 2006
LEGISLATIVE ENVIRONMENTAL
POLICY OFFICE

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued For: MK Weeden Construction, Inc.
P.O. Box 1164
Lewistown, MT 59457

Permit Number: 3404-01

Preliminary Determination Issued: 02/28/06
Department Decision Issued: 03/16/06
Permit Final:

1. *Legal Description of Site*: MK submitted an application to operate a portable aggregate crushing/screening plant initially located in Section 10, Township 23 North, Range 23 East, in Fergus County, Montana. Permit #3404-01 would apply while operating at any location in Montana, except within those areas having a Department-approved permitting program, those areas considered tribal lands, or those areas in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit would be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana.* An addendum to this air quality permit would be required for locations in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

2. *Description of Project*: The permit applicant proposes the removal of the 600-kW diesel generator and replacing it with a 650-kW diesel generator.

3. *Objectives of Project*: The object of the project would be to allow the facility the flexibility to use a generator up to 650-kW.

4. *Additional Project Site Information*: In many cases, this crushing/screening operation may move to a general site location or open cut pit, which has been previously permitted through the Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau (IEMB). If this were the case, additional information for the site would be found in the Mined Land Reclamation Permit for that specific site.

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

6. *A Listing of Mitigation, Stipulations, and Other Controls*: A listing of the enforceable permit conditions and a permit analysis, including a BACT analysis, would be contained in Permit #3404-01.

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

8. *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 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
B. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution
C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture
D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality
E. Aesthetics

The replacement of the 600-kW diesel generator with a 650-kW generator would not have an associated increase in emissions because there would be a limit on the hours of operation. Therefore, there would be no additional impacts from the project.

F. Air Quality

Air quality impacts from the proposed project would not be affected because there would be no increase in emissions associated with the replacement of the generator. Permit #3404-01 would include conditions limiting the generator's hours of operation. Permit #3404-01 would also limit total emissions from the crushing/screening facility and any additional MK equipment operated at the site to 250 tons/year or less, excluding fugitive emissions.

The Department previously determined that the crushing/screening facility would be a minor source of emissions as defined under the Title V Operating Permit Program because the source's PTE was limited to below the major source threshold level of 100 tons per year for any regulated pollutant. Pollutant deposition from the facility would be minimal because the pollutants emitted would be well controlled, widely dispersed (from factors such as wind speed and wind direction), and would have minimal deposition on the surrounding area.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources
H. Demands on Environmental Resources of Water, Air, and Energy
I. Historical and Archaeological Sites
J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The replacement of the 600-kW diesel generator with a 650-kW generator would not have an associated increase in emissions because there would be a limit on the hours of operation. Therefore, there would be no additional impacts from the project.

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

		Major	Moderate	Minor	None	Unknown	Comments Included
A.	Social Structures and Mores				X		yes
B.	Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity				X		yes
C.	Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue				X		yes
D	Agricultural or Industrial Production				X		yes
E.	Human Health				X		yes
F.	Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities				X		yes
G	Quantity and Distribution of Employment				X		yes
H.	Distribution of Population				X		yes
I.	Demands for Government Services				X		yes
J.	Industrial and Commercial Activity				X		yes
K.	Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals				X		yes
L.	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts				X		yes

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

A. Social Structures and Mores
B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity
C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue
D. Agricultural or Industrial Production
E. Human Health
F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities
G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment
H. Distribution of Population
I. Demands of Government Services
J. Industrial and Commercial Activity
K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals
L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The replacement of the 600 kW diesel generator with a 650 kW generator would not have an associated increase in emissions because there would be a limit on the hours of operation. Therefore, there would be no additional impacts from the project.

Recommendation: An EIS is not required.

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: All potential effects resulting from construction and operation of the proposed facility are minor; therefore, an EIS is not required.

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

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: Montana Department of Environmental Quality - Air Resources Management Bureau.

EA prepared by: Julie Merkel
Date: February 15, 2006