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

PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION
ON PERMIT APPLICATION

Date of Mailing: December 22, 2008

Name of Applicant: Schellinger Construction Co., Inc.

Source: Portable Batch Asphalt Plant

Proposed Action: The Department of Environmental Quality (Department) proposes to issue a permit, with conditions, to the above-named applicant. The application was assigned Permit Application Number 3261-02.

Proposed Conditions: See attached.

Public Comment: Any member of the public desiring to comment must submit such comments in writing to the Air Resources Management Bureau (Bureau) of the Department at the above address. Comments may address the Department's analysis and determination, or the information submitted in the application. In order to be considered, comments on this Preliminary Determination are due by January 21, 2009. Copies of the application and the Department's analysis may be inspected at the Bureau's office in Helena. For more information, you may contact the Department.

Departmental Action: The Department intends to make a decision on the application after expiration of the Public Comment period described above. A copy of the decision may be obtained at the above address. The permit shall become final on the date stated in the Department's Decision on this permit, unless an appeal is filed with the Board of Environmental Review (Board).

Procedures for Appeal: Any person jointly or severally adversely affected by the final action may request a hearing before the Board. Any appeal must be filed by the date stated in the Department's Decision on this permit. The request for a hearing shall contain an affidavit setting forth the grounds for the request. Any hearing will be held under the provisions of the Montana Administrative Procedures Act. Submit requests for a hearing in triplicate to: Chairman, Board of Environmental Review, P.O. Box 200901, Helena, MT 59620.

For the Department,

Vickie Walsh
Air Permitting Program Supervisor
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-3490

Skye A. Hatten, P.E.
Environmental Engineer
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-

VW: SH
Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Permitting and Compliance Division
P.O. Box 200901, Helena, Montana 59620
(406) 444-3490

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued For: Schellinger Construction Co., Inc.
P.O. Box 39
Columbia Falls, MT 59912-0039

Permit Number: #3261-02

Preliminary Determination Issued: December 22, 2008
Department Determination Issued:
Permit Final:

1. *Legal Description of Site*: Schellinger operates a portable drum-mix asphalt plant at various locations throughout Montana. Montana Air Quality Permit (MAQP) #3261-02 would apply while operating at any location in Montana, except those areas having a Department -approved permitting program, areas considered tribal lands, or areas in or within 10 km of PM_{10} nonattainment areas. *A Missoula County air quality permit will be required for locations within Missoula County.* Addendum 2 applies when Schellinger is operating in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

   The portable drum-mix asphalt plant will be initially located at the NW¼ of the SE¼ and the NE¼ of the SW¼ of Section 36, Township 30 North, Range 21 West, in Flathead County, Montana (Jellison Pit). The facility is allowed operation at any of the following locations in or within 10 km of the Kalispell, Whitefish, or Columbia Falls PM_{10} NAAs during the winter months (October 1 through March 31): 1) the NE¼ of the SW¼ of Section 23, Township 30 North, Range 21 West (A-1 Paving Hodgson Road Pit); 2) the NE¼ of the NE¼ of Section 26, Township 29 North, Range 22 West (Tutvedt Pit); 3) the NW¼ of the NW¼ of Section 31, Township 29 North, Range 21 West (NUPAC Pit); 4) the NW¼ of the NW¼ of Section 22, Township 29 North, Range 21 West (A-1 Paving Mohl Pit); 5) the N½ of Section 21, Township 30 North, Range 21 West (Carlson Pit); 6) the S½ of the SE of Section 31, Township 31 North, Range 22 West (Peschel Pit); 7) the NE¼ of the SE¼ of NW¼ of Section 9, Township 27 North, Range 21 West (Spoklie Pit); and 8) the NW¼ of the SE¼ and the NE¼ of the SW¼ of Section 36, Township 30 North, Range 21 West (Jellison Pit). In addition, the facility will be able to operate at various locations throughout Montana during the summer season (April 1 through September 30), which would include in or within 10 km of the Libby, Kalispell, Columbia Falls, Whitefish, Thompson Falls, and Butte PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

2. *Description of Project*: The current permit action includes a modification to Permit #3261-00 and Addendum #1 increasing the hours of operation limitations and tonnage limitations for the operation of a portable asphalt plant in or within 10 km of the following PM_{10} NAAs: Libby, Kalispell, Whitefish, Columbia Falls, Thompson Falls, and Butte, as specified above. In addition to this modification, the current permit action updates rule references, permit format, and the emissions inventory. The process description is discussed in Section I.B of the permit analysis of Permit #3261-02.

3. *Objectives of Project*: Schellinger, in an effort to sustain business and revenue for the company, has submitted a request to modify the operation limitations and tonnage limitations included in Permit #3261-00. The issuance of Permit #3261-02 with Addendum 2 would allow Schellinger to increase their hours of operation and ultimately their production at their portable drum-mix asphalt plant.

4. *Additional Project Site Information:* In many cases, the crushing/screening operation may move to a general site location or open cut pit, which has been previously permitted through the IEMB. If this were the case, a more extensive EA would have been conducted and would be found in the Mined Land Reclamation Permit for that specific site.

5. *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 Schellinger demonstrated compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as required for permit issuance. Therefore, the "no-action" alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

6. *Listing of Mitigation, Stipulations, and Other Controls*: A listing of the enforceable permit conditions and a permit analysis, including a Best Available Control Technology analysis, would be contained in Permit #3261-02. More stringent operational limitations, applicable to operation in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} NAAs, would be contained in Addendum 2.

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 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.

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 & BIOLOGICAL EFFECTS: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Terrestrial and Aquatic Life and Habitats

Terrestrials would use the same areas in which the asphalt plant would operate. However, the asphalt operations would have limited production and hours of operation, and have seasonal and intermittent operations, so only minor effects to terrestrial life would be expected as a result of equipment operations or from pollutant deposition.

Only minor amounts of water would be used for pollution control on surrounding area, so little impact is expected upon aquatic life. Impacts on aquatic life from surface water runoff and pollutant control on the surrounding area would typically be minor. For the initial site location, surface water runoff would not be an issue because the facility would be operating in a depressed open cut pit developed below the surrounding land surface. Also, silt fences, straw bales and gravel berms would be used to protect the surrounding water resources at this site location. Additionally, fuel would be stored on site in a properly designed containment system. Finally, pollutant deposition would be minimal because the area of operation is relatively flat and the facility is a portable (temporary) source that has operational limitations that control facility emissions.

Birds may use the area surrounding the operational site. For the initial (proposed) operational site, there is a great blue heron rookery along the Flathead River, about 1 mile south of the Jellision pit. Cumulative impacts to the bird rookery would occur in conjunction with other operations in the area, but would be minor, as the Department limitations would affect the facility production and hours of operation. The facility would also be considered a minor source of air pollution and would be operating in a permitted open-cut pit. Additionally, conditions placed in Addendum 2 to Permit #3261-02 would limit any potential impacts to wildlife and the surrounding habitat in the nonattainment areas because only minor amounts of pollutant would be generated and only minimal pollutant deposition would accumulate on the surrounding area of operation. Further, Addendum 2 would include additional conditions and pollution control measures to protect the environment (habitat) when this facility is operating in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} NAAs in Montana.

B. Water Quality, Quantity, and Distribution

Water would be used for dust suppression on the surrounding roadways and areas of operation. However, the water used would only cause a minor disturbance to the area because only relatively small amounts of water would be needed. Minor surface water and ground water quality impacts would be expected as a result of using water for dust suppression because only small amounts of water would be required. Any accidental spills or leaks from equipment would be required to be handled according to the appropriate environmental regulations protective design and operational measures would be used to prevent impacts from spills or equipment leaks. For the initial site location, these measures would also include water monitoring for protection of the ground water. Thus, only minor effects to water quality, quantity, and distribution in the area would occur.

As described in Section 8.F of this EA, the maximum impacts from the air emissions from this facility would be relatively minor. While air emissions and deposition of pollutants would occur, the Department determined that any impacts from deposition of pollutants would be minor as a result of conditions placed in Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2. Additionally, the operations would be intermittent and seasonal in nature. Thus, the small and intermittent amounts of deposition from the crushing/screening operations would have only minor impacts upon water quality, quantity, and distribution.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability, and Moisture

There would be minor impacts to the geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture near the asphalt plant operations due to the facility construction and use, the increase in vehicle traffic, the use of water for dust suppression, and the minor amounts of pollutant deposition resulting from the asphalt operations. Also, as explained in Section 8.F of this EA, the temporary nature of the operation and conditions placed in Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2 would reduce the impacts from deposition. However, because the Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau (in their EA for the Jellison Pit) has identified that there are no fragile, compactable, or unstable soils present and no unusual geologic features, there would be no impacts to the geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture from the asphalt plant operations.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

While there would be minor impacts on the quantity and quality of vegetation cover at the site due to vegetation disturbance, the final reclamation proposal for the site would further reduce the need for vegetation at the site if a “pond” were established. In addition, minor amounts of pollutant deposition would occur on the surrounding vegetation. However, as explained in Section 8.F of this EA, the Department determined that, due to the temporary nature of the operation, and conditions placed in Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2, any impacts from the deposition of pollutants would be minor. Also, because the water usage for pollution control would be minimal (as described in Section 8.B) and the associated soil disturbance would be minimal (as described in Section 8.C), corresponding vegetative impacts would also be minimal.

E. Aesthetics

The asphalt plant operations and emissions would be visible and would create additional noise in the area. Permit #3261-02 would include conditions to control emissions (including visible emissions) from the plant. Since the asphalt plant operations are temporary and are a relatively minor source of air pollution with intermittent and seasonal operations, any impacts would be minor.

F. Air Quality

The air quality impacts from the asphalt plant operations would be minor because Permit #3261-02 would include conditions limiting the opacity from the plant, as well as requiring water spray bars to control air pollution. Water would be used on storage piles, haul roads, and the operational area to further reduce emissions when the plant is operating. Additionally, the facility is considered a minor source of air pollution and would have limited hours of generator operations, equipment production limits, temporary and seasonal use. The pollutant emissions at the site would be disbursed and would have minimal deposition. In addition, Addendum 2 to Permit #3261-02 would include more stringent limitations for any operations taking place in or within 10 km of the certain PM_{10} NAAs in Montana and these limits would be protective of the NAAQS/MAAQS. Therefore, associated air quality impacts upon these areas of operation would be minor, seasonal, and temporary.

The operations would be limited by Permit #3261-02 to total emissions of 250 tons/year or less from non-fugitive sources at the plant, including emissions from any Schellinger equipment operated simultaneously at the site. As this permit is written, the facility's potential emissions are below 100 tons/year for any pollution generated; therefore, the facility is recognized as a minor source of air pollution by the Department for Title V purposes.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

The Department, in an effort to assess any potential impacts to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the proposed area of operations, contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) to identify any species of special concern associated with the initial proposed site location (at Section 36, Township 30 North, Range 21 West, Flathead County, Montana). Search results concluded there are 3 known environmental resources within the defined area. The defined area, in this case, is defined by the township and range of the proposed site, with an additional one-mile buffer.

Two of the species of concern are the bull trout and the westslope cutthroat trout. These two fish species of concern are found within the confluences of the Flathead River, which is some 3,500 feet away. The nearest tributary (feeder stream) is more than 100 meters away from the proposed operational site location. Therefore, because of the distance from the waterways and the relatively flat topography, the proposed operations would have, at most, minor effects on these species of concern.

The bird rookery is within the defined area and is located approximately 1 mile to the south of the proposed project in the S½ of Section 1, Township 29 North, Range 21 West. At most, only minor impacts could be expected from the asphalt plant operation on the great blue heron bird rookery because the facility would be operating on a seasonal and intermittent basis and would utilize pollution control equipment and procedures.

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

The asphalt plant operations would only require small quantities of water, air, and energy for proper operation. As described in Section 8.B of this EA, small quantities of water would be used for dust suppression and pollution control for the facility. As described in Section 8.F of this EA, impacts upon the air quality would be minor because the facility is a temporary source with seasonal and intermittent use, and the use of a baghouse and dust suppression would also be applied to minimize these impacts. Therefore, the impacts upon air resources would be minimal. Since the facility would be supplied with power from a diesel generator, the energy demands would be the use of diesel fuel. Since the facility's generator would have limited hours of operation, would not always be operated at its full capabilities, and would have intermittent use, fuel consumption (energy demands) would also be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The Department contacted the Montana Historical Society - State Historical Preservation Office (SHPO) in an effort to identify any historical and/or archaeological sites that may be present in the proposed area of construction/operation. According to the correspondence from SHPO, there are no previously recorded historical or archaeological sites within the designated search locale. Additionally, the asphalt plant operations would locate within a previously disturbed industrial site typically used for portable asphalt plant operations. According to past correspondence from the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, there is low likelihood of adverse disturbance to any archaeological or historic site, given previous industrial disturbance within an area. Therefore, the chances of the operation affecting any historic or archaeological site is minor.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The asphalt operations would cause minor cumulative and secondary environmental impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the facility would have only seasonal, intermittent, and temporary use. In addition, Addendum 2 to Permit #3261-02

would include more stringent limitations for any operations taking place in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas in Montana, which would further reduce pollutant emissions at the proposed (initial) site location. The facility would generate emissions of particulate matter (PM), particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 microns or less (PM_{10}), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOC), carbon monoxide (CO), and sulfur oxides (SO_x). Noise would also be generated from equipment operations.

Pollutant emissions and noise from the proposed operations would cause minimal disturbance to the site because it is an existing gravel pit located in an area removed from the general population, in an area where other such operations are currently allowed to operate, and because the facility would be considered a minor source of air pollutants by industrial standards. Further, the asphalt plant operation would be limited by Permit #3261-02 to total emissions of 250 tons per year or less from all non-fugitive emissions sources operated at any given site. The Department believes that this facility could be expected to operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations, as outlined in Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2. The addendum would also outline specific conditions and restrictions applicable to operating or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} NAAs. Therefore, the size of the facility and the corresponding permit operating conditions would, therefore, result in minimal cumulative and secondary impacts to the site and surrounding environment.

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 & SOCIAL EFFECTS: The following comments have been prepared by the Department.

A. Social Structures and Mores

The asphalt plant operation would cause no disruption to any social structures or mores in the area of operation because the source would be operating in an area previously permitted for such operations, that would be located away from the general population, would not be a major source of air pollution, and would be required to operate under the conditions of Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2 (thereby further reducing pollutant emissions). Therefore, no native or traditional communities would be affected by the proposed project operations and no impacts upon the social structures or mores to any surrounding communities would result.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area would not be impacted by the proposed asphalt plant operations because the site and surrounding area have already been designated and used for such purposes, and are separated from the general population. Additionally, the facility would be located adjacent to an existing airport and would be considered a portable/temporary source, with seasonal and intermittent operations. The facility would also be required to operate in such a manner as to minimize impacts on the human environment. Thus, no impacts to the cultural uniqueness and diversity to the area would result.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The asphalt plant operations would have little, if any, affect on the local and state tax base and tax revenue because the facility would be a small source by industrial standards and temporary in nature, would need no more than 10 employees to operate, and revenue generated for taxes would be widespread. No full time or permanent employees would be added as a result of issuing Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2, and any tax revenue that would be generated by the operations would be on a seasonal and intermittent basis for both the local and state economy.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The existing vegetation cover would be impacted by emissions from the asphalt plant. However, given the operations is relatively small in size (by industrial standards) and temporary nature, any impacts would be minor. Additionally, land surrounding initial site location (the Jellison Pit) is primarily used for similar industrial operations and the Glacier International Airport and Highway 2 would be nearby. The land surrounding the operational site is being used for local agricultural production, which includes grain production, and would be minimally affected by the asphalt plant operation. The facility emissions would be minor and pollutant dispersion would occur that would minimize impacts to agricultural production. Therefore, minor effects to local agricultural production would occur from emissions of the asphalt plant at the site, but the site would be reclaimed in an effort to minimize such impacts and to benefit the surrounding environment.

As described in Section 8.F of this EA, the impacts of air emissions from this facility would be minor. As a result, the corresponding deposition of the air pollutants on the surrounding vegetation would be minor. Also, because water use would be minimal, as described in 8.B, and the associated soil disturbance would be minimal, as described in 8.C, corresponding vegetative impacts would be minor.

E. Human Health

Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2 would incorporate conditions to ensure that the asphalt plant operations would be operated 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 8.F of this EA, the air emissions from this facility would be minimized by the use of a baghouse and opacity limitations, established in Permit #3261-02. In addition, Addendum 2 to Permit #3261-02 would include more stringent limitations for facility operations taking place in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas, including the Kalispell, Columbia Falls, and Whitefish PM_{10} nonattainment areas during wintertime operations. Also, the facility would be operated in multiple locations on a seasonal and temporary basis, which would further minimize impacts to any one area. Therefore, impacts to human health from this project would be minor.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

Access to recreational activities would not be affected because the facility would operate in an existing industrial area on a temporary and seasonal basis. Minor impacts to the quality of recreational and wilderness activities would be realized as a result of noise and visible emissions generated from the operation of the asphalt plant. However, noise impacts from the facility would have little effect on the recreational and wilderness activities at the initially (proposed) operational site, because the facility is adjacent to Highway 2 and the Glacier International Airport. Any impacts upon the quality of recreational activities would be temporary and minor, due to the portable nature of the asphalt plant operations, limitations on the visible emissions from the facility, and the other operational conditions and limitations within Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The quality and distribution of employment within the initial (proposed) operational site or any other operational site in this area would be minimally affected, as the operations would be temporary and seasonal in nature. Thus, no greater than 10 employees would be needed for such operations. Additionally, any effects on quality and distribution of employment that would occur would be minor and short-lived.

H. Distribution of Population

Given the fact that the facility would initially be operating in an industrial location and in a sparsely populated location, would have limited hours of operation, and would be operated on a seasonal and intermittent basis, no employees would be expected to permanently relocate to the area. Therefore, no change in population distribution would be expected as a result of the facility operations at this site or any other areas of operation.

I. Demands for Government Services

Government services would be required for acquiring the appropriate permits from government agencies and determining compliance with those permits. There would be an increase in vehicle traffic resulting from the operation of the asphalt plant. However, such demands on the governmental services to regulate traffic would be, at most, minor due to the relatively small size and temporary nature of the operation. This permit and corresponding addendum would address air quality concerns from the asphalt plant at the initial site location and at locations in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas. Therefore, overall demands for government services, as a result of issuing air quality Permit #3261-02 and Addendum 2, would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The asphalt plant would represent only a minor increase in the industrial and commercial activity in the proposed areas of operation because the source is a minor source of air pollution and because of the portable and temporary nature of the facility. Similar industrial and commercial activity is projected to result from production of the asphalt plant at the initial site location, but would be minor as the related facilities would also be small by industrial standards, with intermittent and seasonal operations.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

Schellinger would be allowed, by permit, to operate in areas designated by EPA as attainment, unclassified, and those NAA's and locations specified in Addendum 2. Therefore, Permit #3261-01 and Addendum 2 would contain limits, which would be protective of air quality and the ambient air quality standards while the facility is operating in these areas. The permit includes a corresponding Addendum to allow the facility to operate in certain nonattainment areas during the summer months and at 8 specified NAA sites during the winter months.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The asphalt plant operations would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the social and economic aspects of the human environment in the immediate area. Such effects would include increased spending in the areas of operation and increased traffic in the areas where the facility operates. However, no new employees are expected to be hired as a result of the addition of the new equipment. Because the source is a portable and temporary source, any social and economic effects would be seasonal and intermittent. The source would initially be operating in an industrial area designated and used for such operations. The area that is removed from the general population. Therefore, associated impacts upon the social and economic environment would be minor and short-lived.

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

If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is an appropriate level of analysis: Because this plant is a relatively minor source of air pollution and must use reasonable precautions and other means to control emissions, including those outlined in Addendum 2, there would not be any significant impacts. Permit #3261-02 includes conditions and limitations, which, if properly applied, will safeguard the environment and also allow the proposed asphalt plant to operate.

Other groups or agencies contacted or which may have overlapping jurisdiction: Department of Environmental Quality – Permitting and Compliance Division (Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau), State Historic Preservation Office (Montana Historical Society).

Individuals or groups contributing to this EA: Department of Environmental Quality – Permitting and Compliance Division (Air and Waste Management Bureau and Industrial and Energy Minerals Bureau), State Historic Preservation Office (Montana Historical Society).

EA prepared by: Skye Hatten
Date: 12/4/08