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

June 25, 2009

Scott Siddoway
Colstrip Energy Limited Partnership
1087 West River Street, Suite 200
Boise, ID 83702

Dear Mr. Siddoway:

Montana Air Quality Permit #2035-05 is deemed final as of June 25, 2009, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). This permit is for a mercury emission limit and associated operating requirements for the circulating fluidized bed boiler. All conditions of the Department's Decision remain the same. Enclosed is a copy of your permit with the final date indicated.

For the Department,

Vickie Walsh

Moriah Thunstrom

Vickie Walsh
Air Permitting Program Supervisor
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-9741

Moriah Thunstrom
Environmental Engineer
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-4267

VW: MT
Enclosures

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

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued To: Colstrip Energy Limited Partnership
Rosebud Power Plant
1087 West River Street, Suite 200
Boise, ID 83702

Air Quality Permit Number: 2035-05

Preliminary Determination Issued: April 30, 2009
Department Decision Issued: June 9, 2009
Permit Final: June 25, 2009

1. *Legal Description of Site:* North 1/2, Section 32, Township 3 North, Range 41 East in Rosebud County, Montana

2. *Description of Project:* CELP is proposing to install and operate mercury emission controls in conjunction with an MEMS.

3. *Objectives of Project:* This project would reduce current mercury emission levels to a maximum of 0.9 lb/TBtu, calculated as a rolling 12-month average, and would fulfill requirements of ARM 17.8.771 with respect to applying for a permit to include the applicable mercury emission standard and control strategy requirements.

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 CELP 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 mercury control technology analysis, would be included in MAQP #2035-05.

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	Aquatic and Terrestrial 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

Any impacts resulting from the proposed project to terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats would be minor because all proposed activities would take place within the defined CELP property boundary, an existing industrial site. Further, minor impact to the surrounding area from the air emissions (see Section VII of the permit analysis) would be realized due to dispersion of pollutants.

B. Water Quality, Quantity and Distribution

Any impacts resulting from the proposed project to water quality, quantity, and distribution would be minor because all proposed activities would take place within the defined CELP property boundary, an existing industrial site. Further, minor impact to the surrounding area from the air emissions (see Section VII of the permit analysis) would be realized due to dispersion of pollutants.

Sorbents and coal combustion byproducts (CCB) used in, or resulting from, mercury control have been extensively studied and found to be stable from the standpoint of leachability of captured mercury and other metals. The Department reviewed current literature on the subject of mercury leaching from CCBs. The literature is in substantial agreement on the point that mercury captured with activated carbon does not leach readily from fly ash. A number of leaching methods were used in the reviewed analyses, including Toxic Chemical Leaching Procedure(TCLP), a Synthetic Groundwater Leaching Procedure (SGLP), 30-day and 60-day long-term leaching tests, and adaptations of TCLP at lower (2.0) and higher (7.0) pH values. In many cases the dissolved mercury in the leachate was below detection limits, and in all cases was below Federal Maximum Contaminant Level for mercury in drinking water. The Department determined that the use of activated carbon for mercury control would not present a source of groundwater pollution.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture

Any impacts resulting from the proposed project to geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture would be minor because all proposed activities with respect to limits and practices associated with limiting mercury emissions would take place within the defined CELP property boundary, an existing industrial site. Further, minor impact to the surrounding area from the air emissions (see Section VII of the permit analysis) would be realized due to dispersion of pollutants.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Any impacts resulting from the proposed project to vegetation cover, quantity, and quality would be minor because all proposed activities with respect to limits and practices associated with the proposed permit action would take place within the defined CELP property boundary, an existing industrial site. Further, minor impact to the surrounding area from the air emissions (see Section VII of the permit analysis) would be realized due to dispersion of pollutants.

E. Aesthetics

Minor impacts to the aesthetic nature of the area would result from the proposed CELP permit action because all proposed activities would take place within the defined CELP property boundary, an existing industrial site. Any changes in operational practices to minimize mercury emissions may be visible from locations around the CELP site. However, the CELP site is a previously disturbed industrial location; any aesthetic impacts would be minor and consistent with current industrial land use of the area.

Overall, any impacts to the aesthetic nature of the project area from CELP's proposed permit action, including construction activities and normal operations resulting in air emissions and deposition of air emissions would be minor.

F. Air Quality

The air quality impacts from the current permit action would be minor because MAQP #2035-05 would include conditions limiting emissions of air pollutants from the source, specifically by establishing a mercury emissions limit and requiring specific mercury emission control technologies be implemented.

The Department reviewed current literature on the possible loss of mercury to the atmosphere from CCBs, either as mercury vapor, or biologically-mediated dimethylmercury. Microbial methylation generally requires a good supply of organic matter and an approximately neutral pH level. Ash is generally very poor in organic matter and, in Montana, the ash is alkaline. Research on mercury methylation has indicated that the total mercury volatilization rate tends to be extremely small. The Department determined that it is very unlikely that any measurable amount of mercury could be released to the atmosphere from ash ponds.

Overall, any impacts to the air quality of the project area from CELP's proposed permit action, including construction activities, normal operations resulting in air emissions, and deposition of air emissions would be minor and in compliance with all applicable state and federal ambient air quality standards.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

The Department contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) in an effort to identify any species of special concern associated with the proposed project location. Search results concluded there is one species of concern in the area. Area, in this case, is defined by the township and range of the proposed project location, with an additional one-mile buffer. The species of concern identified by the MNHP is the common sagebrush lizard.

The CELP site is currently used for industrial purposes. Any changes in operation associated with minimizing mercury emissions would take place within the existing plant site. Because industrial operations have been ongoing within the existing CELP property boundary and potential permitted emissions from CELP show compliance with all applicable air quality standards, it is unlikely that the species of special concern would be affected by the proposed project. Overall, any impacts to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources would be minor.

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

Demands on environmental resources of water, air, and energy would be minor. As previously discussed, the proposed permit action would establish a limit for allowable air emissions of mercury and mercury control practices. Therefore, any impacts to air resources in the area would be minor and would be in compliance with applicable standards.

This permit action does not include any increase in the demand for water. Therefore, any impacts to the demand for water resources in the affected area associated with CELP operations would be minor.

This permit action would not change, in general, the overall amount of power used or produced. Overall, any impacts to the demands on the environmental resources of water, air, and energy from CELP's proposed permit action would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

In an effort to identify any historical and archaeological sites near the proposed project area, the Department contacted the Montana Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). According to SHPO, there have been no previously recorded sites within the designated search locales. SHPO indicated as long as there would be no disturbances or alterations to structures over 50 years of age, there would be a low likelihood cultural properties would be impacted and did not feel a recommendation for a cultural resource inventory was warranted at this time.

The Department determined that due to the previous industrial disturbance in the area (the area is an active industrial site) and the small amount of land disturbance that may be required for the proposed permit action, it is unlikely that any undisturbed existing historical or cultural resource exists in the area and if these resources did exist, any impacts would be minor due to previous industrial disturbance in the area.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Overall, any cumulative and secondary impacts from the proposed permit modification on the physical and biological resources of the human environment in the immediate area would be minor due to the fact that the predominant use of the surrounding area would not change as a result of the proposed project. The Department believes that this facility could be expected to operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as would be outlined in MAQP #2035-05.

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
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 proposed project would not cause a disruption to any native or traditional lifestyles or communities (social structures or mores) in the area because the project would be constructed at a previously disturbed, industrial site. The proposed project would not change the nature of the site.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The proposed project would not cause a change in the cultural uniqueness and diversity of the area because the land is currently used for electrical generation using waste coal; therefore, the land use would not be changing.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The plant's overall capacity would not change as a result of the proposed project. In addition, no new employees would be needed for this project. Therefore, no impacts to the local and state tax base and tax revenue are anticipated from this project.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The current permit action would not displace or otherwise affect any agricultural land or practices since CELP operates on an existing industrial site.

E. Human Health

There would be minor potential effects on human health due to limiting mercury air emissions from the operation of the boiler. In addition, MAQP #2035-05 would include conditions to ensure that the facility would be operated in compliance with all applicable rules and standards. These rules and standards are designed to be protective of human health. Overall, the Department determined that any impact to public health would be minor.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

The proposed permit action and overall CELP operations would not affect access to any recreational or wilderness activities in the area. CELP would continue to be located at its existing industrial site. This project would not result in any changes in access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

No change in the number of employees currently onsite is anticipated as a result of this project. Therefore, this project would not have impacts to the quantity and distribution of employment in the area.

H. Distribution of Population

This project does not involve any significant physical or operational change that would affect the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population. The distribution of population would not change as a result of this project.

I. Demands for Government Services

Demands on government services from the proposed permit modification would be minor because CELP would be required to procure the appropriate permits (including a state air quality permit) and any permits for the associated activities of the project. Further, compliance verification with those permits would also require minor services from the government. Overall, any demands on government services resulting from the proposed permit modification would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The current permit action would change various aspects of the previous CELP operations, specifically related to minimizing mercury emissions associated with the operation of the boiler, but would not result in an overall change in facility purpose; therefore, the proposed permit modification would not impact any industrial or commercial activity in the area.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

The current permit action would not contribute to the nonattainment status of any surrounding area. The Department is unaware of any other locally adopted environmental plans or goals. The state air quality standards would protect air quality at the proposed site and the environment surrounding the site.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts from the proposed permit modification on the economic and social resources of the human environment in the immediate area would be minor due to the fact that the predominant use of the surrounding area would not change as a result of the proposed project. The Department believes that this facility could be expected to operate in compliance with all applicable rules and regulations as would be outlined in MAQP #2035-05.

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 establishes a mercury emission limit and associated operating requirements for the boiler in order to comply with ARM 17.8.771. MAQP #2035-05 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: Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) – Air Resources Management Bureau; Montana Historical Society – State Historic Preservation Office; Natural Resource Information System – Montana Natural Heritage Program.

EA prepared by: Moriah Thunstrom
Date: April 15, 2009