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

August 4, 2011

Joni Johnson
Seifert Enterprises, LLC
Plant #1
P.O. Box 210
198 Range View Loop
West Cliffe, CO 81252

Dear Ms. Johnson:

Montana Air Quality Permit #4667-00 is deemed final as of August 4, 2011, by the Department of Environmental Quality (Department). This permit is for a portable crushing and screen operation. 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

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

Whitney Walsh

Whitney Walsh
Environmental Engineer Intern
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 782-2689 ext. 208

VW: WW
Enclosure

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: Seifert Enterprises, LLC
Plant #1
P.O. Box 210
198 Range View Loop
West Cliffe, CO 81252

Montana Air Quality Permit number: 4667-00

Preliminary Determination Issued: 07/01/2011
Department Decision Issued: 07/19/2011
Permit Final: 08/04/2011

1. *Legal Description of Site*: Seifert proposes to operate a portable nonmetallic mineral processing facility, which would initially be located at Section 15, Township 27 North, Range 56 East within Richland County, Montana. However, MAQP #4667-00 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 would be required for locations within Missoula County, Montana. An addendum would be required for locations in or within 10 km of certain PM_{10} nonattainment areas.

2. *Description of Project*: The Department received a permit application from Seifert for the proposed operation of a portable crushing and screening facility with a maximum rated design process rate of 500 TPH for crushing and 500 TPH of screening production. Seifert proposes to utilize a portable electrical generator powered by a diesel-fired engine of 225 hp and a direct drive engine of 160 hp to supply electrical power to the plant. Seifert has requested that this permit be written in a de minimis friendly manner.

3. *Objectives of Project*: The objective of the project would be to produce business and revenue for the company through the sale and use of aggregate. The issuance of MAQP #4667-00 would allow Seifert to operate the permitted equipment at various locations throughout Montana (as described above), including the proposed 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 Seifert 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 #4667-00.

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

This permitting action would have a minor effect on terrestrial and aquatic life and habitats, as the initial proposed project would be located within an existing industrial property that has already been disturbed. Any subsequent locations would likely be commercial pit locations that have also already been disturbed. Furthermore, the air emissions would have only minor effects on terrestrial and aquatic life because facility emissions would be well dispersed in the area of the operations (see Section 7.F of this EA) and would expect to have intermittent and seasonal operations. 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 general facility area. This water use would only cause minor, if any, impacts to water resources because the facility would require a small volume of water. In addition, the facility would emit air pollutants, and corresponding deposition of pollutants would occur, as described in Section 7.F. of this EA. However, the Department determined that, due to dispersion characteristics of pollutants and conditions that would be placed in MAQP #4667-00, any impacts from deposition of pollutants on water quality, quantity, and distribution would be expected to be minor.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture

Only minor impacts from deposition of air pollutants on soils would be expected (as described in Section 7.F of this EA) and only minor amounts of water would be used for pollution control. Thus, only minimal water runoff would occur. Since only minor amounts of pollution would be generated and corresponding emissions would be widely dispersed before settling upon surrounding soils and vegetation (as described in Section 7.D of this EA), impacts would be expected to be minor. Therefore, any effects upon geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture from air pollutant emissions from equipment operations would be expected to be minor and short-lived.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Only minor impacts would be expected to occur on vegetative cover, quality, and quantity because the facility would operate in an area where vegetation has been previously disturbed. During operations, the facility would be a minor source of emissions and the pollutants would be widely dispersed (as described in Section 7.F of this EA); therefore, deposition on vegetation from the proposed project would be minor. Since water usage would be minimal (as described in Section 7.B of this EA) and the associated soil disturbance from the application of water and water runoff would be minimal (as described in Section 7.C of this EA), corresponding vegetative impacts would be expected to be minor.

E. Aesthetics

The crushing facility would be visible and would create noise while operating at the proposed site. However, Permit MAQP #4667-00 includes conditions to control emissions, including visible emissions, from the plant. The facility would be portable, would operate on an intermittent and seasonal basis, and would be a small industrial source. Therefore, any visual aesthetic impacts would be short-lived and minor.

F. Air Quality

Air quality impacts from the proposed project would be minor since the facility would be relatively small and operate on an intermittent and temporary basis. MAQP #4667-00 includes conditions that would limit the facility's opacity; require water and water spray bars be available on site and used to ensure compliance with opacity standards; and limit the facility's production rate.

Furthermore, the Department determined that this crushing/screening facility would be a minor source of emissions as defined under the Title V Operating Permit Program because the source's potential to emit is limited to below the major source threshold level of 100 TPY for any regulated pollutant. Pollutant deposition from the facility would be expected to be minimal because the pollutants emitted would be widely dispersed (from factors such as wind velocity and wind direction) and would have minimal deposition on the surrounding area. Therefore, air quality impacts from operating the crushing facility in this area would be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

In an effort to assess any potential impacts to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the initial proposed area of operation (Section 15, Township 27 North, Range 56 East, Richland County, Montana), the Department contacted the Natural Resource Information System – Montana Natural Heritage Program. Search results concluded there are fifteen known species of concern within the area. The search area in this case is defined by the section, township, and range of the proposed site, with an additional 1-mile buffer. The known species of concern include fifteen vertebrate animals: the Whooping Crane (Endangered), Piping Plover (Threatened), Least Tern (Endangered), Black-billed Cuckoo,

Pallid Sturgeon (Endangered), Paddlefish, Shortnose Gar, Northern Redbelly Dace, Sturgeon Chub, Sicklefin Chub, Blue Sucker, Iowa Darter, Sauger, Eastern Red Bat, and Townsend's Big-eared Bat. While these species may be found within the search area, their preferred habitat would not likely include the relatively small and previously disturbed initial project location. Specific effects of operating the crushing facility in this area would be minor since the facility is relatively small in size and located within an existing pit, and would have only seasonal and intermittent operations in the area. Therefore, the Department determined that any effects upon these species would be minor and short-lived.

Initial and typical operations would likely take place within a previously disturbed industrial site, further limiting the potential for impact to any unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resource. Therefore, the overall industrial nature of the area would not change as a result of the proposed project and any associated impacts would be expected to be minor.

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

Due to the relatively small size of the project, any demand on environmental resources would expect to be minor. Small quantities of water would be required for dust suppression of particulate emissions generated at the site. Since the emissions from the source would be minor, intermittent, and seasonal, demands on air resources would be minor. Due to operating schedule, energy requirements would also be small and provided on-site by a diesel-fired engines and generator. In conclusion, overall impacts to water, air, and energy resources would 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 initial location of the facility. Search results concluded that there were no previously recorded historical or archaeological resources of concern within the search area surrounding the proposed site for initial operation of the processing plant. Therefore, no impacts upon historical or archaeological sites would be expected as a result of operating the proposed crushing/screening plant.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

Operation of the portable crushing/screening plant would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because it would be located at a previously constructed pit and would be limited in the amount of air emissions generated. Emissions and noise generated from the equipment would likely result in only minor impacts to the area of operation because it would be seasonal and temporary in nature. Additionally, if this facility were used in conjunction with any other equipment owned and operated by Seifert, the combined emissions would not be permitted to exceed 250 tons per year of non-fugitive emissions of any individual pollutant. Overall, cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment would expect to 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
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 operation of the crushing facility would cause no disruption to the social structures and mores in the area because the source would be a minor industrial source of emissions and would only have temporary and intermittent operations. Further, the facility would be required to operate according to the conditions that would be placed in MAQP #4667-00, which would limit the effects to social structures and mores.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

Since the initial location is sited within a previously constructed open cut mine the cultural uniqueness and diversity of this area would not be impacted by the operation of the proposed crushing/screening facility.

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. According to Seifert, the facility would employ a maximum of six employees during the operating season. However, as the facility is 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 since the source would be portable and the money generated for taxes would be widely distributed.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The proposed project would have a minor impact on local industrial production since the facility would increase scoria/gravel production. Minimal deposition of air pollutants would be expected to occur on the surrounding land (as described above in Section 7.F), whereby effects on the surrounding vegetation or agricultural production would be expected to be minor.

E. Human Health

MAQP #4667-00 would incorporate conditions to ensure that the crushing and screening facility 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 7.F. of this EA, the air emissions from this facility would be minimized by the use of water spray and other operational limits. Additionally, the facility would be operating on a temporary and seasonal basis. Therefore, only minor impacts would be expected on human health from the proposed project.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

Based on information presented by Seifert, no recreational activities or wilderness areas are near the proposed project site. Therefore, no impacts to the access to and quality of recreational and wilderness activities are anticipated.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

The portable crushing/screening operation would be used in association with a nearby construction project so the operations at this location would be temporary. No individuals would be expected to permanently relocate to this area as a result of operating the crushing/screening facility. Therefore, no effects upon the quantity and distribution of employment in this area would be expected.

H. Distribution of Population

Based on information from Seifert the facility would require employment of a maximum of six individuals. However, since operation would be based out of Colorado and this project site is temporary, no local employment would be expected. 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

While the crushing and screening facility is operating a minor increase in traffic may occur on existing roadways in the area. In addition, 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, demands for government services would be minor.

J. Industrial and Commercial Activity

The operation of the crushing and screening facility would represent only a minor increase in the industrial activity in the proposed area of operation because the source would be a relatively small industrial source that is portable and temporary in nature. No additional industrial or commercial activity would be expected as a result of the proposed operation.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

Seifert would be allowed through issuance of MAQP #4667-00 to operate in areas throughout Montana designated by EPA as attainment or unclassified for ambient air quality. An Addendum would be required to operate in or within 10 km of a PM_{10} nonattainment area. MAQP #4667-00 would contain operational restrictions for protecting air quality and to keep the facility's emissions in compliance with any applicable ambient air quality standards as well as any locally adopted environmental plan or goal. The Department is unaware of any locally adopted environmental plans or goals in the initial project location. Because the proposed crushing and screening facility would be a portable source and would have intermittent and seasonal operations, any impacts from the project would be minor and short-lived.

L. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The operation of the crushing and screening facility would present only minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the social and economic aspects to the human environment within the immediate area of operation, as the source would be portable and temporary. A slight increase in traffic would have minor effects on local traffic in the immediate area. Because the source is relatively small and temporary, only minor economic impacts to the local economy would be expected from operating the facility. Furthermore, this facility may be operated in conjunction with other equipment owned and operated by Seifert but any cumulative impacts upon the social and economic aspects of the human environment would be minor and short-lived. Thus, only minor and temporary cumulative effects would be expected on the local economy.

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 a portable crushing and screening facility. MAQP #4667-00 includes conditions and limitations to ensure the facility would 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: W. Walsh
Date: June 30, 2011