



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: March 28, 2012

Name of Applicant: MK Weeden Construction

Source: Crusher/Screening Facility

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 4536-01.

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 April 12, 2012. 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) 444-9741

Craig Henrikson
Environmental Engineer
Air Resources Management Bureau
(406) 444-6711

VW: CH
Enclosures

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

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)

Issued To: MK Weeden Construction

Montana Air Quality Permit number: 4536-01

Preliminary Determination Issued: 03/28/2012

Department Decision Issued:

Permit Final:

1. *Legal Description of Site:* Section 13, Township 26 North, Range 57 East, in Richland County, Montana.
2. *Description of Project:* MK Weeden proposes to operate a portable crushing/screening plant.
3. *Objectives of Project:* MK Weeden proposes to operate a portable screening plant to sort sand and gravel like material for various uses.
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 MK Weeden 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 #4536-01.
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

Terrestrials may use the same area as the facility site. The proposed project would be considered a minor source of emissions by industrial standards. Limitations and conditions would be placed in MAQP #4536-01 to minimize these emissions. Minor effects on terrestrial life would be expected.

Impacts on aquatic life may result from storm water runoff and pollutant deposition, but such impacts would be minor as the facility would be a minor source of emissions. Since only a minor amount of air emissions would be generated, only minor deposition would occur. Therefore, only minor effects to aquatic life and habitat would be expected from the proposed screening operation.

B. Water Quality, Quantity and Distribution

Water would be required for pollution control for equipment operation. However, pollutant deposition and water use would cause minor impacts as only a small volume of water would be used and only a small amount of pollution deposition would be expected. Overall, the equipment would be expected to have minor impacts to water quality, quantity, and distribution in the area of operation.

C. Geology and Soil Quality, Stability and Moisture

The facility would be a minor source of emissions by industrial standards and would occupy a relatively small area for the crushing/screening operations. Therefore, impacts from the emissions from the crushing/screening operation would be expected to be minor.

The crushing/screening operation would have only minor impacts on soils in any proposed site location because the facility is relatively small in size, would use relatively small amounts of water for pollution control, and would be expected to have seasonal and intermittent operations. Therefore, any affects upon geology and soil quality, stability, and moisture at any proposed operational site would be expected to be minor.

D. Vegetation Cover, Quantity, and Quality

Because the equipment at the facility would be a minor source of emissions by industrial standards and would operate in a relatively small area a used for the crushing/screening operations, impacts from the emissions of the operation would be minor.

The amount of air emissions from this project would be minor. As a result, the corresponding deposition of the air pollutants on the surrounding vegetation would also be minor.

E. Aesthetics

The crushing/screening operation would be visible and would create additional noise while operating. However, MAQP #4536-01 would include conditions to control emissions, including visible emissions, from the plant. Also, because the screening operation would be portable, would be expected to operate on an intermittent and seasonal basis, and would typically locate within an area designated for such activities, any visual and noise impacts would be expected to be minor and short-lived. At the initial proposed location, the nearest residence is approximately 1.4 miles away.

F. Air Quality

The air quality impacts from the screening operation would be expected to be minor because the facility would be relatively small and be required to operate using appropriate air pollution controls. MAQP #4536-01 would include conditions limiting the opacity from the plant, as well as requiring water spray bars to control air pollution.

Furthermore, this facility would be expected to be used on a temporary and intermittent basis, thereby further reducing potential air quality impacts from the facility. Air quality impacts would be expected to be minor.

G. Unique Endangered, Fragile, or Limited Environmental Resources

To assess potential impacts to unique endangered, fragile, or limited environmental resources in the proposed area of operations, the Department contacted the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) to identify any species of concern associated with the initial proposed site location. Search results concluded the whooping crane is the single species of concern for the proposed site. The defined area, in this case, is defined by the township and range of the proposed site, with an additional one-mile buffer.

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

The crushing/screening operation would require only small quantities of water, air, and energy for proper operation. Water would be used for dust suppression and would control particulate emissions being generated at the site. However the total usage would be expected to be relatively small. Energy requirements would be required, and consist mostly of one on-site diesel fired generator. Any impacts to water, air, and energy resources in any given area would be minor.

I. Historical and Archaeological Sites

The Department contacted the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to request a cultural resource file search for the project location to aid the Department in the assessment of impacts to historical and archeological sites. The SHPO file search reported no previously recorded sites within the designated search area. The Department would expect minor, if any, impacts to any sites present in the area.

J. Cumulative and Secondary Impacts

The proposed project would cause minor cumulative and secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment because the facility would generate emissions. Noise would also be generated from the site. Emissions and noise would cause minimal disturbance because the equipment is small and the facility would be expected to operate in areas designated and used for such operations. The potential impacts to the individual physical and biological considerations above were minor. Collectively, any cumulative or secondary impacts to the physical and biological aspects of the human environment would be expected 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 proposed project would result in minor, if any, impacts to social structures and mores. The project would typically operate in an area designated for crushing and screening activities. Furthermore, the operations are expected to be intermittent and seasonal.

B. Cultural Uniqueness and Diversity

The proposed project would result in minor, if any, impacts to cultural uniqueness and diversity. The project would typically operate in an area designated for such activities. Furthermore, operations are expected to be intermittent and seasonal. No significant employment is expected.

C. Local and State Tax Base and Tax Revenue

The proposed project would result in minor, if any, impacts to the local and state tax base and tax revenue. The equipment proposed would not be expected to require any more than a few additional employees.

D. Agricultural or Industrial Production

The equipment would typically operate in an area previously designated for agricultural operations. The proposed project would have a minor impact on local industrial production since the project would increase air emissions slightly.

Conditions and limitations placed in MAQP #4536-01 would ensure only a minor increase in allowable air emissions, with minimal deposition of air pollutants. Therefore, deposition on the surrounding land and vegetation would be expected to be minor. Any affects to agricultural production would be expected to be minor.

E. Human Health

Conditions would be incorporated into MAQP #4536-01 to ensure that the facility would operate in compliance with all applicable air quality rules and standards. These rules and standards are designed to protect human health. The air emissions from this project would be required to be minimized by the use of water spray.

F. Access to and Quality of Recreational and Wilderness Activities

This facility would typically be located on previously disturbed property and would not be expected to impact access to recreational and wilderness activities. Minor impact on the quality of recreational activities might be created by noise. Visible air emissions would be minimized as a result of limitations placed in the MAQP and the expected temporary and portable nature of the operation.

G. Quantity and Distribution of Employment

This facility would be a small, portable operation. Therefore, this project would not be expected to have any more than a minor effect to the quantity and distribution of employment in any given area of operation.

H. Distribution of Population

The facility would be small and temporary in nature with very few employees. Therefore, the facility would be expected to have little, if any, impact on the normal population distribution in the area of operation or any future operating site.

I. Demands for Government Services

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 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, and be portable and temporary in nature.

K. Locally Adopted Environmental Plans and Goals

The Department is not aware of any locally adopted environmental plans or goals. The proposed project would be allowed by its Montana Air Quality Permit to operate in areas 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 PM₁₀ nonattainment area. The permit would contain maximum capacity and opacity limits for protecting air quality and to keep facility emissions in compliance with any applicable ambient air quality standards. Because the facility would be small and portable, any impacts from the project would be minor.

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.

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/screening operation. MAQP #4536-01 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: Craig Henrikson

Date: 03/15/2012