

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



MARC RACICOT, GOVERNOR

STATE OF MONTANA

(406) 444-2544

PO BOX 200901
HELENA, MONTANA 59620-0901

RECEIVED

JUN 03 1998

**ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY COUNCIL**

May 28, 1998

To Whom It May Concern:

The Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has prepared the following Environmental Assessment as required by law in ARM 16.2.626(2) and ARM 16.2.628(2). This project involves removing the existing underground fuel storage tanks and piping, and installing three single-wall fiberglass underground fuel storage tanks with double-wall fiberglass piping at 8192 Huffine Lane in Bozeman, MT.

The DEQ prepares Environmental Assessments to inform interested government agencies, public groups, or individuals of a proposed action and to determine whether or not the action may have a significant effect on the human or natural environment. This Environmental Assessment will be circulated for seven (7) days. After the seven-day comment period, DEQ will decide what action to take regarding this permit.

If you care to comment on this proposed action, please write or call the Remediation Division by June 5, 1998. Our telephone number is 406-444-1420 and our mailing address is P.O. Box 200901, Helena, MT, 59620-0901.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeff L. Tobin".

Jeff Tobin
Environmental Engineer Specialist

cc: Environmental Assessment

O/O NAME: Sutey Oil Co	FACILITY NO: 16-05064
PERMIT NO: 98-0727	DATE OF APPLICATION: 5/26/98
PERSON PREPARING EA: Jeff Tomlin, Env. Eng. Spec.	COUNTY: Gallitan
LOCATION: 8192 Huffine Lane (4 Corners W)	West of Bozeman, MT
FACILITY NAME: Thriftway #8	EA COMPLETED: 5/28/98
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: Close existing tanks and piping, and install three single-wall fiberglass underground storage tanks with double-wall flex piping.	
DESCRIPTION OF THE BENEFITS AND PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION: Comply with 1998 requirements and build new store and fueling facility to replace the existing store and fuel facility.	

- A: Significant Unavoidable Impacts
- B: Insignificant as a result of conditioned mitigation
- C: Insignificant as proposed

	POTENTIAL IMPACTS					
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	AMPLIFICATION
PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>TOPOGRAPHY</u> : Are there unusual geologic features? Will the surface features be changed?			x			No significant impacts. Location is currently a gasoline and convenience store in a developed area.
2. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE</u> : Are fragile, compactible or unstable soils present? Are there special reclamation considerations?			x			No significant impacts.

	POTENTIAL IMPACTS					
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	AMPLIFICATION
3. <u>WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:</u> Are important surface or groundwater resources present? Is there potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality?			x			Groundwater estimated 18' below surface. Continuous automatic tank gauge and double-wall piping should detect leaks before serious environmental contamination.
4. <u>AIR QUALITY:</u> Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?			x			Natural air currents and vent pipes will dissipate hydrocarbon vapors to a safe level. No significant impact.
5. <u>DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:</u> Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?			x			No significant impact.
6. <u>IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:</u> Are there other studies, plans or projects on this tract?			x			None known.
7. <u>TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN, AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:</u> Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?			x			Minimal wildlife, birds, or fish on or around this facility. No significant impact.
8. <u>VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:</u> Will vegetative communities be permanently altered? Are any rare plants or cover types present?			x			No significant impact. Facility is and will be primarily concrete, asphalt, or compacted road mix.

May 28, 1998

	POTENTIAL IMPACTS					
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	AMPLIFICATION
9. <u>UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:</u> Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Any species of special concern?			x			None known. No significant impact.
10. <u>HISTORICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL SITE:</u> Are any historical, archeological or paleontological resources present?			x			None known. No significant impact.
11. <u>AESTHETICS:</u> Is the project on a prominent topographical feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise, light or odors?			x			Business will be visible from the roadway and adjoining properties. Noise, light, and odors will be typical for a medium sized convenience store with fuel sales.
12. <u>AGRICULTURE:</u> Will grazing lands, irrigation waters or crop production be affected?			x			No significant impact. Area is currently developed.
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT						
1. <u>SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:</u> Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?			x			None known. No significant impact.
2. <u>CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:</u> Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?			x			None expected. No significant impact.
3. <u>DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:</u> Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?			x			None expected. No significant impact.

May 28, 1998

	POTENTIAL IMPACTS					
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	AMPLIFICATION
4. <u>HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY:</u> Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?			x			Natural air currents and tank vents should dissipate the hydrocarbon vapors to a safe level. Leak detection equipment should detect releases before serious health or safety problems occur.
5. <u>COMMUNITY & PERSONAL INCOME:</u> Will the facility generate or degrade income?			x			Improvement to the facility should increase volume and income.
6. <u>QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:</u> Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimate number.			x			Rebuilt updated enlarged facility will create about 5 new jobs.
7. <u>LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE REVENUES:</u> Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?			x			Updating and enlarging the facility will increase it's value and therefore increase it's taxes.
8. <u>DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:</u> Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?			x			Minimal change from existing. No significant impact.
9. <u>INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:</u> Will the project add to or alter these activities?			x			No significant impacts. Area is currently developed.
10. <u>ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:</u> Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?			x			Recreational or wilderness areas are not accessed through this property.

	POTENTIAL IMPACTS					
	A	B	C	LONG TERM	SHORT TERM	AMPLIFICATION
11. <u>AESTHETICS</u> : Is the project on a prominent topographical feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise, light or odors?			x			Business will be visible from the roadway and adjoining properties. Noise, light, and odors will be typical for a medium sized convenience store with fuel sales.
12. <u>LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS</u> : Are there state, county, city, USFS, BLM, tribal, etc., zoning or management plans in effect?			x			Local officials have not expressed any concern over this project.
13. <u>TRANSPORTATION</u> : Will the project affect local transportation networks and traffic flows?			x			No significant impact.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT: The only public involvement I am aware of is this environmental assessment

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED: Close a viable business. Double-wall tanks provide better environmental protection; however, cost more.

COMPLIANCE STATUS: This project, as permitted, will be in compliance with the UST regulations. The facility must, however, be operated and maintained in accordance with the UST rules and regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING PREPARATION OF AN EIS: Not necessary at this level of disturbance.

OTHER GROUPS OR AGENCIES CONTACTED OR WHICH MAY HAVE OVERLAPPING JURISDICTION: Fire Prevention and Investigation Bureau regulates above ground components.

INDIVIDUALS OR GROUPS CONTRIBUTING TO THIS EA: The tank contractor, personal knowledge of the area, local zoning officials, and the facility owner.

cc: Director
 Division Administrator
 Governor's Office
 ✓ Legislative Environmental Policy Office