

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Environmental Assessment

PERMITTING AND COMPLIANCE DIVISION
Water Protection Bureau

Name of Project: City of Hysham, Wastewater Treatment Facility

Location of Project: 46° 17' 35" N latitude, 107° 15' 35" W longitude

City/Town: Hysham

County: Treasure

Description of Project: This is a reissuance of an MPDES permit MT0021709 for the City of Hysham Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) which intermittently discharges treated domestic wastewater to an unnamed tributary to the Yellowstone River. The unnamed tributary, an ephemeral stream, travels 1.5 miles below the point of discharge before reaching the Yellowstone River. The WWTF consist of a two-cell facultative lagoon (with one portable floating aerator in cell one) constructed in 1966. Piping modifications were completed at the facility in 1997.

Agency Action and Applicable Regulations: The proposed action of the Department is to reissue the MPDES permit for another five-year cycle.

Applicable rules and statute:

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 2 - Water Quality Permit Application and Annual Fees.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 5 - Mixing Zones in Surface and Ground Water.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 6 - Surface Water Quality Standards.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 7 - Nondegradation of Water Quality.

ARM Title 17, Chapter 30, Sub-chapter 12 and 13 - Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Standards.

Montana Water Quality Act, MCA 75-5-101 et. seq.

Summary of Issues: The effluent limits on biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) and total suspended solids (TSS) of the previous permit are continued in the renewed permit plus load (lbs/day) limits are added for BOD₅ and TSS. A numerical effluent limit on oil and grease (O & G) is added to the renewed permit along with new monitoring requirements for the parameters of BOD₅, TSS, *Escherichia coli* (*E. coli*), O & G and pH.

Affected Environment & Impacts of the Proposed Project:

Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts). Include frequency, duration (long or short term), magnitude, and context for any significant impacts identified. Reference other permit analyses when appropriate (ex: statement of basis). Address significant impacts related to substantive issues and concerns. Identify reasonable feasible mitigation measures (before and after) where significant impacts cannot be avoided and note any irreversible or irretrievable impacts. Include background information on affected environment if necessary to discussion.

N = Not present or No Impact will likely occur. *Use negative declarations where appropriate (wetlands, T&E, Cultural Resources).*

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
1. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE: Are soils present which are fragile, erosive, susceptible to compaction, or unstable? Are there unusual or unstable geologic features? Are there special reclamation considerations?	[N] The Hysham WWTF has been at this same location since 1966.
2. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION: 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?	[N] Additional effluent limits on O & G and load limits on BOD ₅ and TSS, plus additional monitoring requirements, will assure discharge quality.
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones (Class I airshed)?	[N]
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N]
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] The Hysham WWTF has been at this same location since 1966. Effluent limits will assure discharge quality.
6. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are any federally listed threatened or endangered species or identified habitat present? Any wetlands? Species of special concern?	[N] No wetlands. No known federally listed threatened or endangered species or species of special concern present. The Hysham WWTF has been at this same location since 1966. Effluent limits will assure discharge quality.
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] No sites identified. The Harlowton WWTF has been at this same location since 1966.
8. AESTHETICS: Is the project on a prominent topographic feature? Will it be visible from populated or scenic areas? Will there be excessive noise or light?	[N]
9. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY: Will the project use resources that are limited in the area? Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project? Will new or upgraded powerline or other energy source be needed)	[N]
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
11. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N] Additional effluent limits have been imposed plus additional effluent monitoring.
12. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N]
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N]
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N]
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N]
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N]
17. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES: Are wilderness or recreational areas nearby or accessed through this tract? Is there recreational potential within the tract?	[N]
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N]
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N]
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]
22(a). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Are we regulating the use of private property under a regulatory statute adopted pursuant to the police power of the state? (Property management, grants of financial assistance, and the exercise of the power of eminent domain are not within this category.) If not, no further analysis is required.	[N]
22(b). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: Is the agency proposing to deny the application or condition the approval in a way that restricts the use of the regulated person's private property? If not, no further analysis is required.	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
22(c). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: If the answer to 21(b) is affirmative, does the agency have legal discretion to impose or not impose the proposed restriction or discretion as to how the restriction will be imposed? If not, no further analysis is required. If so, the agency must determine if there are alternatives that would reduce, minimize or eliminate the restriction on the use of private property, and analyze such alternatives. The agency must disclose the potential costs of identified restrictions.	[]

- 23. Description of and Impacts of other Alternatives Considered: None
- 24. Summary of Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impact: None
- 25. Cumulative Effects: None
- 26. Preferred Action Alternative and Rationale: The preferred action is to reissue the MPDES permit. This action is preferred because the permit program provides the regulatory mechanism for protecting water quality by enforcing the terms of the MPDES permit.

Recommendation for Further Environmental Analysis:

EIS
 More Detailed EA
 No Further Analysis

Rationale for Recommendation:

- 27. Public Involvement: A 30-day public comment period will be held.
- 28. Persons and agencies consulted in the preparation of this analysis: None

EA Checklist Prepared By: James F. Brown

Date: July 8, 2009

Approved by:

 Jenny Chambers, Chief
 Water Protection Bureau

 Date