

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Environmental Assessment

PERMITTING AND COMPLIANCE DIVISION
Water Protection Bureau

Name of Project: The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) will reissue the Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (MPDES) permit for the Town of Hobson Wastewater Treatment Facility (Hobson WWTF) for a five-year cycle.

Type of Project: The DEQ proposes to renew the MPDES permit for the Hobson WWTF that serves the Town of Hobson. The Hobson WWTF is a two-cell facultative lagoon system. The current WWTF was constructed in 1993 on the footprint of the former lagoons.

The Hobson WWTF was designed to serve 258 residents, and currently serves approximately 211 residents. The design flow of the facility is 0.039 million gallons per day (mgd) or 0.06 cubic feet per second (cfs). The lagoons have a combined detention time of 207 days. The two lagoon cells are lined with a synthetic liner.

The wastewater collection system serving the Town of Hobson consists of over 12,500 feet of gravity sewer line, an influent wastewater lift station and a force main to transport the wastewater to the treatment facility. The gravity sewer lines are all 8-inches in diameter. The force main is 6 inches in diameter. A lagoon influent splitter gate vault allows wastewater to be directed to either lagoon No. 1 or to lagoon No. 2.

Location of Project: T 14N, R 15 E, Section 26

City/Town: Hobson

County: Judith Basin

Description of Project: MPDES permit renewal.

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

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 draft permit preserves the effluent concentration limits for BOD₅, TSS, and the limits for *E. coli* from the previous permit. Load limits for BOD₅ and TSS from the previous permit will be maintained in addition to the concentration limits for these parameters. New effluent limits for BOD₅ and TSS percent removal are incorporated into the draft permit. Monitoring of the effluent is required at the end of the treatment train, prior to discharge to the effluent ditch.

Benefits and Purpose of Action: The permit will ensure compliance with the Montana Water Quality Act and protect beneficial uses of the Judith River.

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]
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 will improve effluent quality and protect beneficial uses of the Judith River.
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]

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
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]
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N]
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. LAND USE: (waste disposal, agricultural lands [grazing, cropland, forest lands, prime farmland], recreational lands [waterways, parks, playgrounds, open space, federal lands), access, commercial and industrial facilities [production & activity, growth or decline], growth, land-use change, development activity)	[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]
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]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
RESOURCE	[Y/N] POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES
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]
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.	[N]

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: An EIS is not required under the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) because the project lacks significant adverse effects to the human and physical environment. All of the anticipated effects to the physical and human environment will be mitigated or eliminated during project implementation.

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:

EA prepared by: Jeffrey H. Ward
Date: July 2012

Approved by:

Jenny Chambers, Chief
Water Protection Bureau

Date