

**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Environmental Assessment**

**Permitting and Compliance Division
Water Protection Bureau**

Name of Project: Gallatin Gateway County Water & Sewer District

Type of Project: Discharge of wastewater into ground water under the Montana Ground Water Pollution Control System (MGWPCS) permit program

Location of Project: Southeast ¼ of Section 11, Township 3 South, Range 4 East, Gallatin County

City/Town: Gallatin Gateway

County: Gallatin

Description of Project: The following Environmental Assessment (EA) addresses a permit for the proposed Gallatin Gateway County Water & Sewer District Wastewater Treatment Facility. The proposed facility would treat domestic wastewater created by existing residential and non-residential sources. The proposed permit authorizes the permittee to discharge treated wastewater into Class I ground water through a subsurface drainfield at one discharge structure (Outfall 001).

Agency Action and Applicable Regulations: The proposed action is to issue an individual MGWPCS permit that contains effluent limits and effluent monitoring requirements. The permit is issued under the authority of the Montana Water Quality Act (75-5-101 et seq., MCA.), Montana Ground Water Pollution Control System (ARM 17.30.1001-1045), and Montana Numeric Water Quality Standards in the Department Circular DEQ-7 (October 2012).

Summary of Issues: The purpose of this action is to regulate the discharges of pollutants to state waters from the regulated facility. Issuance of an individual permit will require the applicant to implement, monitor, and manage practices to prevent pollution and the degradation of ground water.

Affected Environment & Impacts of the Proposed Project:

Y = Impacts may occur (explain under Potential Impacts).

N = Not present or No Impact will likely occur.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

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] No significant impacts identified.
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] Ground water within the area is Class I ground water with a specific conductance less than or equal to 1,000 $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$. The Department authorized a standard mixing zone for nitrate from the outfall; however, as long as the permittee adheres to the effluent limits established within the permit, water quality standards outside of the mixing zone should be met. Monitoring and reporting of the effluent is required prior to discharge to ensure compliance with applicable standards and rules.
3. AIR QUALITY: Will pollutants or particulate be produced? Is the project influenced by air quality regulations or zones?	[N] No significant impacts identified.
4. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY: Will vegetative communities be significantly impacted? Are any rare plants or cover types present?	[N] The Natural Heritage Database does not list any plant species of concern within the area of the facility.
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[N] The Natural Heritage Database indicates three species designated as S2 (very limited or potentially declining numbers) in the vicinity of the facility: Grizzly Bear, Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout, and Westslope Cutthroat Trout. However, the area directly adjacent to the proposed facility does not appear to serve any of these populations.
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] Regional studies suggest wetlands and riparian areas are at considerable risk near Gallatin Gateway, however, the proposed wastewater treatment facility does not immediately impact wetlands or riparian vegetation. Regarding threatened species, please refer to 4 and 5 (above).
7. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] None identified. The Montana State Historic Preservation Office (MSHPO) recommends that in the event that cultural materials are inadvertently discovered the permittee should contact the MSHPO office for investigation.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

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] No significant impacts have been identified.
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 power line or other energy source be needed?	[N] No significant impacts have been identified. The Department analysis indicates that water quality standards will not be exceeded outside of the standard mixing zone for the parameters expected in the effluent. The monitoring and reporting requirements of the effluent ensure the identification of significant variations in the wastewater.
10. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N] No significant impacts identified.

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

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] No significant impacts identified.
13. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N] No significant impacts identified.
14. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N] No significant tax revenue impacts identified.
15. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N] No, the proposed facility would serve existing homes, businesses, and community facilities.
16. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] None identified.
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] None identified.
18. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project	[N] The proposed treatment facility would serve existing

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
add to the population and require additional housing?	sources of domestic wastewater and potentially could serve a small increase in population.
19. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N] No significant impacts identified.
20. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N] No significant impacts identified.
21. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N] No significant impacts identified.
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] No significant impacts identified.
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] No significant impacts identified.
22(c). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: If the answer to 22(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] No significant impacts identified in 22(b).

23. Description of and Impacts of other Alternatives Considered:

- A. No Action: Under the “No Action” alternative, the Department would not issue an individual ground water discharge permit under the Montana Ground Water Pollution Control System administrative rules. The proposed action will have environmental benefits compared to leaving the facility unpermitted.
- B. Approval with modification: The Department has not identified any necessary modifications to grant approval.

24. Summary of Magnitude and Significance of Potential Impacts:

Impacts were assessed with the assumption that the facility will comply with the terms and conditions of the permit. Violations of the permit could lead to significant adverse impacts to state waters. Violations of the permit are not an effect of the agency action

since the permit itself forbids such activities. However, the Department has taken steps to ensure that violations do not occur. The Department provides assistance to applicants in understanding and implementing the requirements of the permit. The Department also conducts periodic inspections of permitted facilities, and identifies potential problems with design or management practices. If violations of the permit do occur, the Department will take appropriate action under the water quality act (75-5-617, MCA). Enforcement sanctions for violations of the permit include injunctions, civil and administrative penalties, and cleanup orders.

25. **Cumulative Effects:** The issuance of this individual MGWPCS discharge permit would not have cumulative effects because the permit prohibits pollution and degradation of state waters.
26. **Preferred Action Alternative and Rationale:** The preferred action is to reissue the individual MGWPCS discharge permit. This action is preferred since the permit provides a regulatory mechanism for protecting ground water quality by applying effluent limits and monitoring requirements to the discharged wastewater.

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 because the project lacks significant adverse effects to the human and physical environment.

27. **Public Involvement:** A 30-day public comment period (MT-13-17) will be held from July 8, 2013 through August 8, 2013. A public hearing has not been held. Public comment documents will be posted on the Department web page: <http://deq.mt.gov/notices/WQnotices.mcp>. For copies of the draft EA or to submit comments, write or call the Montana Department of Environmental Quality c/o Barb Sharpe, P.O. Box 200901, Helena MT 59620-0901, telephone (406) 444-2838
28. **Persons and agencies consulted in the preparation of this analysis:**
Montana Natural Heritage Program
Montana Fish and Wildlife web site, animal species information web page
Natural Resource Information System, Montana State Library
Historical Preservation Society
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey

EA Checklist Prepared By:

Rainie DeVaney

June 7, 2013

Approved By:

Bob Habeck, Chief
Water Protection Bureau
Permitting and Compliance Division

DRAFT

Signature

Date