

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Environmental Assessment

Water Protection Bureau

Name of Project: Stoney Brook Condominium Village

Type of Project: Reauthorization discharge of treated domestic wastewater to ground water under the Montana Ground Water Pollution Control System (MGWPCS) permit program.

Location of Project: NW1/4NE1/4 Section 23, Township 9 North, Range 3 West

City/Town: Clancy

County: Jefferson

Description of Project: This Environmental Assessment (EA) is for a MGWPCS permit renewal for the Stoney Brook Condominium Village (facility). The proposed MGWPCS permit reauthorizes Julie Rasmussen (permittee) to discharge treated wastewater from subsurface discharge structures (Outfalls 001 and 002) into Class I ground water. The scope of this EA addresses the operation and discharge of the current wastewater treatment and disposal system. The magnitude and significance of potential impacts are summarized below (bullet #24).

Agency Action and Applicable Regulations: The proposed action is to reissue 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 (MCA 75-5-101 *et seq.*), the Montana Ground Water Pollution Control System (ARM 17.30.1001-1045), and the Montana Numeric Water Quality Standards in the Department Circular DEQ-7.

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 permittee 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	
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 have been 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] No significant impacts have been identified. The ground water in the vicinity of Outfalls 001 and 002 is Class I ground water with a specific conductance less than 1,000 µS/cm. As discussed in the Fact Sheet document, the proposed wastewater treatment system may provide a higher level of treatment of nitrogen in comparison with conventional treatment methods. DEQ has developed effluent limitations based on nondegradation-nonsignificance criteria to maintain the beneficial uses of all state waters (see Fact Sheet).
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?	[Y] Based on a search of the Natural Heritage Database the Lesser Rushy Milkvetch (<i>Astragalus convallarius</i>) was identified.
5. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS: Is there substantial use of the area by important wildlife, birds or fish?	[Y] Based on a search of the Natural Heritage Database, these species of concern have been identified including: the Spotted Bat (<i>Euderma maculatum</i>), Veery (<i>Catharus fuscescens</i>), and Evening Grosbeak (<i>Coccothraustes vespertinus</i>).
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?	[Y] Both the U.S .Fish & Wildlife Service and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management have ranked the Spotted Bat (<i>Euderma maculatum</i>) as “Sensitive”. The BLM has ranked the Veery as Sensitive.

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	
7. SAGE GROUSE EXECUTIVE ORDER: Is the project proposed in core, general or connectivity sage grouse habitat, as designated by the Sage Grouse Habitat Conservation Program (Program) at: http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/cardd/sage-grouse?	[N] The project is not listed as being within sage grouse habitat.
8. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES: Are any historical, archaeological or paleontological resources present?	[N] A general recommendation by the Montana State Historic Preservation Office (MSHPO) states that in the event that cultural materials are inadvertently discovered, the permittee should contact the MSHPO office for investigation.
9. 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] Most drainfields are constructed sub surface. Most wastewater treatment systems are enclosed within buildings located on pre-disturbed lands previously used for agriculture practices.
10. 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]
11. IMPACTS ON OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES: Are there other activities nearby that will affect the project?	[N] Discharges from this facility, if run in accordance with the terms of the permit associated with it, will not adversely affect water resources.

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
12. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY: Will this project add to health and safety risks in the area?	[N]
13. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION: Will the project add to or alter these activities?	[N]
14. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT: Will the project create, move or eliminate jobs? If so, estimated number.	[N]

IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
15. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES: Will the project create or eliminate tax revenue?	[N] Construction of more condominiums in the subdivision will increase tax revenues.
16. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES: Will substantial traffic be added to existing roads? Will other services (fire protection, police, schools, etc.) be needed?	[N]
17. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS: Are there State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, etc. zoning or management plans in effect?	[N] Wastewater treatment systems may be owned and operated by local communities or sewer districts. These systems are a vital tool in protection of their own public and environmental health.
18. 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]
19. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING: Will the project add to the population and require additional housing?	[N]
20. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES: Is some disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities possible?	[N]
21. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY: Will the action cause a shift in some unique quality of the area?	[N]
22. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:	[N]
23(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]
23(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

23(c). PRIVATE PROPERTY IMPACTS: If the answer to 23(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 were identified in 23(b).

24. **Description of and Impacts of other Alternatives Considered:**
- A. No Action: Under the “No Action” alternative, the Department would not issue this ground water discharge permit. “No Action” may lead to the creation of non-permitted wastewater systems. This may result in a net negative impact to ground water quality as the permit would prevent pollution and degradation of state waters.
 - B. Approval with Modification: The Department has identified the applicant’s request to change ground water monitoring sampling from composite sampling to grab sampling as a modification to grant approval.
25. **Cumulative Effects**: Cumulative effects were analyzed as part of this EA and permitting determination. No cumulative impacts have been identified based on ambient receiving ground water conditions at the time of this analysis (see Fact Sheet). The final permit prohibits pollution and degradation of state waters.
26. **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.

27. **Preferred Action Alternative and Rationale:** The preferred action is to reissue an 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.

28. **Public Involvement:**

Legal notice information for water quality discharge permits are listed at the following website: <http://deq.mt.gov/Public/notices/wqnotices>. Public comments on this proposal are invited any time prior to close of business on **July 6, 2016**. Comments may be directed to:

DEQWPBPublicComments@mt.gov

or at:

Water Protection Bureau
PO Box 200901
Helena, MT 59620

All comments received or postmarked prior to the close of the public comment period will be considered in the formulation of the final permit. DEQ will respond to all substantive comments pertinent to this permitting action and may issue a final decision within thirty days of the close of the public comment period.

All persons, including the applicant, who believe any condition of the draft permit is inappropriate, or that DEQ's tentative decision to deny an application, terminate a permit, or prepare a draft permit is inappropriate, shall raise all reasonably ascertainable issues and submit all reasonably available arguments supporting their position by the close of the public comment period (including any public hearing). All public comments received for this draft permit will be included in the administrative record and will be available for public viewing during normal business hours.

Copies of the public notice were mailed to the applicant, state and federal agencies and interested persons who have expressed interest in being notified of permit actions. A copy

of the distribution list is available in the administrative record for this draft permit. Electronic copies of the public notice, draft permit, fact sheet, and draft environmental assessment are available at the following website:
<http://deq.mt.gov/Public/notices/wqnotices>.

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding this permit may contact the DEQ Water Protection Bureau at (406) 444-3080 or email DEQWPBPublicComments@mt.gov. All inquiries will need to reference the permit number (MTX000197), and include the following information: name, address, and phone number.

During the public comment period provided by the notice, DEQ will accept requests for a public hearing. A request for a public hearing must be in writing and must state the nature of the issue proposed to be raised in the hearing.

29. **Persons and/or Agencies Consulted or Referenced in the Preparation of this Analysis:**

Montana Natural Heritage Program
Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology web site
Natural Resource Information System, Montana State Library
Historical Preservation Society
United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey

EA Checklist Prepared By:

Carolyn DeMartino

April 8, 2016

Approved By:

Jon Kenning, Chief
Water Protection Bureau

DRAFT

Signature

Date