SEELEY LAKE SEWER DISTRICT
PUBLIC HEARING
September 6, 2018

Attendance:

Beth Hutchinson	President	**PRESENT**
Troy Spence	Vice President	**PRESENT**
Mike Boltz	Director	**ABSENT**
Davy Good	Director	**PRESENT**
Greg Robertson	Missoula Co	**ABSENT**
Felicity Derry	Secretary	**PRESENT**
Kim Myre	Missoula Co	**ABSENT**
Amy Deitchler	Great West Eng.	**PRESENT**

OPENING:
7:16pm by Beth Hutchinson at The Senior Center, 707 Pine Drive, Seeley Lake.

Beth Hutchinson: Felicity can you do the roll call please? Felicity Derry: Troy. Troy Spence: Present. Felicity Derry: Beth. Beth Hutchinson: Present. Felicity Derry: Davy. Davy Good: Present. Felicity Derry: And Mike is not here. Seven sixteen. I don't think Amy's quite ready. Beth Hutchinson: Just a sec. Felicity Derry: We're finally all done in your neck of the woods with all of the fire hydrants. Davy Good: Yeah, I see, nice.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:
Beth Hutchinson: I think that tonight we will work the public comments into Amy's presentation once she is done with the initial part. Because she is the person collecting the information and with the most detailed information to address any of your comments. So as soon as Amy's ready. And we're gonna just move out. Felicity Derry: Can you see from there? You probably can't can you? Davy Good: If it's on there I can, but. I'll be able to see better from out there. Felicity Derry: I'm just gonna stay here.

Beth Hutchinson: How many of you have been to one of Amy's presentations before? This is Amy Deitchler from Great West. Amy Deitchler: You were at the May 3rd presentation right Walt? Beth Hutchinson: She knows you. Walt Hill: I know. Amy Deitchler: The May 3rd. Walt Hill: Oh, yeah. I'm sorry. That's almost last year. Beth Hutchinson: So, yeah like two people then. It's good. This will be a fresh room for almost everybody.

Al Castonguay: Could you turn off about half the lights. George Hauser: I'll see what I can do. They're over there by the door. Beth Hutchinson: Thanks George. George Hauser: Is that better? Al Castonguay: Yeah much better. Beth Hutchinson: That's too much. George Hauser: Better? Beth Hutchinson: That's really good. Felicity Derry: You sound like an optometrist.

NEW BUSINESS:

Submittal of Grant Application for Phase II of the Seeley Lake Wastewater Project

Amy Deitchler: Alright as Beth said I am Amy Deitchler with Great West Engineering and I'm a project manager for the Seeley Lake Sewer District for Great West Engineering. Umm, for any of those that were at the May 3rd meeting this is the exact same presentation. Umm, we just had to notice it differently umm, to complete the grant application.

So, umm, why are we here? Umm basically the District has identified some wastewater system needs. Umm, we're updating the 2012 Preliminary Engineering Report. We completed an Environmental Assessment on that 2018 engineering PER update. And we're here to get any public comment on the PER or on the Environmental Assessment that was completed.

So, what is a Preliminary Engineering Report? Well it looks at the entire system. Whether you are doing a water system or a wastewater system. And it identifies any kind umm, of deficiencies in the system. Umm, it's an analysis of the existing system. Umm, it's gonna give a problem definition if one is found with your system. And then it will evaluate alternatives and identify solutions. Umm, and then establishes costs, umm, funding opportunities, umm, and develops that funding scenario. And how we want to fund the next phase of the project. And then will provide an implementation schedule and get public comment on that PER.

So, the planning area for the Seeley Lake Sewer District is out lined in black here. And that's the area that we focus on for the PER. So, initial District concerns. There's shallow groundwater. Umm, groundwater monitoring wells umm, studies of the Seeley Lake Water Quality District that have come out. Umm, wastewater flows in general. Umm, the Montana Bureau of Mines Geology report umm, identified groundwater flowing under the town and into the lake. And then high septic densities in that area with small lot sizes and no replacement areas for those drainfields to come into compliance with current regulations.

So, the background of Great West with the District. We prepared a PER in 2004. And we pursued and were successful with several grants. Umm, the. In that PER we had lagoons up near the airport. Umm, during the environmental process the airport would not allow those lagoons to be constructed because you get birds landing on lagoons that interfere with airports. So, the FAA regulations umm, ended up commenting and dismissing that alternative.

Umm, in 2007 Missoula County completed an income survey for Phase I to allow the project to become CBDG eligible. In 2008, we prepared an amendment to the 2004 PER. Umm, we did a much more in-detail predesigned collection system. And then looked for alternatives to that treatment site. We were still hoping at that time to go with lagoons. Umm, but we pursued additional funding. Umm, we were not able to find a location that would house lagoons. So, our alternative changed to an SBR on some Forest Service property. Umm, between 2008 and 2012 we tried to acquire that Forest Service property through a townsite act, and it failed.

Umm, the District came under new management and a new 2012 PER was completed locating the plant back by the airport on DNRC property. Umm, this project that's in the 2012 PER is currently what we have under design. Umm, at this point TSEP, RRGL, RD grant, LOR Foundation, STAG,

WRDA are all grant partners that are helping to fund that project. As well as local funds, umm Missoula County and then a Rural Development loan is part of their package. Umm, Phase I includes the collection system, that I'll show you here in a minute, and then a treatment plant, up by the airport. Umm, we're currently in design and have a designing schedule for this work with the District. Umm, we're still hopeful that this will go to bid this winter, January February, and start in the spring.

Umm, so the location of the septics in the District are shown here as the black dots. And that is the main concern, umm with the groundwater flows that I'll show. Currently the Sewer District. This graph here shows the property sizes in the District. With over 40% of the properties being less than a quarter acre in size. Umm, with 70% of the septic systems being 10 years or older. Umm, and 45% being 20% or older. Umm, so this is a big concern because there are no replacement areas on a property a quarter acre or less. You have to have a half acre to get a replacement area on your lot. So again, like you said the lots are undersized for replacement areas. Umm, there's a high number of septic tanks that are older septic systems. Umm, some people continue to use seepage pits. Or have to use seepage pits because they don't have a replacement area. Umm, the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology have looked at this. Umm the Clearwater Resource Council and then the District has completed the well monitoring. Umm, this here shows the groundwater flow path into the lake and the Clearwater River umm, from the District. And this is the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology who put this map together with the groundwater path, flow paths. Umm, that min, Bureau of Mines and Geology report show nitrate and chlorides data is starting to degrade due to septic tank effluent. Umm, there's additional development along the shoreline that would likely result in septic tank degradation. Umm, and that the degradation continues over time and that the algae growth umm, along the shore will continue to get worse and worse over the years. Umm, they concluded in their studies that a groundwater monitoring network should be established. Umm, and that development to the east and south is not likely to threaten the lake but more likely to threaten the Clearwater River.

Umm, let's see nitrate in the Seeley Lake groundwater. Over time this is a map that's not showing up very well. But this is from the Montana Bureau of Mines report, and it is showing that nitrates are continuing to rise. This data is averages from the District monitoring wells. Umm, and it's showing that nitrates are continuing to rise. Umm at certain times of the year they might be low. At certain times of the year they may be high. But on an average overall yearly basis it is starting to rise. Umm, here this line shows, this green line right here, shows a 7.5 milligram per liter nitrate level, which is what the groundwater discharge permit obtained by the District already. This is what you'll be required to treat to and meet on a maximum daily basis. Umm, this other green line up here is the EPA maximum concentration limit. Well one is starting, continues to climb and has almost met the EPA MCL limit on an average basis.

Al Castonguay: Where are those wells located? Or do you know? Amy Deitchler: Yep. So well one is down by the lake right in this area here. Well two is also right there down by the lake. And then well four is out in this area right here. And so that data was sent to me by the District and I just put it on a chart. Umm, Energy Labs I believe does the District's. Felicity Derry: ME, ahh they do for ME Labs, that's right. Amy Deitchler: ME Labs that's right does all the water quality testing for the District.

So, benefits of the wastewater improvements. Umm, the groundwater and the surface water will continue to get better over time. Umm, the recreational value of the lakes and rivers will continue to be a place that everyone in the state and nation want to come to. Umm, public health. We will not

have septic system failures in yards. Umm, there's no risk ever of groundwater contamination in the lake. Umm, swimming and boating access will satisfy all of the current DEQ two sanitary standards. Umm, economic development and adding additional properties. Umm, community growth. Regulatory compliance both EPA and DEQ, as well as Missoula County standards. And continue to protect and enhance the property values.

So, umm our alternative analysis what do we look at when we are looking at wastewater treatment or collection. Ahh, we look at the Preliminary Design. Can the standard gravity collection system be constructed? Does an SBR get you to your groundwater discharge permit limits? Operational requirements. How much time is the District gonna have to spend on pumps and managing the day to day activities of a gravity system versus a pressure system? Energy requirements. How much money is the District going to spend in energy? Are we gonna meet your groundwater discharge permit? Umm, land requirements. Is there a site in the District that we can put a plant? Where can we put the pipes? How can we connect each home or business? Umm, environmental considerations. You know, are we going to have issues with wildlife or bears. Or is the FAA going to allow this type of system around the airport. And then ultimately costs.

So, kind of back to the 2012 PER. The wastewater treatment. And all the way back to the 2004. These are the different types of treatments that we looked at for the District. We have looked at facultative lagoons, which are just big ponds. We have looked at aerated lagoons. Umm they put air into that big pond and allow it to shrink in size a little bit. A total retention lagoon, keeping all the wastewater in one area and never discharging it to groundwater or surface water. Constructed wetlands. Septic tanks with a community dosed drainfield. Umm, septic tanks with sand filters and a dosed drainfield. Converting the wastewater into snow. Ahh, a BNR system, which is a very, very advanced wastewater treatment system. A fixed film system, which would be your ponds followed by some kind of media to help get your removals. Umm, an activated sludge plant, which is what you going, which is the recommended alternative. Ahh, Biolac is a less effective mechanical treatment for a groundwater discharge permit. Sequencing Batch Reactor, which is the activated sludge system that you will be, we are designing. Umm, membrane bioreactor system, which has membranes. It's very similar to an SBR, and it's a package system but it has membranes to provide higher treatment. And then storage and irrigation, which is what the 2004 PER ultimately recommended with irrigation to the pine trees.

Umm, as we go through the alternatives we look at the technical feasibility. The environmental impacts. The total life cycle cost for twenty years. Umm, public health and safety. Operation and maintenance and public opinion.

So, in the 2012 PER our preferred treatment alternative was an SBR. This is an SBR down in the community Rae, down by Bozeman. It has a small footprint. Umm, we get very reliable nitrogen removal 5 to 7 milligrams per liter. Umm, it's easily automated and can be remotely accessed. It's relatively simple O&M, and can run a lot of the time on its own. It's easily expandable, and tank area added, and the major pieces can be upgraded but you don't have to get rid of anything. Umm, it is a lower O&M cost than most other mechanical treatment plants. It's a lower capital cost because it's a packaged system, so one supplier provides all the equipment and a contractor builds the concrete basins. Umm, and then the groundwater disposal up there, we have the permit. We are designing around 5 milligrams per liter. Based on our permit we have to 7.5 milligrams per liter. Umm, so we will be able to meet the water quality and meet the groundwater discharge permit.

The collection system alternatives. Umm, this is currently Phase I in red. Phase II in yellow. Phase III is in blue and Phase IV is in purple. So, this 2018 PER is focused on the sections in yellow and how we're going to start funding that collection system. We looked at a standard gravity system. So, you put pipe in manholes in the ground and it runs to a lift station, or a central location and then it's sent up to the plant. We looked at a small diameter collection system. That requires umm, it's like a four-inch pipe instead of an eight-inch pipe. And everything is under pressure getting to it and then it's kind of forced based on those smaller pumps umm, to a central location. And then we looked at a pressurized location where everything, is 100% pumped.

So, what we, our preferred alternative is a combination of gravity system with umm, some grinders on properties that needed to be lifted up to the main lines. So, this is a rough layout of what we did to try and serve every property in the District. As we get into the design we'll get out there and get the, get everything surveyed. Umm we'll ensure these layouts can work via gravity. Umm, can we remove some of the grinder pumps from the properties we've identified that probably are going to have to be pumped? Due to some of the gravity, some of the properties have to be pumped. So, umm, this is our best guess based on some really big topos. Umm, like twenty-foot to fifty-foot contours. This is our best guess at getting this thing started to getting it funded and how we put a cost estimate together. Umm, most of these properties along the lake will probably have to be pumped, but there may be some changes that we can do in the design once we get the survey and see if they actually have to be pumped. And then this is the lower section it will run up and connect into the Phase I manhole right here.

So, our potential grant and funding sources are the same for Phase I. Umm, we're looking at an RRGL DNRC grant, we're looking at WRDA, we're looking at STAG. Those are both federally funded and come through Senator Tester's Office. Umm from the federal government. Umm, CDBG is a competitive grant application. The Treasure State Endowment Program, umm otherwise known as TSEP. This application. This one and the RRGL one, have gone in. Umm, the State Revolving Fund is a loan source. Rural Development, they do a grant loan package. Umm, then any other congressional appropriations that we can get.

So, as we start to put together the funding strategy. Umm, a lot of the programs are based on medium household incomes. Umm, and then what your target rate is for your community. So, the Seeley Lake CDP, which is larger than the District, but we don't have an income survey for Phase II yet. So, we have to use the CDP numbers for this application. But the combined wastewater water rate would be, have to be 78.22 or greater to be able to apply for most of these funding programs. Umm, the wastewater only target rate is 30.61. So, the homes that don't have umm, water provided by the Seeley Lake Water District, their target rate would be 36.61. And then the LMI, which CDBG relies upon to be 51% or greater for their program. Umm, right now the American, American survey from the census shows 46.55% MHI. So, what is the residential user rate? So, the collection system, based on the layout that we currently have, the engineering cost, the administration cost right now we have a cost of six and a half million dollars for the project. Umm, TSEP their max grant is seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. RRGL their max grant is one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars. WRDA is typically around half a million dollars, but you can sometimes get that on additional cycles. So, I know right now you have one point six million dollars in WRDA grants for Phase I. That happened over multiple cycles. Umm, SRF principal forgiveness umm, for wastewater systems is a maximum of half a million dollars. Umm, let's see RD grant and loans. That one changes. Umm,

what they've asked us to do going into this funding cycle is not to show a grant any larger than 25% because their rules are changing. Currently on Phase I, I believe there's a six point seven million. They are not, they are capping their grants at five million dollars from here on out. Umm, so they've asked us, and they've asked every firm in the state going into TSEP and RRGL applications to show no more than a 25% grant. And so, we have done that on this funding scenario. Umm, in reality I think there is a possibility to get up to at least 50% grant. And in conversations with Steve Troendle umm, he has said the same thing but they've asked us not to show that in this funding application. So right now, as we go in with this funding application we're showing a user rate of $75.47 for the Phase II collection system. Umm, I do think there's probably WRDA money out there that can help lower that user rate and I think as we move along with RD grant can also get a better grant package and get that user rate lowered a little bit.

Beth Hutchinson: I'd like to ask a question. So, this financial bunch is simply for the collection system. It's not for their share of the forced main and the treatment plant. Amy Deitchler: Well actually it does show in here umm, and we did include right here in the existing average user cost. We do show the O&M for the plant right here in this. Beth Hutchinson: Okay so that's O&M, but what about the previous debt that each phase has to share? Amy Deitchler: I believe that is in, based on estimates, that's in that $63. Because $36 is the O&M cost. I believe it's around $36 for the O&M cost. And then the additional is based on the bond for Phase I treatment. In those bond documents from Dorsey and Whitney, and they did an estimate of what each property will be, and I believe it's around $27 for construction of the plant. Beth Hutchinson: I'd appreciate if you can double check on that, okay. So that people can see it broken out. It makes more sense to them. Amy Deitchler: Yeah, Dorsey and Whitney, yeah, they have all that bond estimates broken out in the draft bond documents for the Rural Development program. Yep, we can look and see what that is.

Umm, so the target rate, the other important thing here, that puts Phase II at 260.5% of the target rate for Phase II. And so that makes us eligible for the maximum grant for the TSEP application.

The other part of the TSEP application is the Environmental Assessment. Umm so basically, we have a check list. Did you, do you have the environmental assessment? Felicity Derry: I do. Amy Deitchler: It's a checklist that we go through that many agencies put together, TSEP and the WASACT program. Doing the EA, we look at that, see if there is any significant environmental impact. Almost every sewer on this project is going to be in an existing road. Umm, and we've had comments from Fish, Wildlife and Parks, EPA, DEQ, Missoula County and no one has provided any significant comment, other than being in support of the project. Umm, public comment can be provided tonight. We have that document. Umm, anyone and everyone can take a look at it providing any kind of comment. It's also on seeleylakeinfrastructure website under downloaded documents and everyone can look at it there. Umm, like I said to date we have gotten no comments of significant impact. Umm, as of right now the EA is acceptable and an environmental impact statement is not required.

So where do we go from here? Umm, we get any kind of comments tonight on the PER and EA. Umm, the PER has been finalized, but I will take comment on it. The RRGL and the TSEP grant applications have been submitted. DNRC for $125,000. TSEP for $750,000. Umm, we'll start the process soon, after we hear what the decision on these two applications is, for the RD application. Umm, I believe Greg is also already working in Missoula County on WRDA grants and other appropriations for Phase II. Umm, once we have a funding package together we will start designing

on Phase II and hopefully around the fall of 2019 we'll advertise and bid the Phase II project. Umm, early winter, or late winter early spring of 2020. And then the project will go to construction as soon as possible in 2020. Again, both of these websites here, seeleylakeinfrastructure you can provide public comment on the EA or the PER. And there's also information on the Missoula County website. It's a little bit harder to find. If you go under Public Works Seeley Lake, umm they do have information there. And they may have those draft bond documents on there. I'm not 100% sure on that.

Beth Hutchinson: Just for your information the seeleylakeinfrastructure is operated by Great West. Amy Deitchler: It is. Yes. So, that's really my presentation. I'll open it up for questions or comments.

Pat Caffrey: This is not a comment, just a question. Felicity Derry: Could you state your name please? Pat Caffrey: Pat Caffrey. Felicity Derry: Thank you. Pat Caffrey: Ahh, you said the background 2007 or slightly before that a site had been applied for with the Forest Service. Amy Deitchler: ahh hah. Pat Caffrey: Ahh, rather than go up to the airport for a disposal site. And you said it had been denied. Do you recall the ahh, general reasons why that happened? Amy Deitchler: Umm, no.

Mike Lindemer: I can answer that. Mike Lindemer. Ahh, the Forest Service with their grant application to get the, or obtain the property, you have to exhaust all other properties throughout the area. There is nothing available that they will allow you to use on their site. Beth Hutchinson: There was another issue with that site in that it was heavily loaded with groundwater and sloughing and things like that. It wasn't a very desirable site. Amy Deitchler: It was not as ideal as the site up by the airport. Mike Lindemer: You don't happen to have a map showing exactly where the site is? Because I think some, a lot of people don't understand exactly. It's not really up at the airport. Stop at the High School Hill Road and it is to your left, or to your north between Cottonwood Lakes Road and the top of the High School Hill Road. Is where it is. Where those two roads join.

Beth Hutchinson: Amy I have a question. Umm, we have shallow groundwater and we're going to be taking an immense amount of liquid and moving it into a sub watershed outside where it's been coming. Are there likely to be any impacts from that? Amy Deitchler: No. Beth Hutchinson: No. Amy Deitchler: No. We've done a pretty extensive soils ahh, investigation up there. We've done drilling with the geo technical. Beth Hutchinson: I'm more interested in the area where it's being removed. Amy Deitchler: From down here? Beth Hutchinson: Yeah. Amy Deitchler: No. Beth Hutchinson: No.

Frank Paxton: Frank Paxton. I live up there. Have you done a study on where the water's flowing up there? Amy Deitchler: We have. Yep, and we have. Frank Paxton: What is going to happen to the medical waste? Amy Deitchler: The medical waste? Frank Paxton: Yeah. Amy Deitchler: Well, the overall treated effluent will be to 5 milligrams per liter, total nitrogen. Umm, and then a total phosphorus number. We don't have a total phosphorus number. It will be UV disinfecting umm. We have monitoring wells at the bottom of that property that we're currently monitoring on a quarterly basis. Umm, so we have all the background. Umm, if that background were ever to start creeping we would have to increase treatment somehow. Umm, but the water quality below that monitoring well will not be impacted.

Frank Paxton: Because I have a regular river running between my house and the neighbor's over the hill, and it's coming from that direction. And I sent a letter to the Board, I don't know where it's at, but, of a whole bunch of people that signed it that has wells up there. Have you got a copy of it? Amy Deitchler: I have not received a copy of it. Frank Paxton: Has the Board got a copy? Felicity Derry: It's, it's in the files. That was from last year, or maybe the year before? Frank Paxton: Last year or the year before. Felicity Derry: Okay. I have it. Beth Hutchinson: Can you get that sent to Amy? Felicity Derry: I can.

Beth Hutchinson: Umm, I have one other question. Umm, seepage pits. Are those the same thing as rings? Are they cesspools? What are they? Amy Deitchler: Seepage pits are containers to get the wastewater and really no treatment is provided before it's discharged. Umm, they're not very pleasant. Beth Hutchinson: So, are they also called rings? Amy Deitchler: I've never heard them called rings. I, I would have to investigate what rings are. I don't know.

Jim Erven: I can speak to that. Jim Erven, Health Department. So, that seepage pit is, umm, they are commonly referred to as rings. They're generally steel culverts sitting horizontally. They have perforations on the outside. The difference between a seepage pit and cesspool, a seepage pit is gonna have primary treatment in the form of a tank where you have solid matter, and retention time there you would have anaerobic treatment happening in the tank. The wastewater then would go to the seepage pit where it's discharged to soil and you have aerobic treatment by umm, bacteria in the soil. But seepage pits don't treat well, especially for nitrates which is the issue here, right. Umm, but they also don't treat very well for bacteria and viruses because you have, ahh you can have what you call saturated flows. And they also go a lot deeper, right. A drainfield sits two to three feet deep in the ground. A seepage pit is gonna sit typically about 6 feet in the ground. If you have shallow groundwater that's an issue because you need dry unsaturated soils for that treatment to occur, and so umm, seepage pits don't offer ahh, the level of treatment that a drainfield would offer. They are better than cesspools because cesspools are literally just a whole in the ground where everything you flush ends up. There's virtually no treatment with a cesspool, but. Beth Hutchinson: Thanks.

Nathan Bourne: Is that ahh, you said that this is taking comment on the 2012 PER. Where's that available to view? Or is it available on the website? Amy Deitchler: This is for comment on the 2018 update. The twenty. Nathan Bourne: Where is that located? Cause I haven't found it on the website yet, ahh on the seeleylakeinfrastructure. Amy Deitchler: Ahh, it's at the District offices. Nathan Bourne: So, there's a paper, a paper copy of that. Amy Deitchler: umm hmm. Felicity Derry: At Kim's. Nathan Bourne: At Kim's. Nathan Bourne: Okay. Amy Deitchler: Umm, and she has the, I mean she has the 2012 PER, the 2018 PER. She has the grant applications that were submitted. Felicity Derry: The 2012 PER is also at the library. Beth Hutchinson: Yeah, I was gonna ask about that. Did you just get one copy of the update and the umm, Phase II PER? Because it would be nice to have a copy at the library too. Felicity Derry: Okay. I think we just got one, didn't we? Amy Deitchler: Umm hmm. Felicity Derry: Because I think that's definitely what Kim has. We didn't put one at the library. Amy Deitchler: Okay.

Nathan Bourne: Do you know how big the area is of that American Communities survey? What is the actual area that that encompasses? Amy Deitchler: I don't know exactly. It's been a while. It's, it's quite a big area. And that's why income surveys if we decide to go after CDBG funding, umm an income survey would have to be completed.

Allan Castonguay: Allen Castonguay. I have about three comments. Amy Deitchler: Okay. Allan Castonguay: One is you people start talking about websites and at this point I don't own a computer. I never want a computer. And I don't have any access to that type of information. Amy Deitchler: Okay. Allan Castonguay: So, I think you should be working on that. I think there's a few other older people in here that feel the same way. Amy Deitchler: And all of those documents are available at the District office. Allan Castonguay: Okay. Amy Deitchler: Yep, every single on them. Allan Castonguay: The second is I cannot understand ladies when they talk, okay. I, you were shooting numbers out there like machine gun bullets and I didn't understand a bit of it, because I can't hear well. Amy Deitchler: Okay. Allan Castonguay: That's good enough for now. Amy Deitchler: Okay. Allan Castonguay: Okay. So, you should be speaking up a little louder for us people that cannot hear. Amy Deitchler: Okay. Allan Castonguay: And maybe a little slower, okay. Amy Deitchler: Yep. And next time please feel free to interrupt me and ask me to speak louder or slow down. Yeah, I would appreciate that. Allan Castonguay: Okay. Amy Deitchler: Anyone else?

Nathan Bourne: Is there, do you guys have any theories on why test well number one is raising faster than the other two test wells? For nitrate level. Amy Deitchler: Umm, because it's probably the most concentrated area receiving flows from the septic areas, but umm, I've not confirmed that in modeling. And I don't believe the Bureau of Mines has either.

Beth Hutchinson: Umm, one other question. In a conversation, probably at this point a month ago. You mentioned an issue over what phase the elementary school should be put into. Amy Deitchler: Yes. Beth Hutchinson: And on the map it was in two but, no it was in one. But you thought two was better. Could you talk about that a little bit please? Amy Deitchler: Yeah and that's something that I wanted to visit with at the design meeting when I have those maps. But part of it is Phase I we can connect the elementary school using a grinder pump after the survey was completed. Umm, in Phase II I believe we can connect it to a different main and connect it via gravity. And so, I mean that's the Board's decision, but my recommendation would be any pumps that you can eliminate you should and do gravity. And so that's something for the 60% design meeting that we will discuss.

Walt Hill: When is that meeting? Amy Deitchler: The seventeenth at 5pm. Walt Hill: Where? Felicity Derry: At the Satellite Office. Beth Hutchinson: Yeah, I scheduled it there because it's intended primarily for the Board. Other people can come, but their participation would be limited to listening, but you certainly can come and listen. Umm, it would be a good idea at this moment, if you would let me jump out for a minute. How many people would be interested in that? Because the Satellite Office as you all know isn't that large and we could reschedule where it's being held if a lot of you want to come. Walt Hill: And this is a 50%. Beth Hutchinson: 60%. Walt Hill: 60%. I'd like to come. Beth Hutchinson: If you think you would like to attend that meeting can you raise your hand. Alright we'd better reschedule where it's being held, and bring it into here.

Mark Driscoll: The pumps you're talking about. If there's a power outage what happens to those at that point? Do they have a backup? Amy Deitchler: They have a battery backup that's umm, depending on the model that we get and. So, with the Rural Development program we cannot sole source a product. Umm, but we can write things into the specifications. And so, some of them have solar power umm, battery backup. And then some have a battery backup that charges. That we would recommend not using the solar but having that battery backup that charges with the power and then it recharges once the power kicks back on. Mark Driscoll: And how long does that last? Amy Deitchler: They last typically three days, I believe.

Allan Castonguay: Do you install backup valves? For power the outage that he talks about. If you get a backup in the system, if you don't have a backup valve it all backs up into the house. Amy Deitchler: Yes, we, they are all, they all have check, double check valves on them. Allan Castonguay: Okay. Each house has that? Amy Deitchler: Each house that has a grinder system would have a double check valve on them. Allan Castonguay: Okay. Felicity Derry: Sir, the. What's your name please? Mark Driscoll: Mark Driscoll. Felicity Derry: Say that again. Mark Driscoll: Mark Driscoll. Felicity Derry: Thank you.

Tom Morris: Tom Morris. So, you say the ones with the grinder pumps will have check valves. The gravity flow system won't? Amy Deitchler: No. Gravity flow is by gravity into the sewer system. You can use it at any time. The main lift station will have a backup generator that can run for three days on diesel power that will pump from the lift station up to the plant. Tom Morris: I understand that, but still is there a check valve at the lift station? Amy Deitchler: Yes. Tom Morris: Okay. Amy Deitchler: Yep. Walt Hill: You just don't want it coming back to your house. Tom Morris: I don't want it coming back to my house. We're pumping up hill a long ways. And I have a second question. You talked about, you have monitoring wells at the proposed site. Amy Deitchler: Umm hmm. Tom Morris: Can, do you know what the nitrate levels are now? In that groundwater. Amy Deitchler: I do and I can know that for the seventeenth, but I don't know it tonight. Tom Morris: Okay. You've done soil type testing there, but where the monitoring wells are here that the Sewer District is using, has there been any soil type testing done? Amy Deitchler: I do not believe so. Tom Morris: That's what I thought. So, the monitoring wells are actually just telling you that there's a change from when we drilled the wells to where we're at now. Amy Deitchler: Right and the. Tom Morris: But we have no, but as far as DEQ requirements we have not the soil type that's required to be known for what the limits are. If you read law, if you read the rule of the law. Amy Deitchler: I guess, umm on a monitoring well we do not have the soil type. Tom Morris: They're not test wells but monitoring wells. Yes. Amy Deitchler: Right. Well, I guess I don't know that. I would have to ask Vince because those were drilled prior to my time. Tom Morris: Yeah, I know. I was on the Board at the time. Amy Deitchler: Okay, okay. Yeah and so, I don't know the background on whether those are monitoring wells or test wells or exactly what kind of wells that it. But, I mean we are monitoring out of them, so. Tom Morris: That's right. Okay. Thank you.

Pat Caffrey: So, you have two monitoring wells? Amy Deitchler: There are actually three monitoring wells and testing, yeah three monitoring wells and one was a standard I believe. Pat Caffrey: And we have one that the nitrate levels are in the excess. Amy Deitchler: Well they're all in excess of the DEQ groundwater discharge limit. Yep. Umm, well three is climbing slowly. Umm, and then well two is fairly, just about the same in average every year. Now if you really drilled down into the data umm, you do see fluctuations with the seasons also. And you see. Pat Caffrey: Well my comment would be, you know well number one may indicate a point source rather than a, you know. Amy Deitchler: It could. Pat Caffrey: It's a large area and we're hanging a lot of umm, faith on well one it looks like.

Jim Erven: Standard nitrate levels in groundwater umm, in Missoula County, are, generally less than. Amy Deitchler: One. Jim Erven: Well less than one. Amy Deitchler: Well less than one. Jim Erven: Usually like point zero five milligrams per liter. All three of these wells are typically over five milligrams per liter. Amy Deitchler: Yeah, I mean right here this is four milligrams per liter. Five, six. Pat Caffrey: What did you say Missoula County averages? Jim Erven: Well, your standard

background nitrate levels in groundwater is usually well less than one milligram per liter. So, it's generally a tenth of a milligram per liter is typical.

Beth Hutchinson: Can I clarify. Did you say that these readings came out of the Montana Bureau of Mines? Amy Deitchler: Not these. Beth Hutchinson: Not these. Amy Deitchler: These are the District monitoring wells. Beth Hutchinson: Okay. Amy Deitchler: Umm, this data here, which it's not showing on the screen very well, but you can see it here. This screen. They were showing an increase also, umm in their report. And so, they recommended these monitoring wells that the District drilled and have been monitoring since 2004.

Beth Hutchinson: Would you all find it helpful if we created a graph in human readable size and kept track of this data so that you could see it whenever you felt like it. We can hang it up at meetings. Jim Erven: I have that on my computer I can email it to you. Beth Hutchinson: Thank you.

Amy Deitchler: Mike also, there are maps at the District office that show, the big maps, that show the treatment site and the collection. Mike Lindemer: Yeah, the only problem is that the treatment site shows the whole section, instead of the actual footprint of the treatment site. Amy Deitchler: Okay, zoomed in. Mike Lindemer: And that's what's confusing for people. Because it's they think it's huge. Beth Hutchinson: It is about ten acres, right? Amy Deitchler: It's twenty-six acres. Mike Lindemer: The, the property that we have for the treatment site is twenty-six acres. But he footprint of the treatment site itself is. Amy Deitchler: Six. Beth Hutchinson: Six. Amy Deitchler: And then the pressure dose screen building is another four or six. For Phase I and II collection.

Walt Hill: What is the footprint size of the treatment plant itself? Amy Deitchler: Umm, it's tiny. Umm, I don't even know if you would do in acres, you'd do it in square feet. But I don't know what that SBR. Mike Lindemer: It's gonna be about the size of this building. Amy Deitchler: Yeah. Walt Hill: Yeah, and a very small portion of the site. Amy Deitchler: Yep. Walt Hill: In Bozeman where they have theirs it's in a residential all around it. Amy Deitchler: Yup. The City of Helena, the City of Missoula, umm all of the larger cities their plants are right in the middle of the community for the most part. Walt Hill: Right next to Walmart. Amy Deitchler: CostCo in Helena.

Beth Hutchinson: Now how is the plant itself sheltered? Because things I looked at suggested that a greenhouse or something was removed. What's left as its shelter? Amy Deitchler: For the basins themselves, nothing. They are just out in the open. They are open-air basins.

Frank Paxton: Will they be fenced or anything? Amy Deitchler: Yes. They will be fenced with an electrical fence. Frank Paxton: How high? Amy Deitchler: Fourteen feet, I think. That was dictated due to bears. That was dictated at the site. The Rural Development EA process and on what that fence was and how high it was to be. Frank Paxton: Thank you.

Beth Hutchinson: Are there any other questions? Alright, in that case I close the hearing and we will move on to the business part of the meeting. Applause. Amy Deitchler: Thank you.

Resolution#09062018 to accept the Environmental Assessment

Beth Hutchinson: Alright the next part of our meeting is to accept the Environment Assessment that has been presented to us by Great West and that's up to the Board to motion and discuss and vote on.

Davy Good: I'll make a motion that we accept it. Beth Hutchinson: Louder. Davy Good: I'll make a motion that we accept it. Beth Hutchinson: Thank you. Troy Spence: I'll second it. Beth Hutchinson: It's been moved and seconded that we accept the Environmental Assessment presented to us by Great West. Is there any discussion? Beth Hutchinson: There should be some. Umm, so fundamentally it appears that the Board members think that the elements that have been covered in the Environmental Assessment have been thorough and accurate. And that in putting forth this document to TSEP its a representation that makes sense for the District. Okay. Alright. We'll move to a vote. Call. Could you call the role for the vote please? Felicity Derry: Sure. Davy? Davy Good: Aye. Felicity Derry: Troy? Troy Spence: Aye. Felicity Derry: Beth? Beth Hutchinson: Yes.

Beth Hutchinson: Alright we have three votes so the Environmental Assessment has been accepted, which means that on the tenth, or sooner, the application for the TSEP can be completed with the materials that are going to be sent forth by Great West. We were granted an extension because of the confusion a couple of months ago and had till the tenth to get our application complete. So that is the conclusion our business for this evening. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT:

Davy Good: I'll make a motion to adjourn. Troy Spence: Second it. Beth Hutchinson: All those in favor? Davy Good: Aye. Troy Spence: Aye. Beth Hutchinson: The meeting is adjourned.

Attest:

_____

Beth Hutchinson, President

-And-

| SEAL |

_____

Felicity Derry, Secretary