

Ohio EPA Responsiveness Summary

Mark Ahner Steel Crib Pier Ohio EPA ID#: 062589

On May 11, 2006 Ohio EPA held a public information session and public hearing on the proposed Mark Ahner Steel Crib Pier project. This document is Ohio EPA's response to all concerns, questions, and comments raised in testimony given at the public hearing, and in letters received at Ohio EPA during the public comment period, regarding water quality issues relevant to the review of the Section 401 application.

In an effort to help you review this document, Ohio EPA has organized the information in a consistent format and used different fonts to distinguish among comments and responses. The document is organized as follows:

- **Comment #:** This section provides a summary of interested party questions. When appropriate, these are direct quotes from interested party testimony or submitted comments. Similar comments are combined, when appropriate.
 - **Response #:** *This section has language in italics and summarizes Ohio EPA's response to the corresponding question/comment.*
-
-

Comment #1: A commenter was concerned about the blasting affecting the existing seawalls and drinking water wells, and creating unwanted noise.

Response #1: *The project has been modified to use a mechanical breaker instead of blasting. Therefore, no blasting will be done as part of this project.*

Comment #2: A commenter was concerned about the possible shoreline erosion that might occur due to the construction of the dock.

Response #2: *The project design has an open section along the shoreline to allow for water flow through the area. It is believed that with this open section there will be little change in the current water patterns.*

Comment #3: A commenter expressed concern about the possible affect the construction might have on the glacial grooves on the site.

Response #3: *It is the understanding of Ohio EPA that the glacial grooves will be avoided.*

Comment #4: A commenter was concerned about the cumulative affects of these types of projects on Lake Erie.

Response #4: *Cumulative affects are very hard to quantify and review. Ohio EPA uses a Total Maximum Daily Load evaluation (TMDL) to assesses impairments in entire watersheds and to identify the causes and sources of any detected impairments. However, due to the size and complexity of this waterbody, no TMDL has been completed for Lake Erie.*

Comment #5: A commenter suggested that mitigation should be restoring bottomland at some shoreline location and that the mitigation amount should be calculated at 10 times the area disturbed by a project.

Response #5: *Ohio EPA's rules and regulations do not currently specify the type of mitigation nor the mitigation ratios for Lake Erie projects. It is unclear to Ohio EPA as to what is meant by "restoring bottomland" in regards to Lake Erie projects. For Lake Erie projects, mitigation is handled on a case-by-case basis.*