

Appendix 8-1

Assessment of Regional Wastewater Collection and Treatment Needs in Ohio

Summary of Water Quality Information
(assembled from *Ohio 2004 Integrated Water Quality
Monitoring and Assessment Report* and other sources)

Summary of Current Community Wastewater Information
(assembled from NPDES permit Form 2A applications)

Allen County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Allen and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the small streams draining to the Auglaize River between Spencerville and Delphos, and the headwaters of the Auglaize River and the small streams draining to it, south of Harrod, generally met water quality standards with watershed scores of 81 and 94, respectively. The Ottawa River drainage, including the Lima area and areas east and northwest of Lima, was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and industrial pollutants, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include stream channelization, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land and stream habitat limitations, and urban runoff and storm sewers (Lima area). No water quality data is available for the portions of the Blanchard River and Riley Creek watersheds in the northeastern part of Allen County.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 3.5%, or approximately 3,750 fewer people by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. The Allen county sewer district currently provides a regional wastewater approach that serves the needs of the townships (see http://www.co.allen.oh.us/san/departement.php). Water quality conditions within the county need to improve, but it is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Ashland County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. Although the county contains watershed areas of significant size that generally meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life, there is also a significant portion of the county whose watersheds generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life, or for which no water quality data is available.</p> <p>A number of streams in Ashland and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Jerome Fork Mohican River and the small streams draining to it, centrally located and the largest watershed area within Ashland County, generally meet their water quality standards, with a watershed score of 88. In addition, the drainage of the Clear Fork Mohican River, which stretches into the southwest corner of the county, also meets its standards with a watershed score of 100. The Black Fork Mohican River, and smaller streams draining into it, located southwest of the city of Ashland, and the West Branch Black River drainage, which stretches just across the northern boundary of the county southeast of New London (Huron County) were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, failing septic systems, and industrial pollutants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities, channelization from development activities, and stream habitat alterations, for example removal of vegetation along streams.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 16.2%, or approximately 8,530 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Ashtabula County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent but generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Grand River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA are between 1993-1997 and in 2002. Full attainment of its standards was met by 87.6% of its length. Partial attainment was met by 9% of its length, and 3.4% was in non-attainment. The major negative water quality impacts were waste storage/storage tank leaks.</p> <p>A number of streams in Ashtabula and nearby counties were sampled between 1994-2000. Of the assessed watersheds, the Ashtabula River watershed, in the northeast corner of the county, generally meets its water quality standards with a watershed score of 91. The Conneaut Creek watershed and Lake Erie tributaries, also in the northeast corner of the county, also meet their water quality standards with a watershed score of 99. The Pymatuning Creek drainage was rated very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score less than 20 (although it should be noted that the natural wetland characteristics of Pymatuning Creek contribute significantly to the low watershed score).</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants have been documented in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include flow alteration, dredging, channelization, streambank destabilization, and industrial land treatment activities, all related to development. Also impacting streams are habitat alterations and landfills. No water quality data is available for the portions of the Grand River watershed north of the Village of Rock Creek, the Rock Creek and Mosquito Creek watersheds located in the southern part of the county, or the tributaries to the Pymatuning Reservoir located on the eastern edge of the of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 3.6%, or approximately 3,690 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Auglaize County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. However, the majority of the county's waterways should be considered not meeting their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Auglaize and nearby counties were sampled between 1994-2000. Of the assessed watersheds, the Auglaize River and the small streams draining into it between Wapakoneta and Waynesfield generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 94. The Ottawa River drainage south of Cridersville, the Beaver Creek drainage west of St. Marys and New Bremen, and the Loramie Creek drainage, which includes Minster, were all very poor with watershed scores of less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather sewer overflow problems and industrial pollutants, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include stream channelization, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, and flow and habitat alterations. No water quality data is available for the St. Marys watershed on the western end of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 11.7%, or approximately 5,450 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Brown County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u> Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. The majority of waters generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Brown and surrounding counties were assessed between 1996-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Eagle Creek and the West Fork Ohio Brush Creek drainages on the eastern side of the county generally met water quality standards with watershed scores of 88 and 95, respectively. The East Fork Little Miami River drainage on the west side of the county, and the tributaries that drain to the Ohio River between Georgetown and Russellville were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, ongoing land development and suburbanization, and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities, stream flow alterations, stream channelization for development purposes, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No water quality data is available for the drainages of the streams flowing to the Ohio River on the southwest and southeast corners of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 33.8%, or approximately 14, 295 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Carroll County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Of the watersheds assessed, water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from poor to good-excellent. Water quality information is not available for the majority of Carroll County (approximately 85% of the total area).</p> <p>Streams in the assessed watersheds in Carroll and surrounding counties were assessed between 1996-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Yellow Creek watershed, located in the southeast corner of the county, generally meets its water standards with a watershed score of 85. The Sandy Creek drainage, located in the northwest corner of the county, was poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score less than 40.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants and failing septic systems have been documented in some of the assessed watersheds of the county. Another major factor impacting water quality is nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 25.8%, or approximately 7,330 more people by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Champaign County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data sources:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p> <p>Biological and Water Quality Study of the Big Darby Creek Watershed, 2001/2002</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. The majority of waters generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Champaign and surrounding counties were assessed between 1994-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Buck Creek drainage in the southern part of the county generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 91. The Great Miami River drainage, west of St. Paris, and the Mad River drainage, south of Urbana, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20. However, it should be noted that these drainages represent only a small percentage of the area within Champaign County.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants and small flows from package wastewater plants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, upstream impoundments, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, urban runoff and storm sewers, and road and utility work. No water quality data is available for the drainages of the streams flowing to the Great Miami River northwest and southwest of St. Paris on the western side of the county.</p> <p>Recent survey work in the Big Darby Creek watershed revealed that most streams meet their standards for the protection of aquatic life. However, the upper segments of both Big and Little Darby creeks, and a number of tributaries, do not meet standards. While the lower mainstem of Big and Little Darby creeks attained standards in 2001-2002, there was evidence of stress from pollution and poor habitat.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 20.9%, or approximately 8,135 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs.</p>

Clark County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. The majority of waters generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Mad River is the county's largest stream. The most recent year in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA was 1994 (18.4 miles assessed - downstream Donnels Creek to confluence with the Great Miami River). Full attainment of its biological standards was met by 86.3% of its assessed length. Partial attainment was met by 13.7% of its length. The major negative water quality impacts (reported over its assessed length) were habitat alterations and channelization for agricultural activities.</p> <p>A number of streams in Clark and surrounding counties were assessed between 1994-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Buck Creek and Deer Creek drainages in the northeast corner of the county generally met water quality standards with watershed scores of 91 and 92, respectively. The Mad River watershed west of Springfield was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and impacts from small flows from package wastewater plants, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No water quality data is available for the drainage for the streams flowing to the Great Miami River and the Mad River in the western and southwestern parts of the county, respectively.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by 0.5%, or approximately 785 fewer people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs.</p>

Clinton County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Clinton and surrounding counties were assessed between 1996-1998. Of the assessed watersheds, the Rattlesnake Creek drainage in the eastern part of the county, and the Todd Fork drainage in the southern part of the county generally met water quality standards with watershed scores of 100 and 82, respectively. The Rattlesnake Creek drainage in the northeast part of the county and the East Fork Little Miami River drainage in the southwest part of the county were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants have been documented. Failing septic systems, ongoing land development and suburbanization, and surface mining impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors causing poor water quality in Clinton County include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land and development activities, stream flow alterations, upstream impoundments, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, confined feeding operations, streambank destabilization from development activities, and impacts from urban runoff and storm sewers.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 32.5%, or approximately 13,180 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Columbiana County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent but generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Columbiana and nearby counties were sampled between 1994-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Little Beaver Creek watershed, on the eastern side of the county, generally meets its water standards with a watershed score of 90. The Mahoning River drainage, in the northern edge of the county, was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score less than 20. It should be noted that this represents only a small portion of the county.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers, industrial pollutants, failing septic systems, and surface and subsurface mining impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include stream channelization from agricultural and development activities, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, confined animal feeding operations, habitat alterations such as removal of riparian vegetation, flow alterations, spills, contaminated sediments, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No water quality data is available for the portions of the Sandy Creek watershed in the southwestern part of the county, or the Ohio River tributaries in the southeastern corner of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 0.1%, or approximately 75 less people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Crawford County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Crawford and nearby counties were assessed between 1994-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the drainages of Honey Creek, north and east of Chatfield and with Tiro on its southern edge, Broken Sword Creek, northeast of Nevada in Wyandot County and west of Tiro, and Olentangy River, south of North Robinson, were the closest to meeting water quality standards with watershed scores of 62, 71 and 64, respectively. The Little Scioto River drainage, south of Bucyrus, was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score of 19.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather sewer overflow problems and failing septic systems, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution and channelization from agricultural activities, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as removal of riparian vegetation, and urban runoff.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 7.6%, or approximately 3,580 fewer people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Defiance County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Maumee River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1993, 1996 and 1997 (107.9 miles assessed - Indiana border to Lake Erie). Full attainment of its biological standards were met by 46.7% of its assessed length, partial attainment was met by 13.9% of its length, and 39.4% was in non-attainment. The major negative water quality impacts (reported over its assessed length) were flow and habitat alterations, agricultural runoff, channel modification, siltation, combined sewer overflows, and community wastewater plants.</p> <p>The Tiffin River, the county's second largest stream, was last sampled by Ohio EPA in 1992 (19.7 miles assessed - Brush Creek to confluence with the Great Miami River) when it was considered in partial attainment of its biological standards. The major negative water quality impacts (reported over its assessed length) were siltation, agricultural runoff, and channel modification. Industrial pollutants impact streams in the Tiffin River drainage in the northeast corner of the county. A report with the complete findings is available (http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/documents/Tiffin1993.pdf). This data is considered historical from the perspective of current water quality assessment and planning needs.</p> <p>A number of smaller streams in Defiance and nearby counties were sampled between 1997-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Maumee River drainage to the northeast of the City of Defiance was the closest to meeting water quality standards (watershed score of 75). The St. Joseph River drainage, in the northwest corner of the county, and the South Turkeyfoot Creek drainage, represented in Defiance County by a small area just west of the Henry County line in the southeastern corner of the county, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 20. It should be noted that the watershed areas with very poor water quality conditions were all relatively small and make up only a small proportion of the total county area.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants have been documented, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers, impacting streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution and streambank destabilization from agricultural activities, stream flow and habitat alterations, such</p>

	<p>as riparian vegetation removal, and stream channelization for agricultural purposes. No water quality data is available for the Auglaize River drainage southwest of the city of Defiance.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 1.7%, or approximately 680 more people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>
--	---

Delaware County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good. The majority of waters generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Scioto River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1995, 1997-2000, and 2002 (177.4 miles assessed - downstream of the Little Scioto River to its confluence with the Ohio River). All biological assessment criteria were met in 90% of its assessed length. The major negative water quality impacts (for its entire assessed length) were streambank destabilization from agricultural activities, pollutants from industrial and municipal sources, dam construction, combined sewer overflows, and flow alterations.</p> <p>The smaller rivers and streams in Delaware and nearby counties were sampled between 1994-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Alum Creek and Big Walnut Creek drainages in the eastern part of the county were the closest to meeting water quality standards with watershed scores of 69 and 68, respectively. The small streams draining to the Scioto River, west of the City of Delaware and Village of Powell, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, failing septic systems, impacts from small flows from package wastewater plants, and ongoing land development and suburbanization in much of the county impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include sewage line construction, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, confined feeding operations, and streambank destabilization from agricultural activities. No water quality data is available for the small streams draining to the Scioto River in the northwest corner of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 142%, or approximately 156,207 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county, especially in the southern half of the county.</p>

Erie County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Erie and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the West Branch Huron River drainage west of Milan generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 81. The drainage south of Bay View, with tributaries to Lake Erie, was very poor with a watershed score of 3.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution, habitat alterations, and channelization. No water quality data is available for the tributaries to Lake Erie, south of Sandusky.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 4.4%, or approximately 3,510 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county.</p>

Fairfield County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from fair-good to good-excellent. Approximately half of the assessed watersheds do meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life; the other half of assessed watersheds still need some improvement in order for them to meet their assigned water quality standards.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Fairfield and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2000. Of the assessed watersheds, the Clear Creek watershed, in the southern part of the county, and the Walnut Creek and South Fork Licking River watersheds, in the northern part of the county, generally met water quality standards with watershed scores of 95, 88 and 95, respectively. The other assessed watersheds in the county had watershed scores between 61-80, indicating that improvement is needed.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants have been documented, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers, industrial pollutants, and suburbanization and land development activities stemming from the burgeoning growth of the Columbus metropolitan area, impacting streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No recent water quality data is available for the Salt Creek drainage in the southwest corner of the county, and for the Rush Creek drainage on the eastern side of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 63.7%, or approximately 78,255 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county.</p>

Fayette County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Fayette and nearby counties were sampled between 1996-1999. Of the assessed watersheds, the Rattlesnake Creek watershed, in the southern part of the county, generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 100. The watersheds of Paint, Sugar, and Rattlesnake Creeks in the eastern and southern parts of the county were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores of less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural purposes, urban runoff and storm sewers, and upstream impoundments. No water quality data is available for the North Fork Paint Creek watershed on the eastern side of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 6.5%, or approximately 1,855 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Franklin County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005 Data source: 2002 Central Scioto Plan Update	Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary. <u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u> The assessment provided in Sections 3 and 4 of the Central Scioto Plan Update provided this information. This material is reproduced here in Appendix 8-2.

Fulton County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u> Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Tiffin River, the county's largest stream, was last sampled by Ohio EPA in 1992 when it was considered in partial attainment of its standards. The major negative water quality impacts were siltation, agricultural runoff and channel modification. Industrial pollutants impact streams in the Tiffin River drainage in the southwest corner of the county. A report with the complete findings is available (see http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/documents/Tiffin1993.pdf). This data is consider historical from the perspective of current water quality assessment and planning needs.</p> <p>A number of smaller streams in Fulton and nearby counties were sampled in 1997. Of the assessed watersheds, the Bean Creek drainage and the small streams draining to the Maumee River between Wauseon and Liberty Center (Henry County) were the closest to meeting water quality standards with watershed scores of 50 and 67, respectively. Tributaries to the Tiffin River, the Brush Creek drainage near Archbold, the Bad Creek watershed near Delta and the headwaters of Swan Creek were all very poor to poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 25.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and industrial pollutants, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities and stream habitat limitations. No water quality data is available for the portions of Swan Creek and Bear Creek in eastern and northern Fulton County.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 16.7%, or approximately 7,030 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Hancock County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Hancock and surrounding counties were sampled between 1993-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Blanchard River drainage, west of Findlay, was the closest to meeting water quality standards (with watershed scores of 41 and 46). The Middle Branch Portage River drainage, west of Van Buren, was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score of 8.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and failing septic systems, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, and channelization. No water quality data is available for the portions of the Blanchard River drainage east of Findlay and Arlington or for the Riley Creek drainage south of Mt. Cory.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 10.9%, or approximately 7,740 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Hardin County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u> Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent but generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Hardin and surrounding counties were assessed between 1995-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Scioto River drainage southeast of Kenton generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 83. The Ottawa River drainage, north of Alger and McGuffey in the northwest corner of the county, and the Tymochtee Creek drainage, northeast of Kenton, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers, industrial pollutants, and failing septic systems, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, and stream channelization for agricultural purposes. No water quality data is available for the Blanchard River drainage north of Kenton, the Rush Creek drainage east of Mount Victory in the southeast corner of the county, and the Riley Creek drainage which just stretches across the northwest corner of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 2.8%, or approximately 885 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Henry County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Maumee River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1993, 1996 and 1997 (107.9 miles assessed - Indiana border to Lake Erie). Full attainment of its biological standards were met by 46.7% of its assessed length, partial attainment was met by 13.9% of its length, and 39.4% was in non-attainment. The major negative water quality impacts (reported over its assessed length) were flow and habitat alterations, agricultural runoff, channel modification, siltation, combined sewer overflows, and community wastewater plants.</p> <p>A number of smaller streams in Henry and nearby counties were sampled between 1997-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Maumee River drainage in the north central and western parts of the county was the closest to meeting water quality standards (watershed scores of 75 and 67). The South Turkeyfoot Creek drainage, southeast of Napoleon, and the Bad Creek drainage, northeast of Liberty Center, were very poor with watershed scores below 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and industrial pollution, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream bank destabilization and stream channelization for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 3.1%, or approximately 900 more people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Highland County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Highland and surrounding counties were assessed between 1996-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Rattlesnake Creek drainage in the northern part of the county, and the West Fork Ohio Brush Creek drainage and the Ohio Brush Creek drainage, both in the southern part of the county, generally met water quality standards with watershed scores of 100, 95 and 88, respectively. The Paint Creek drainage in the northeast part of the county and the East Fork Little Miami River drainage in the southwest part of the county were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20. However, it should be noted that these watersheds represent only a relatively small percentage of the total land area within the county.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants have been documented. Surface mining impacts streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors causing poor water quality in Highland County include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, habitat and stream flow alterations, upstream impoundments, channelization for agricultural purposes, and streambank destabilization from agricultural activities.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 24.7%, or approximately 10,100 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Holmes County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent but generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Holmes and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Killbuck Creek watershed, centrally located and the largest watershed area within Holmes County, generally met its water standards with a watershed score of 97. In addition, the drainage of the smaller streams draining into the Walhonding River, located in the southeast corner of Holmes County, also met its standards with a watershed score of 100. The South Fork Sugar Creek drainage was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from industrial pollutants, failing septic systems, and surface mining impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include stream channelization from agricultural activities, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, habitat alterations such as removal of riparian vegetation, flow alterations, streambank destabilization, and industrial land treatment. No water quality data is available for Lake Fork Mohican River, Black Fork Mohican River, or the smaller streams in the Mohican River watershed in the western part of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 27.6%, or approximately 10,750 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Huron County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Huron and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the West Branch Huron River drainage west of Norwalk and northeast of Attica (Seneca County) generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 81. The drainage of the Lake Erie tributaries, west of Wakeman, and the West Branch Huron River drainage, south of North Fairfield and north of Shiloh, were poor in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores of 30 and 36, respectively.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, failing septic systems, and industrial pollutants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution, flow and habitat alteration, such as removal of riparian vegetation, and channelization. No water quality data is available for the drainage of the tributaries to Lake Erie in the northwest corner of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 7.6%, or approximately 4,530 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Knox County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from fair-good to good-excellent. They generally do meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life, although there is still room for improvement.</p> <p>The Mohican River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1997 and 1998 (27.6 miles assessed - entire length). Full attainment of its biological standards was met by 100% of its length.</p> <p>A number of rivers and streams in Knox and nearby counties were assessed between 1993-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, five out of seven watershed scores ranged between 81-100, a level that meets Clean Water Act goals. One watershed, the lower Kokosing River and tributaries, scored 64, indicating that improvement is needed.</p> <p>Major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities, and flow regulation and alterations. Conditions in one watershed unit, the tributaries of the Mohican River east of Danville in the northeast corner of the county, have not been assessed.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 28.2%, or approximately 15,385 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs.</p>

Licking County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from poor to good-excellent. Although the majority of the assessed watersheds in the county meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life, there is also a significant portion of the county where watersheds generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life, or for which no water quality data is available.</p> <p>The Licking River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1993-1994 (30.2 miles assessed - entire length). All biological assessment criteria were met in 94% of its length. The segment of river below Dillon Reservoir in Muskingum County is affected by dam tailwater releases.</p> <p>The smaller rivers and streams in Licking and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, five watershed scores ranged between 81-100, a level that generally meets Clean Water Act goals. The drainage for the streams that flow into the Licking River, east of Hanover on the east side of the county, was poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score of 36.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, suburbanization and land development activities, industrial pollutants, small flows from package wastewater plants, and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, confined animal feeding operations, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No recent water quality data is available for the North Fork Licking River drainage north of Newark.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 36.6%, or approximately 53,270 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county, especially along the anticipated growth corridors in western Licking County.</p>

Logan County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data sources:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p> <p>Biological and Water Quality Study of the Big Darby Creek Watershed, 2001/2002</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. Generally, the majority of the county's waterways do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Logan and surrounding counties were assessed between 1994-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Great Miami River drainage, southwest of Bellefontaine, and the drainages for the streams flowing to the Scioto River in the northeast corner of the county generally met water quality standards, with watershed scores of 98 and 83, respectively. The Bokes Creek watershed draining to the Scioto River, also in the northeastern corner of the county, was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, industrial pollutants, and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, upstream impoundments, dredging, stream channelization and streambank destabilization for agricultural purposes, confined feeding operations, hazardous waste spills, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No water quality data is available for the Rush Creek drainage in the northeast part of the county.</p> <p>Recent survey work in the Big Darby Creek watershed revealed that most streams meet their standards for the protection of aquatic life. However, the upper segments of both Big and Little Darby creeks, and a number of tributaries, do not meet standards. While the lower mainstem of Big and Little Darby creeks attained standards in 2001-2002, there was evidence of stress from pollution and poor habitat.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 14.1%, or approximately 6,500 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs.</p>

Madison County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data sources:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p> <p>Biological and Water Quality Study of the Big Darby Creek Watershed, 2001/2002</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. The majority of waters generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Madison and nearby counties were sampled between 1997-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Deer Creek drainage in the central part of the county was the closest to meeting water quality standards with a watershed score of 72. Five watersheds, which make up the majority of the area within the county, have watershed scores ranging from 61-80, indicating fair-good water quality conditions, and that improvement is needed. The Sugar Creek and Rattlesnake Creek watersheds in the southwest corner of the county were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 20. It should be noted that the watershed areas with very poor water quality conditions were all relatively small and make up only a small proportion of the total county area.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, including sewer capacity and wet weather overflow issues, small flows from package wastewater plants, and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural purposes, urban runoff and storm sewers, and upstream impoundments. No water quality data is available for the North Fork Paint Creek watershed in the southern part of the county.</p> <p>Recent survey work in the Big Darby Creek watershed revealed that most streams meet their standards for the protection of aquatic life. However, the upper segments of both Big and Little Darby creeks, and a number of tributaries, do not meet standards. While the lower mainstem of Big and Little Darby creeks attained standards in 2001-2002, there was evidence of stress from pollution and poor habitat.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 15.7%, or approximately 6,310 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county, especially in the Big Darby Creek and Deer Creek watersheds.</p>

Marion County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Scioto River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1995, 1997-2000, and 2002 (177.4 miles assessed - downstream of the Little Scioto River to its confluence with the Ohio River). All biological assessment criteria were met in 90% of its assessed length. The major negative water quality impacts (for its entire assessed length) were streambank destabilization from agricultural activities, pollutants from industrial and municipal sources, dam construction, combined sewer overflows, and flow alterations.</p> <p>A number of smaller streams in Marion and nearby counties were sampled between 1994-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Scioto River drainage west of Green Camp generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 83. The Tymochtee Creek drainage, north of New Bloomington, and the Little Scioto River drainage, east and northeast of Green Camp, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and failing septic systems, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural purposes, and contaminated sediments. No water quality data is available for the Scioto River drainage, south of Green Camp, and the Rush Creek drainage, south of La Rue in the southwest corner of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 3.0%, or approximately 1,980 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Mercer County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u> Of the watersheds assessed, water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to poor. Over half of Mercer County does not have water quality information available.</p> <p>A number of streams in Mercer and surrounding counties were sampled in 1999. Of the assessed watersheds, six were poor or very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 25.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as removal of riparian vegetation, channelization for agricultural purposes, confined animal feeding operations, and stream bank destabilization from agricultural activities.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 12.3%, or approximately 5,035 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Morrow County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from fair to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of rivers and streams in Morrow and nearby counties were assessed between 1994-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, scores for three out of eight watersheds, all on the eastern side of the county, ranged between 81-100, a level that meets Clean Water Act goals. West of the above mentioned watersheds, two watersheds, the Whetstone Creek and Olentangy River drainages, scored 60 and 52, respectively, indicating that improvement is needed.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from wastewater plants and failing septic systems and septage disposal impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, and stream channelization for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 22.2%, or approximately 7,025 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Muskingum County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Of the watersheds assessed, water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. Almost half of Muskingum County's area does not have water quality information available.</p> <p>The Muskingum River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1993-1994 (111.1 miles assessed - entire length). Full attainment of its biological standards was met by 54.4% of its assessed length. Partial attainment was met by 45.6% of its length. The major negative water quality impact (reported over its assessed length) was industrial pollution.</p> <p>The Licking River is the county's second largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1993-1994 (30.2 miles assessed - entire length). Full attainment of its biological standards was met by 94% of its assessed length. Partial attainment was met by 6% of its length. The segment of river below Dillon Reservoir in Muskingum County is affected by dam tailwater releases.</p> <p>A number of smaller streams in Muskingum and nearby counties were sampled between 1989-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Salt Creek drainage, in the eastern part of the county, generally met water quality standards (watershed score of 100). The drainages for Meigs Creek and Wills Creek, in the southeastern corner of the county, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions (watershed scores of 0).</p> <p>Coal mining activities and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. In addition, impacts from sewage overflows and poorly treated effluents from package wastewater plants in the greater Zanesville area have been noted. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, and stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 11.8%, or approximately 9,970 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs.</p>

Paulding County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Of the watersheds assessed, water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from poor to good-excellent. The majority of Paulding County does not have water quality information available (approximately 3/4 of the total area).</p> <p>The Maumee River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1993, 1996 and 1997 (107.9 miles assessed - Indiana border to Lake Erie). Full attainment of its biological standards were met by 46.7% of its assessed length, partial attainment was met by 13.9% of its length, and 39.4% was in non-attainment. The major negative water quality impacts (reported over its assessed length) were flow and habitat alterations, agricultural runoff, channel modification, siltation, combined sewer overflows, and community wastewater plants.</p> <p>Of the watersheds assessed, the largest watershed, the Maumee River drainage in the northwest section of the county, has fair water quality conditions (watershed score of 55). In addition, there are relatively small parts of two other watersheds in the county that have been assessed. The Auglaize River drainage, located in the southeast corner of the county, east of Melrose, generally met water quality standards (watershed score of 81), although there is a considerably greater degree of non-attainment with the small streams than there is with the larger streams within the watershed. The Powell Creek drainage, located in the far northeast corner of the county, south of Defiance (Defiance County), has poor water quality (watershed score of 31).</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality in Paulding County include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream bank destabilization from agricultural activity, and stream channelization for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 6.9%, or approximately 1,410 fewer people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Pickaway County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data sources:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p> <p>Biological and Water Quality Study of the Big Darby Creek Watershed, 2001/2002</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from poor to fair-good and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Scioto River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA are 1995, 1997-2000, and 2002 (177.4 miles assessed - downstream of the Little Scioto River to its confluence with the Ohio River). All biological assessment criteria were met in 90% of its assessed length. The major negative water quality impacts (for its entire assessed length) were streambank destabilization from agricultural activities, pollutants from industrial and municipal sources, dam construction, combined sewer overflows, and flow alterations. Specific to the Scioto River downstream from the Columbus urban area (Franklin and Pickaway counties), there is degradation by pollution from combined sewer overflows, wastewater effluents and other sources.</p> <p>The smaller rivers and streams in Pickaway and nearby counties were sampled between 1994-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, five out of six assessed watersheds, associated with Big Darby Creek, Deer Creek, the Scioto River, and Walnut Creek, were the closest to meeting water quality standards with watershed scores ranging between 61 - 80, indicating that improvement is needed. The drainage of the streams flowing into the Scioto River north of Circleville was poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score of 21.</p> <p>Recent survey work in the Big Darby Creek watershed revealed that most streams meet their standards for the protection of aquatic life. However, the upper segments of both Big and Little Darby creeks, and a number of tributaries, do not meet standards. While the lower mainstem of Big and Little Darby creeks attained standards in 2001-2002, there was evidence of stress from pollution and poor habitat.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, failing septic systems, small flows from package wastewater plants, industrial pollutants, and suburbanization and land development activities (northern part of the county) impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, and urban runoff and storm sewers. No water quality data is available for the North Fork Paint Creek watershed in the southwest corner of the county, and for the drainages for Salt Creek and the streams</p>

	<p>draining to the Scioto River in the southeast corner of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 13.8%, or approximately 7,250 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county, especially in the central and northern portions of the county.</p>
--	--

Putnam County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. However, they generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Auglaize River is the county's largest stream. It was most recently sampled by Ohio EPA in 1996 and 2000 (33.3 miles assessed - Ottawa River to mouth). Full attainment of its biological standards was met in 60.1% of its assessed length, partial attainment was met in 17.3% of its length, and 22.6% was in non-attainment. The major negative water quality impacts (reported over its assessed length) were flow alteration and stream channelization for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>The Blanchard River is the county's second largest river. It was most recently sampled by Ohio EPA in 1996 (downstream Dukes Run to confluence with the Auglaize River). Full attainment of its biological standards was met by 65.9% of its assessed length and partial attainment was met by 34.1% of its assessed length. The major negative water quality impact (reported over its assessed length) is channelization for agricultural purposes.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Putnam and nearby counties were sampled between 1993-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the small streams draining to the Auglaize River between Continental to south of Fort Jennings generally met water quality standards (watershed score of 81). The Ottawa River drainage, south of Kalida, and the South Turkeyfoot Creek drainage, represented in Putnam County by a small area just south of the Henry County line northwest of Leipsic, were very poor with watershed scores less than 20. It should be noted that these take up a relatively small percentage of the total county.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and industrial pollutant impacts, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality in Putnam County include stream channelization, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, and stream habitat limitations. No water quality data is available for relatively large areas of the county including the Blanchard River watershed east of Dupont and west of Leipsic, the Little Auglaize River watershed, west of Fort Jennings, and the Riley Creek drainage, west of Pandora.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 3.9 %, or approximately 1,340 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized</p>

	point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.
--	---

Richland County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u> Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Richland and nearby counties were assessed between 1993-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the Clear Creek Mohican River and small streams draining to it, in the southern part of the county, and the North Branch of the Kokosing River, also in the southern part of the county, generally met water quality standards (watershed scores of 90 to 100). The part of the Black Fork Mohican River drainage directly north of the Clear Creek Mohican drainage, east of Ontario, was very poor with a watershed score of 5.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, failing septic tanks, and industrial pollutants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include stream channelization, nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream habitat limitations, urban runoff and storm sewers.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 2.6%, or approximately 3,335 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Seneca County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent. However, they generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life. It should be noted that approximately half the county does not have water quality information available.</p> <p>A number of streams in Seneca and nearby counties were sampled between 1995-2002. Of the assessed watersheds, the West Branch Huron River drainage, north of Attica, generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 81. However, only a relatively small portion of the watershed is present in the county. The drainage for the tributaries to Lake Erie east of Green Spring was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with a watershed score of 3.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution and channelization from agricultural activities, and stream flow and habitat alterations, such as removal of riparian vegetation. No water quality data is available for most of the western part of the county and much of the northern part (5 watersheds).</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 13.2%, or approximately 7,760 fewer people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Shelby County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Great Miami River is the county's largest stream. The most recent years in which it was sampled by Ohio EPA were 1994, 1995 and 2000. Full attainment of its biological standards was met by 67% of its assessed length, partial attainment was met by 30.2% of its assessed length, and 2.8% was in non-attainment. The major negative water quality impacts were flow and habitat alterations, such as removal of riparian vegetation, dam construction and upstream impoundments, nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities, stream bank destabilization from agricultural activities, wet weather sewer overflows, community wastewater plants, and industrial pollutants.</p> <p>A number of smaller streams in Shelby and nearby counties were sampled in 1994 and 1999. Of the assessed watersheds, the drainage of the Great Miami River southeast of Anna generally met water quality standards with a watershed score of 98. The Loramie Creek drainage in western Shelby County was very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores below 20.</p> <p>Major factors impacting water quality in these streams include flow and habitat alterations, such as removal of riparian vegetation, channelization, stream bank destabilization from agricultural activities, upstream impoundments, and nonpoint pollution from agricultural activities. No water quality data is available for the St. Mary's watershed, north of Kettlersville in the northwest corner of the county, and for the Great Miami River drainage southeast of Sidney.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 9.9 %, or approximately 4,760 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Union County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data sources:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p> <p>Biological and Water Quality Study of the Big Darby Creek Watershed, 2001/2002</p>	<p>Regional wastewater and water quality planning is necessary.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good. The majority of waters generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Union and surrounding counties were sampled between 1995-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Little Darby Creek drainage in the southwestern corner of the county was the closest to meeting water quality standards with a watershed score of 67. However, it occupies only a relatively small part of the county. The Mill Creek and Big Darby Creek watersheds, which occupy most of the southern part of the county, were fair, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores of 48 and 57, respectively. The Bokes Creek watershed draining to the Scioto River, between West Mansfield (Logan County) and Magnetic Springs, and the small streams draining to the Scioto River in the southeast corner of the county were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores of less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants, ongoing land development and suburbanization, small flows from package wastewater plants, failing septic systems, and industrial pollutants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, stream flow and habitat alterations, such as riparian vegetation removal, stream channelization for agricultural and development purposes, confined feeding operations, and streambank destabilization from agricultural activities. No water quality data is available for the Rush Creek drainage and for the small streams draining to the Scioto River in the northern part of the county.</p> <p>Recent survey work in the Big Darby Creek watershed revealed that most streams meet their standards for the protection of aquatic life. However, the upper segments of both Big and Little Darby creeks, and a number of tributaries, do not meet standards. While the lower mainstem of Big and Little Darby creeks attained standards in 2001-2002, there was evidence of stress from pollution and poor habitat.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 108.3%, or approximately 44,285 more people by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that a coherent regional plan is needed to address sewage collection and treatment needs throughout the county, especially in the Big Darby Creek and Mill Creek watersheds.</p>

Van Wert County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Most of Van Wert County does not have water quality information available. The one watershed in the county that does have information is the Auglaize River drainage located on the southeastern edge of the county, west of Vendocia and Elgin. Delphos is located within the watershed. Streams in this drainage generally met water quality standards (watershed score of 81), although there is a considerably greater degree of non-attainment with the small streams than there is with the larger streams within the watershed. This watershed could be considered doing good-excellent. However, it must be emphasized that this watershed area makes up only a small part of the area of the county.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agricultural land, and flow and habitat alterations.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 4.9%, or approximately 1,465 fewer people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized point source pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Williams County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to good-excellent and for the most part do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>The Tiffin River, the county's largest stream, was last sampled by Ohio EPA in 1992 when it was considered in partial attainment of its standards. The major negative water quality impacts were siltation, agricultural runoff and channel modification. A report with the complete findings is available (see http://www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/documents/Tiffin1993.pdf). This data is consider historical from the perspective of current water quality assessment and planning needs.</p> <p>Rivers and streams in Williams and nearby counties were sampled in 1997. Of the assessed watersheds, the West Branch of the St. Joseph River and the small streams draining to it generally met water quality standards (watershed score of 100). The areas south of Blakeslee and northwest of Edon draining to the St. Joseph River, and the Tiffin River north of Stryker were very poor with watershed scores of less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from a number of community wastewater plants, including wet weather overflows from combined sewers and industrial pollutants, impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution from agriculture, channelization, habitat alterations, and flow regulation. No water quality data is available for the East Branch of the St. Joseph River centered around Pioneer on the northern edge of the county.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to decrease by about 1.8%, or approximately 700 fewer people, by 2030. This trend suggests that local communities will not face strong demand for additional wastewater collection and treatment capacity. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

Wyandot County

Source	Identified Regional Collection and Treatment Need(s)
<p>State of Ohio EPA evaluation, 2005</p> <p>Data source:</p> <p>2004 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report</p>	<p>None.</p> <p><u>Summary of Water Quality Information</u></p> <p>Water quality conditions in the county's waterways range from very poor to fair-good and generally do not meet their assigned water quality standards for the protection of aquatic life.</p> <p>A number of streams in Wyandot and nearby counties were assessed between 1998-2001. Of the assessed watersheds, the Broken Sword Creek drainage (containing Nevada) was the closest to meeting water quality standards with a watershed score of 71. The Tymochtee Creek drainage, in the southwest corner of the county, and the Little Scioto River drainage, in the southeast corner, were very poor, in terms of water quality conditions, with watershed scores less than 20.</p> <p>Localized water quality impacts from community wastewater plants and failing septic systems impact streams in some watersheds of the county. Other major factors impacting water quality include nonpoint pollution and channelization from agricultural activities, and stream flow and habitat alterations, such as removal of riparian vegetation.</p> <p>Population in the county is projected to increase by about 1.4%, or approximately 330 more people, by 2030. It is Ohio EPA's finding in this update of the State 208 plan that current and future localized pollution problems can be addressed through ongoing programs and the capacities of the management agencies identified.</p>

County

Allen

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
American - Bath Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PH00007*HD	1.50	1.31	1996	1996	100	4		
American II WWTP	2PH00006*GD	0.80	0.41	1973	1985	100	6		0
Beaverdam WWTP	2PB00018*HD	0.10	0.07	1977		100	2		
Bluffton WWTP	2PC00005*ID	1.90	0.84	2003	2003	95	5	5	
Delphos Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00029*ND	3.83	1.46	1931	1982	35	7	65	5
Elida Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PB00046*JD	0.66	0.42	1966	1998	100	1		
Golf at Sugar Creek	2PR00134*BD								
Harrod WWTP	2PA00023*ID	0.09	0.05	1984	1998	100	2		

County

Allen

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Lima WWTP	2PE00000*KD	53.00	17.49	1931	1999	37	27	63	2
Shawnee No 2 Wastewater Treatment Works	2PK00002*HD	2.00	2.60	1994	1994	100	25		
Spencerville WWTP	2PC00000*GD	0.45	0.43	1955	1999	100	1		0
Village of Lafayette	2PA00049*GD	0.10	0.04	1981	1999	100	2		

County
Ashland

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Ashland Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00010*KD	5.00	5.37	1930	1988	100	11		0
Jeromesville Water Treatment Plant	2IZ00072*DD								
Jeromesville WWTP	2PA00092*AD	0.07	0.00	2004	2004	100	2		0
Mohican Juvenile Correction Facility	2PP00005*ED	0.02	0.02	1967	1993	100	0		0
ODNR, Mohican State Park Lodge	2PP00033*DD	0.08	0.01	1972	1972	1	2		
Savannah WWTP	2PA00086*CD	0.05	0.03	1997	1997	100	1		
Troy Township Wastewater Facility	2PH00019*AD	0.05	0.00	2004	2004	100	1		
Village of Bailey Lakes	2PR00028*FD	0.04	0.31	1983	1987	100	3		

County

Ashland

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Hayesville WWTP	2PA00089*AD	0.06	0.00	2004		100	4		
Village of Loudonville WWTP	2PD00023*GD	0.60	0.66	1961	1971	100	0		
Village of Perrysville WWTP	2PA00004*GD	0.13	0.05	1976	2004	100	3		

County
Ashtabula

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Andover Water Pollution Control	3PB00000*GD	0.50	0.00	1996	1996	90	5	0	0
ASHCRAFT WWP	3PG00150*CD	0.08	0.03	1978	2002	100	0		0
ATB Dorset OutPost	3PP00041*BD	0.00	0.00	2000	0	100	0		0
City of Ashtabula	3PE00002*KD	12.00	5.39	1955	1970	100	6		
City of Conneaut Ohio WWTP	3PD00002*KD	3.00	1.90	1973	1988	100	6		0
COFFEE CREEK WWTP	3PG00145*DD	0.15	0.06	1998	1998	100	1		0
Geneva on the Lake	3PC00020*FD	0.42	0.30	1970	1997	100	0		0
Geneva WWTP	3PD00014*ND	1.00	1.00	1938	1995	100	5		

County
Ashtabula

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
HOLIDAY CAMPLANDS STP	3PH00029*ED	0.15	0.07	1972	2003	100	6		0
MEADOWWOOD ALLOTMENT WWTP	3PG00075*DD	0.04	0.01	1976	1976	100	0		0
Meadowood Allotment Wastewater Plant	3PG00075*CD	0.00	0.00	1976		100	0		0
ODOT Rest Area 04-42 WWTP	3PP00016*DD	0.01	0.00	1992	0	100	0		0
Orwell WWTP	3PB00041*FD	0.52	0.21	2004	2004	100	1		0
Village of Jefferson WWTP	3PC00021*ED	0.95	0.52	1953	1995	100	4		0
Village of Roaming Shores WWTP	3PB00068*FD	0.16	0.15	2000	2000	100	28		0
Village of Rock Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant	3PA00029*CD	0.07	0.03	1989	1989	100	235		

County
Auglaize

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Auglaize County Commissioners-Arrowhead	2PG00090*GD	0.01	0.01	1979	2002	100	1		
Beverly Hills Subdivision	2PG00073*ED	0.02	0.01	1978		100	0		0
City of St Marys	2PD00026*ND	2.00	1.00	1948	1969	100	12		
Cridersville WWTP	2PB00048*GD	0.00	0.00	1983	1983	100	1		
Forest Lane Subdivision	2PG00105*CD	0.00	0.00	1987	1998	100	0		
Minster WWTP	2PB00036*ID	1.05	1.31	1992	0	100	3		
New Bremen WWTP	2PB00034*JD	0.90	0.08	1985	1990	100	3		
ODOT 7-33	2PP00026*DD	0.01	0.00	1988	1988	100	1		0

County
Auglaize

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Ohio Department of Transportation	2PP00024*DD					100	0		
Ohio Department of Transportation	2PP00025*DD	0.01	0.00	1981		100	0		
Pleasantview Estates Subdivision	2PG00092*ED	0.02	0.01	1974		100	0		0
Sharlon Subdivision	2PG00093*FD	0.01	0.00	1972	2000	100	0		0
Sheerwood Forest Subdivision	2PG00013*FD	0.01	0.01	1968	2003	100			
Unionpolis STP	2PA00054*ID	0.04	0.09	1084	1988	100	1		
Village of New Knoxville	2PA00059*ID	0.35	0.08	1978	1978	100	3		0
Wapakoneta Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00019*JD	2.25	2.69	1936	1983	80	7	20	0

County
Auglaize

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Waynesfield WWTP	2PB00022*JD	0.12	0.14	1969	1989	100	2		

County

Brown

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Fayetteville Perry Twp Sewer District	1PD00024*BD	0.18	0.11	1998	1998	100	2		
Higginsport WWTP	1PA00028*AD	0.07	0.07	2004		100	1		
Ripley Sewage Treatment Plant	1PB00103*GD	0.40	0.16	1970	1990	100	7		
Sardinia WWTP	1PB00108*FD	0.30	0.10	1970	1970	100	5		
St. Martin	1PA00100*DD	0.02	0.01	1938	1989	100	0		0
Village of Aberdeen	1PB00100*GD	0.39	0.13	1966	2001	100	1		0
Village of Georgetown WWTP	1PB00101*GD	0.80	0.70	1972	1991	100	9		
Village of Mt Orab	1PB00044*BD	0.34	0.24	1993	2001	100	10		

County

Brown

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Russellville	1PA00104*BD	0.09	0.02	1997		100			
Waynoka Regional Water and Sewer District	1PS00013*CD	0.10	0.05			100	0		0
BTM Sewer District, Carroll County Comm.	3PB00102*FD	0.80	0.46	1979	2001	100	190		0
Minerva STP	3PC00023*HD	0.69	0.92	1927	1997	100	0		0
Village of Carrollton	3PC00027*FD	0.06	0.47	1936	1978	100			

County
Champaign

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Urbana WPCF	1PD00011*LD	3.00	3.20	1950	1996	100	2		0
Village of North Lewisburg	1PB00039*DD	0.17	33.90	1990	1990	100	2		
Village of St Paris Wastewater Plant	1PB00029*FD	0.50	0.33	1990	1990	100	4		

County

Current Community Wastewater Information

Clark

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
CATAWBA SEWER DISTRICT	1PA00020*DD	0.02	0.02	1988	0	100	120		
City of New Carlisle WWTP	1PD00018*ED	1.00	0.66	1981	1991	100	3		
City of Springfield Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PE00007*KD	25.00	22.00	1935	2000	78	10	22	
Clark Co. Southwest Regional WWTP	1PK00013*ID	2.00	1.55	1979	1993	100	12		
Donnelsville	1PA00026*AD	0.11	0.00	2002		100	3		
KTK WWTP	1PZ00003*DD	0.02	0.01	1984	1984	100	1		
Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport	1PS00009*CD	0.07	0.05	1986	1995	100	1		0
Village of South Vienna	1PA00021*BD	0.08	0.07	1993	1993	100	2		0

County

Current Community Wastewater Information

Clark

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Blanchester Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PB00003*FD	0.99	0.68	1997	1997	100	2		
City of Wilmington	1PD00013*MD	3.00	2.41	1936	1989	100	13		0
Clarksville Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PA00024*BD	0.09	0.03	2001	2001	100	2		
Martinsville-Midland Wastewater Plant	1PH00031*AD	0.15	0.00	2004		100	4		
New Vienna Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PA00005*ED	0.09	0.34	1987		100	4		
Sabina STP	1PB00038*FD	0.38	0.40		1989	100	4		

County
Columbiana

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
City of Columbiana Wastewater Treatment	3PD00041*FD	2.34	2.20	1940	2005	100	13		0
City of East Liverpool	3IV00183*CD								
Columbiana County Elkton WWTP	3PK00016*CD	1.14	1.13	1997	1997	60	0	40	2
Columbiana County Guilford Lake STP	3PH00043*FD	0.40	0.22	1978	0	100	3		0
Columbiana County Skyview Acres STP	3PG00123*ED	0.02	0.01	1968	1968	100	0		0
East Liverpool WWTP	3PD00009*ID	2.70	2.59	1956	1987	100	5		
East Palestine WWTP	3PD00042*ID	1.40	1.20			100			
New Waterford Wastewater Treatment Plant	3PB00059*ID	0.20	0.24	1961	1996	100	1		

County
Columbiana

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Salem Wastewater Treatment Plant	3PD00027*JD	4,000.00	2.61	1928	1995	100	16		
Vilage of Salineville	3PB00026*DD	0.00	0.00	1979	1992	100	0		
Village of Leetonia WWTP	3PB00017*GD	0.34	0.22	1991	2001	100	0		0
Village of Lisbon	3PA00034*AD	1.00	1.00			35	1	65	3
Village of Washingtonville STP	3PB00051*GD	0.12	0.07	1959	1993	100	2		
Village Of Wellsville WWTP	3PD00023*GD	1.00	0.94	1958	2003	100	4		0

County
Crawford

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Bucyrus WWTP	2PD00021*ID	3.40	3.10	1939	2000	20		80	2
City of Crestline	2PC00006*FD	0.95	0.93	1994	1994	90	1	10	1
Galion Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00030*ND	2.70	4.40	1984	1984	100	5		0
Morton Subdivision WWTP	2PG00115*AD	0.01	0.06	1962		100	1		
New Washington WWTP	2PB00060*DD	0.15	0.75	1999		100	2		
Sanitary Sewer District #2 - Linlare WWTP	2PG00089*BD	0.03	0.01	1994		100	0		
Sugar Grove Lake	2PW00013*AD	0.01	0.00	2003		100	0		

County

Defiance

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Auglaize Pines Subdivision WWTP	2PG00051*GD	0.02	0.01	1971		100	1		
City of Defiance WWTP	2PD00013*QD	6.00	3.52	1956	1999	80	9	20	6
Defiance Co Belden's Subdivision WWTP	2PG00050*FD	0.02	0.01	1969	1991	0	1		
Defiance Co Christi Meadows Subdivision WWTP	2PH00010*FD	0.00	0.00	1974	1989	100	4		
Evergreen Lane Care Center Treatment Plant	2PG00052*FD	0.00	0.00	1968		0	0		0
Middle Gordon Creek Subdivision WWTP	2PG00049*FD	0.01	0.00	1971	1989	100	1		
Northeastern Local Schools	2PT00018*BD	0.02	0.02		0	1	1		
Village of Evansport	2PG00055*GD	0.00	0.00	1979		100	1		

County

Defiance

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Hicksville WWTP	2PB00042*ND	0.95	0.67	1935	1996	10		90	7
Village of Ney	2PA00064*BD	0.00	0.00			1			
Village of Sherwood	2PA00017*GD	0.16	0.10	1980	1980	100	2		

County
Delaware

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Alum Creek WRF	4PK00003*BD	10.00	2.80	2001	2001	100	6		0
Ashley Wastewater Treatment Plant	4PB00027*HD	0.19	0.15	1976	1999	100	3		0
Crystal Lake Mobile Home Park	4PV00010*CD	0.02	0.02	1969	1993	100			
Delaware County Home WWTP	4PG00033*GD	0.02	0.01	1975	1995	100	0		0
Galena WWTP	4PB00106*CD	0.08	0.01	1990	0	100	2		0
Galena WWTP	4PC00102*AD	0.50	0.01	2007	1990	100	2		
Hoover Woods WWTP	4PA00006*ED	0.03	0.01	1988	1988	100	0		0
OLENTANGY ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL	4PK00001*ID	6.00	3.65	1996	0	100	11		0

County
Delaware

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Ostrander STP	4PA00007*ED	0.90	0.31	1991		100	4		
SCIOTO HILLS STP	4PG00034*FD	0.08	0.08	1990	0	100	0		0
Sunbury Wastewater Treatment Plant	4PB00010*FD	1.13	0.51	1967	1999	100	3		
Upper Olentangy Water Reclamation Center	4PD00004*LD	5.50	4.68	1983	0	100	15		
Worthington Arms MHP	4PV00093*DD	0.04	0.02	1969	1993	100	1		

County
Erie

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
City of Sandusky	2PF00001*LD	12.50	10.30	1956	1971	20		80	11
City of Vermilion WPCF	2PD00032*KD	2.50	1.20	1983	2000	100	12		
Huron Basin WWTP	2PC00001*HD	2.00	1.03	1985		100	8		
Lake Erie Manufacturers Outlet Center	2PS00006*DD	0.07	0.03	1989	1999	100	1		0
Mittawanga - Ruggles Beach	2PH00011*ED	0.15	0.06	1971	1998	100	0		0
Sawmill Creek WWTP	2PB00056*JD	1.20	0.54	1979	1995	100			
Village of Milan WWTP	2PB00037*KD	0.37	0.16	1985		90	1	10	0

County

Fairfield

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Board of Commissioners, Fairfield County	4PG00027*DD	0.16	0.11	1974	1978	100	0		
Bremen WWTP	4PB00002*FD	0.34	0.28	1956	1986		0	100	0
City of Lancaster WWTP	4PD00001*ID	10.00	5.52	1939	1997	89	4	11	3
City of Pickerington	4PB00017*JD	3.50	1.15	1995	1995	100	4		
Easton Village Water Reclamation Facility	4PH00011*FD	0.16	0.00	1974	1979	100	0		
Lakeside Estates Water Reclamation Facility	4PG00028*FD	0.01	0.01	1964	1964	100	0		
Little Walnut Sycamore Water Reclamation Facility	4PJ00101*BD	0.75	0.08	2000		100	0		
MILLERSPORT SEWAGE TREATMENT	4PB00023*GD	0.30	0.20	2004	0	100	3		

County
Fairfield

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Pleasant Lea Water Reclamation Facility	4PG00030*DD	0.04	0.04	1972	1974	100	0		
Rushville Wastewater Treatment Works	4PR00002*ED	0.04	0.02	1991	1991	100			
Southeastern Correctional Institution	4PP00011*CD	0.40	0.27	1950	1998	100			
Tussing Rd Water Reclamation Facility	4PU00004*HD	3.00	1.80	1973	2004	100	5		
ULTRAK	4IN00162*BD	0.00	0.00	1980	1999	100			
Village of Amanda	4PB00021*CD	0.06	0.05	1992	1992	100	2		0
Village of Baltimore	4PB00011*HD	0.50	0.44	1960	1995	100	1		
Village of Carroll Wastewater Treatment	4PS00015*DD	0.05	0.04	1991	1991	100			

County
Fairfield

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Stoutsville WWTP	4PB00109*AD	0.13	0.00	2007	2007	100	3		
VILLAGE OF SUGAR GROVE	4PA00001*GD	0.08	0.04	1984	0	90	1	10	
Walnut Creek Sewer District	4PA00005*FD	0.18	0.13	1979	2002	100	3		

County
Fayette

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Bloomingsburg WWTP	4PB00025*FD	0.16	0.16	1950	1976	100	1		
City of Washington	4PD00002*ND	6.00	3.95	1983	2000	100	7		
Flakes Ford Estates	4PG00000*DD	0.01	0.01	1976		100	0		0
Miami Trace High School	4PT00121*AD					100	0		0
Rattlesnake WWTP	4PH00007*FD	0.50	0.12	1999	1999	100	2		
Village of Jeffersonville WWTP	4PB00108*AD	0.50	0.53	2005	1998	100	4		0

County
Franklin

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Blacklick Estates WWTF	4PU00002*HD	1.20	1.05	1962	1996	100	4		0
Canal Winchester WRF	4PB00012*HD	2.50	0.61	1999	1999	100	8		
Century Acres WWTP	4PA00010*ED	0.03	0.02	1973	1973	100	1		
City of Columbus Parsons Avenue Water Plant	4IW00018*DD								
Darbydale Wastewater Treatment Plant	4PH00012*AD	0.30	0.00	2003	2003	100	7		0
Enchanted Acres WWTP	4PH00005*ED	0.00	0.00	1972	1972	100	0		
Holton Park WWTP	4PG00050*AD	0.02	0.00	1975	1975	100	0		0
Huber Ridge WWTP	4PU00000*DD	1.02	1.02	1962	1994	100	2		0

County

Fulton

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Airport Industrial Park	2PG00110*CD	0.01	0.00	1968	1968	100	0		
Archbold WWTP	2PD00017*HD	1.75	1.65	1960	1997	100	7		
Delta Wastewater Plant	2PB00003*ID	0.72	0.45	1989		33	3	67	
Harrison Lake State Park	2PP00001*FD	0.04	0.00	1971	2000	100	0		0
Industrial Corridor Sewer System	2PH00020*AD	0.30	0.00	2006	2006	100	1		
Lyons WWTP	2PA00009*CD	0.07	0.03	2002		100			
Metamora WWTP	2PB00065*ED	0.20	0.12	1993		5		95	2
Pettisville WWTP	2PG00014*ID	0.12	0.05	1978	1978	100	0		

County

Fulton

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Pleasant View Subdivision	2PG00109*BD	0.02	0.01	1972	1972	100	0		
Village of Fayette	2PB00045*FD	0.26	0.75	1980		50		50	3
Village of Swanton WWTP	2PB00025*FD	0.92	0.93	1977	1977	25	2	75	
Wauseon Water Reclamation Plant	2PD00016*HD	1.50	1.08	1989	2001	90	2	10	

County
Hancock

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
City of Findlay Water Pollution Control Center	2PD00008*ND	15.00	9.90	1988	2001	85	12	15	4
Village of Arlington	2PA00050*ED	0.17	0.30	1975	1975	100	2		
Village of Mc Comb WTP	2IW00140*FD								
Village of McComb	2PB00002*ED	0.39	0.29	1969	2001	80	0	20	0
Village of Rawson	2PA00039*CD	0.15	0.02	2002		100	2		
Village of Vanlue	2PA00016*ID	0.07	0.03	1978	1978	100	1		

County

Hardin

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Ada WWTP	2PB00050*HD	0.82	1.61	1955	1999	100	3		0
Alger WWTP	2PB00064*JD	0.15	0.15	1983	1983	100	1		
City of Kenton WWTP	2PD00020*HD	2.40	1.20	1955	2000	100	7		0
Eldridge Station Hills WWTP	2PG00005*DD	0.01	0.00	1975	2000	100	0		
Fairwayview STP	2PG00012*FD	0.03	0.02	1969	1969	100	0		0
McGuffey STP	2PA00006*DD	0.15	0.08	1988	2000	100	1		
Mt Victory WWTP	2PA00046*DD	0.09	0.05	1996	1996	100	1		
Reed Road WWTP	2PG00004*ED	0.01	0.00	1973	2000	100	0		

County

Hardin

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Dunkirk WWTP	2PB00061*FD	0.14	0.08	1985	1985			100	4
Village of Forest WWTP	2PB00044*GD	0.20	0.13	1964	1964	20	0	80	2

County

Henry

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Deshler WWTP	2PC00002*GD	0.00	0.00	1959	1959	45	0	54	2
Florida Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PA00091*AD	0.05	0.00	2005	2005	100	1		
Maumee Youth Center - Ohio Dept. Youth Services	2PP00006*CD	0.00	0.00	1986	1986	100	1		0
Napoleon Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00000*ND	2.50	1.67	1958	1998	70	2	30	4
Ridgeville Township Water Sewer District	2PG00043*GD	0.00	1.00	1981	1998	100	4		0
Village of Hamler WWTP	2PB00043*FD	0.00	0.00	1971	1971	50	0	50	1
Village of Liberty Center Environmental Control Ce	2PB00039*HD	0.25	0.08	1978		100	3		
Village of McClure WWTP	2PA00056*BD	0.10	0.10	1995	1995	100	1		

County

Henry

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Highland County Southwest WWTP	1PA00029*AD	0.10	0.00	2006		100	1		
Hillsboro Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PC00100*GD	1.20	1.05	1989	1989	100	5		
Leesburg Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PB00106*FD	0.40	0.18	1980	2005	100	5		
Lynchburg Wastewater Plant	1PB00105*ED	0.00	0.00	1984		100	1		
Paint Creek State Park Beach	1PP00009*CD	0.01	0.00	1983	1983	100	1		
Rocky Fork Lake WWTP	1PS00015*CD	0.30	0.13	1999	1999	100	1		
Rocky Fork State Park	1PP00017*ED	0.03	0.01	1955	1964	100	1		

County

Holmes

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Berlin Village WWTP	3PG00147*CD	0.30	1.00	1993	1993	100	0		0
Chestnut Ridge Elementary School	3PT00118*AD								
Holmes County Commissioners Mount Hope	3PG00135*CD	0.00	0.00	1985		100	0		
Holmes County Jail WWTP	3PG00151*CD	0.03	0.01	0	0	100	0		0
Holmes Winesburg WWTP	3PG00138*CD	0.02	0.01	1986	1986	100	2		
Holmesville WWTP	3PB00069*BD	0.10	0.03	2000	0	100	4		0
Killbuck Wastewater Treatment Works	3PB00067*DD	0.41	0.54	1987	1996	100	1		
October Hills Wastewater Treatment Plant	3PG00134*CD	0.60	0.00	1973		100			

County

Holmes

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Three M Associates LTD	3PR00251*BD								
Village of Millersburg Wastewater Plant	3PC00100*FD	0.50	0.78	1963	1974	100	3		0
Walnut Creek WWTP	3PH00058*CD	0.09	0.08	1986	2000	100	6		

County

Huron

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Bellevue WWTP	2PD00037*ID	2.40	0.93	1969	1994	100	12		
City of Norwalk WWTP	2PD00024*PD	3.50	2.54	1988	0	70	10	30	1
Village of Greenwich	2PB00059*HD	0.20	0.19	1964	1998	25		75	2
Village of Monroeville WWTP	2PB00004*GD	0.20	0.18	1959	1972	100	4		
Village of New London	2PB00058*GD	0.60	0.69	1940	1991	100	0		0
Village of Wakeman WWT Lagoons	2PA00014*DD	0.11	0.08	1994	2003	100	4		
Willard Water Pollution Control Plant	2PD00005*KD	4.50	2.10	1991	1999	40	2	60	3

County

Knox

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Centerburg Wastewater Treatment Facility	4PB00103*GD	0.20	0.20	1966	1988	100	6		
Centerburg Water Treatment Facility	4IW01000*ED	0.00	0.00	1950	1990	100	0		0
Del-Co Water- Thomas E Steward Plant	4IW01003*BD								
East Knox Elementary School	4PT00103*BD	0.01	0.00	1994	1997	100	0		0
Gambier STP	4PB00101*DD	0.45	0.19	1995	1995	100	2		0
Little Jelloway Creek WWTP	4PJ00100*FD	1.00	0.00	1974	1974	10	19		0
Mount Vernon WWTP	4PD00100*JD	5.00	3.64	1952	1992	100	9		
PLEASANT VIEW ACRES WWTP	4PG00042*DD	0.02	0.01		0	100	0		0

County

Knox

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Danville WWTP	4PC00100*FD	0.20	0.20	1995	1995	100	0		0
Village of Fredericktown	4PB00100*FD	0.00	0.00	1939	1991	70	0	30	0

County

Licking

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Alexandria WWTF	4PA00106*AD	0.08	0.00	2005	2005	100	0		0
Buckeye Lake Sewer District #1	4PJ00000*HD	1.10	0.95	1957	1985	100	9		
City of Heath WWTP	4PC00007*JD	1.75	1.79	1962	2004	100	18		
Environmental Control Facility	4PD00101*BD	2.65	1.42	1993	2000	100	43		0
Granville WWTP	4PC00006*FD	1.22	0.54	1986	2002	100	8		0
Hartford WWTP	4PA00105*AD	0.06	0.00	2004	2004	100	2		
Kirkersville WWTP	4PB00104*BD	0.00	0.00	1994	1994	100	1		0
Newark WWTP	4PE00001*JD	8.00	8.89	2000	0	67	13	33	2

County
Licking

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Pataskala WWTP	4PB00009*HD	1.10	0.60	1966	1992	100	5		0
Utica WWTP	4PB00022*ED	0.00	0.00	1930	1984	.	0	1	0
Village of Hebron WWTP	4PB00005*HD	1.50	0.64	1990	1995	100	7		0
Village of Johnstown	4PC00001*GD	0.75	0.00	1961	1984	100	4		0
Wilkins Trailer Park	4PV00012*BD	0.01	0.06	1991		100	1		0
Willowbrook East - Jardin Manor WWTP	4PG00019*ED	0.10	0.05	1974	1974	100	0		

County

Logan

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Bellefontaine WWTP	1PD00000*MD	3,500.00	4.21	1985	1995	100	20		0
FLAT BRANCH WWTP	1PP00006*GD	0.10	0.05	1979	0	100	0		0
INDIAN LAKE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL	1PK00002*JD	2.30	2.91	1985	0	100	25		
Ohio Department of Transportation	1PP00021*BD	0.01	0.00	1987		100	1		
Valley Hi WWTP	1PB00043								
Village of Quincy WWTP	1PB00036*CD	0.19	0.35	1973		100	4		
Village of Rushsylvania	1PB00025*DD	0.10	0.04	1967	1991	100	5		
Village of West Liberty WWTP	1PC00012*ED	0.50	0.40	1940	2003	100	8		

County
Madison

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Choctaw Lake WWTP, Sanitary Sewer District #2	4PG00049*AD	0.30	0.00	2003		100	0		0
London WWTP	4PC00003*KD	2.90	2.29	1936	1986	100	3		0
Madison County Childrens Home Plant	4PG00023*FD	0.01	3,700.00	1940	1970	100	0		0
Madison County SD#1	4PG00045*DD	0.15	0.06	1991	1991	100	2		0
Madison Plains High School	4PT00001*DD	0.00	0.00	1977	1977	100	0		0
Village of Lowellville	3PC00007*HD	0.51	0.35	1990	1990	100	0		0
Village of Mount Sterling	4PB00015*GD	0.50	0.50	1937	1988	98	0		0
Village of Plain City	4PB00016*FD	0.00	0.00	1982	1985	100	1		0

County
Madison

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of South Solon WWTP	4PA00002*CD	0.10	0.00	2002	2002	100	1		
Village of West Jefferson WWTP	4PB00024*GD	1.20	0.98	1988	1988	100	0		0
Wissalohichan Sanitary Sewer District	4PG00048*BD	0.00	0.00	1999		100	2		

County

Marion

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
City of Marion	2PD00011*KD	10.50	9.00	1978	2001	50	6	50	
Fountain Place MHP / SD 5A	2PG00035*FD	0.10	0.12	1991	0	100	2		
Grandview Estates	2PG00036*DD	0.28	0.28	1957	1990	100	1		
Harmony Subdivision	2PG00072*DD	0.01	0.02	1975		100	0		0
LaRue WWTP	2PA00051*CD	0.10	0.02	2000		100	3		
Marion County Commissioners-North Quarry	2PW00004*BD	0.02	0.02			100	2		
Marion County Richland Road WWTP	2PJ00002*ED	175.00	0.98	1975	1995	100	1		
New Bloomington WWTP	2PA00065*CD	0.13	0.06	1997		100	2		

County

Marion

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Sewer District #7 Water Reclamation Plant	2PJ00002*FD	1.75	1.58	1995	0	100	5		0
Village of Caledonia WWTP	2PA00035*CD	0.12	0.04	1995		100	2		
Village of Prospect	2PA00041*GD	0.12	0.18	1976		100	2		

County

Mercer

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Celina WWTP	2PD00033*ND	2.50	2.12	1992	1996	100	14		
Chapel Hill	2PG00103*DD	0.04	0.02	1996	0	100	1		
Chickasaw WWTP	2PA00088*AD	0.07	0.00	2003	2003	100	2		
Coldwater WWTP	2PB00013*GD	0.90	0.68	1990	1995	100	2		0
Fort Recovery WWTP	2PA00030*HD	0.25	0.09	1973	1973	35	2	65	1
Mendon WWTP	2PA00058*ED	0.10	0.07	1968	1968	100	1		0
Mercer Co Philothea SD WWTP	2PG00113*AD	0.02	0.00	2002	2002	100	1		
Mercer County Home	2PG00104*DD	0.04	0.01	1996	0	100	1		

County

Mercer

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Montezuma Club Island WWTP	2PH00015*FD	2.00	0.50	1986	0	100	10		
Northwood	2PG00106*FD	0.08	0.07	1989	0	100	0		
Village of Rockford	2PD00001*FD	0.25	0.20	1986	0	100	1		0
Village of St. Henry	2PB00027*LD	0.78	0.67	1988	2005	100	4		0

County

Morrow

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Candlewood Lake WWTP	4PU00005*DD	0.30	0.08		2003	100	2		0
Highland Local School District	4PT00005*CD								
Northmor High & Junior High School	4PT00110*AD	0.01	0.01			100	0		0
Sparta WWTP	4PA00104*AD	0.04	0.00	2001		100	1		
Village of Cardington WWTP	4PA00100*GD	0.33	0.33	1973	1996	100	2		
Village of Chesterville	4PA00103*AD	0.07	0.00	1999		100	2		
Village of Edison WWTP	4PA00000*BD	0.07	0.05	1999		100	2		
Village of Marengo WWTP	4PA00101*DD	0.04	0.02	1992		100	5		

County

Morrow

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of Mt. Gilead	4PB00102*FD	0.00	0.00	1956	1985	100	0		0

County
Muskingum

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Lakeland Hills	0PG00015*HD	0.00	0.02	1971	1971	100	0		0
New Concord Wastewater Treatment Plant	0PB00028*ED	0.45	0.35	1987	1987	100	2		0
Roseville Wastewater Treatment Plant	0PC00020*DD	0.67	0.40	1989		100	17		0
Stonehenge Treatment Facility	0PG00037*HD	0.00	0.02			100	1		0
Village of Dresden WWTP	0PB00012*HD	0.24	0.20	1930	1990	100	1		
Village of Frazeyburg WWTP	0PB00015*FD	0.18	0.20	1991		100	3		0
West Muskingum	0PG00012*HD	0.00	0.00	1975	2003	100	100		
Zanesville Wastewater Treatment Plant	0PE00000*KD	7.75	6.67	1959	1986	85	1	15	1

County
Muskingum

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Antwerp WWTP	2PA00037*JD	0.33	0.30	1981	1981	100	2		
Cecil WWTP	2PA00033*ED	0.03	0.01	1991	1991	100	1		
Grover Hill WWTP	2PA00085*DD	0.06	0.03	1990	1990	100	2		
Latty WWTP	2PA00073*GD	0.02	0.02	1991	1991	100	1		0
Oakwood WWTP	2PB00031*GD	0.15	0.11	1990	1990	100	1		
Paulding WWTP	2PD00027*HD	0.71	0.67	1960	1960	40	1	60	1
Payne WWTP	2PA00019*GD	0.00	0.00	1965	1997			100	1

County
Pickaway

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Ashville WWTP	4PC00005*JD	0.00	0.00	1994	1994	100	3		0
Circleville WWTP	4PD00003*OD	4.00	1.90	1977	1993	100	7		
Clark's Lake Subdivision WWTP	4PG00014*ED	0.00	0.00	1963	1980	100	0		0
Commercial Point WWTP	4PB00107*BD	0.22	0.13	1997	1997	100	3		0
Earnhart Hill Regional W&SD	4PW00000*ED	0.15	0.11	1970	1988	100	1		
Knollwood Village Subdivision WWTP	4PG00025*GD	0.02	0.02		0	100	0		
New Holland WWTP	4PB00028*FD	0.12	0.14	1980	1980	100	1		0
Pickaway Correctional Institute WWTP	4PP00003*DD	1.40	1.27	1924	1991	100	1		

County
Pickaway

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Pickaway County Commissioners Circle Hills	4PG00013*FD	0.03	0.01	1968	1968	100	0		
Scippo Sewer District WWTP	4PQ00002*CD	0.15	0.03	1995		100			
South Bloomfield Wastewater Treatment	4PB00026*FD	0.16	0.09	1992	1992	100	1		
South Bloomfield WWTP	4PC00101*AD	0.50	0.09	2003	2003	100	2		
Village of Williamsport WWTP	4PA00004*FD	0.15	0.22	1977	1977	100	2		
Walnut Heights	4PG00018*DD	0.07	0.03	1965	1965	100	1		
Wintergreen Hills Subdivision	4PG00024*GD	0.01	0.02		0	100	0		0

County

Putnam

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Continental WWTP	2PB00049*DD	0.00	0.00	1957	1993	100	3		
Village of Columbus Grove WWTP	2PC00004*GD	0.82	0.58	1937	1967	20	5	80	0
Village of Fort Jennings Wastewater Lagoon	2PA00052*FD	0.06	0.01	1998	1998	100	1		
Village of Kalida Sewage Treatment Plant	2PA00047*GD	0.22	0.16	1980	1993	100	2		
Village of Leipsic WWTP	2PB00040*JD	0.62	0.46	1954	1998	30	3	70	1
Village of Ottawa WWTP	2PD00028*ID	3.00	1.00	1953	1998	100	6		
Village of Ottoville	2PA00002*GD	0.17	0.14	1978	1978	100	1		
Village of Pandora	2PB00029*GD	0.40	0.27	1970	1988	20		80	1

County
Richland

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Country Meadows	2PR00075	0.01	0.01	1977	1977	100			
Country Meadows Subdivision	2PG00074*BD	0.01	0.01	1977	1977	100	0		0
Harp Subdivision	2PG00075*DD	0.04	0.13	1974	1974	100	0		
Imperial	2PG00006*ED	0.16	0.20	1969	1993	100	0		0
Lust Subdivision	2PG00077*DD	0.01	0.01	1972	1972	100	0		0
Malabar Farm State Park Inn	2PP00032	0.01	0.00			85			
Mansfield Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PE00001*ID	12.00	10.34	1956	1997	100	15		
Plymouth STP	2PB00014*ED	0.50	0.33	1961		100	5		

County
Richland

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Richland Co Eastview WWTP	2PH00005*FD	0.26	0.35	1967	1967	100	4		0
Shelby wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00036*KD	2.50	1.70	1954	1988	100	0		0
Village of Bellville WWTP	2PB00057*HD	0.33	0.17	1978	1994	100	3		
Village of Butler WWTP	2PA00044*ED	0.12	0.17	1956	1982	100	1		
Village of Lexington WWTP	2PB00019*GD	0.68	0.71	1970	1997	100	1		
Village of Lucas WWTP	2PB00038*GD	0.96	0.15	1987	1997	100	2		0
Village of shiloh WWTP	2PB00017*DD	0.12	0.07	1957	1991	100	2		

County

Seneca

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Bettsville Wastewater Treatment Facility	2PA00072*AD	0.18	0.00	2003		100	1		
Bloomville WWTP	2PB00053*DD	0.13	0.06	1967	1992	100	1		
City of Fostoria WWTP	2PD00031*ND	8.25	5.70	1928	1994	15	12	85	
Green Springs WWTP	2PB00026*FD	0.24	0.26	1966		30	2	70	
Hammer-Heinsman STP	2PG00011*DD	0.03	0.02	1972	2000	100			
Honey Creek WWTP	2PR00107*AD	0.05	0.01	1995	1995	100	1		
Hopewell Township Trustees Meadowbrook	2PR00142*AD								
Seneca County Facilities	2PG00088*CD	0.03	0.03	1969	1993	100	0		

County

Seneca

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Sentinel Vocational Center	2PT00017*BD								
Snakester's	2PR00114*BD								
Tiffin WPC	2PD00025*LD	4.00	3.23	1954	1988	50		50	12
Village of Attica Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PB00001*FD	0.20	0.29	1971	1971	100	0		0
Village of Republic Wastewater Treatment	2PA00087*AD	0.08	0.00	2001	2001	100	2		

County
Shelby

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Anna Sewage Treatment Plant	1PB00004*FD	0.40	0.17	1996	1996	100	1		
Arrowhead Waste Water Plant	1PG00099*DD	0.07	0.04	1972	2002	100			
Botkins WWTP	1PB00007*ED	0.50	0.35	1989	1989	100	2		
Fair Haven Shelby County Home Waste Water Plant	1PT00083*BD	0.01	0.01	1998	1998	100			
Hardin Elementary School	1PT00068*BD	0.01	0.00	1989	1998	100	1		
Hickory Dell Estates WWTP	1PG00101*BD	0.02	0.02	2002	0	100	0		0
Lake Loramie Special Sanitary Sewer District	1PH00028*CD	0.40	0.28	1990	1990	100	11		
Millcreek Sewer District	1PG00021*ED	0.04	0.02	1974	1994	100			

County

Shelby

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Sidney Wastewater Treatment Plant	1PD00009*ND	7.00	6.59	2001	0	100	7		
Village of Fort Loramie	1PX00053*AD	0.20	0.21	1990		100	1		0
Village of Jackson Center	1PB00018*GD	0.37	0.25	1971	1999	100	1		

County
Union

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
City of Marysville WRF	4PE00002*AD	4.00	3.73	2007	2007	100	18		
City of Marysville WWTP	4PC00002*LD	4.00	3.39	1982	2001	100	17		
Crottinger Estates WWTP	4PG00003*FD	0.01	0.01	1972		100	1		0
Darby Meadows WWTP	4PG00005*FD	0.01	0.02			100	0		
Mill Creek Estates WWTP	4PG00036*DD	0.11	0.11	1971	1996	100	1		0
Parrott Village WWTP	4PG00006*ED	0.02	0.03	1972	1996	100	0		0
Richwood WWTP	4PB00018*HD	0.38	0.37	1972	1992	100	7		
tawa Estates WWTP	4PG00009*FD	0.01	0.00	1970		100	0		0

County
Union

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Convoy WWTP	2PB00005*ID	0.20	0.26	1987	1987	100	2		
Delphos Water Pollution Control Plant	2PD00029*MD	3.00	1.00	1930	1991	30		65	10
Middle Point WWTP	2PA00022*ED	0.08	0.09	1991	1991	100	1		
Ohio City WWTP	2PB00030*GD	0.15	0.16	1969	1969	60	2	40	0
Van Wert WWTP	2PD00006*PD	4.00	2.61	1935	2001	30	9	70	2
Willshire WWTP	2PA00013*ED	0.07	0.05	1992	1992	100	2		

County

Williams

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Bryan Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PD00018*LD	3.14	2.78	1940	1988	100	5		
Durham Estates	2PG00085*CD	0.02	0.02	1972	1993	100	0		
Edgerton WWTP	2PB00047*JD	0.30	0.22	1979	1979	100	9		
Hickory Hills	2PG00084*DD	0.01	0.01	1970	1970	100	2		
Hillside Country Living	2PG00086*DD	0.04	0.04	1988		100	0		
Indian Meadows Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PP00002*ED	0.00	0.00	1955	1955	100	0		0
Kunkle Maintenance Building, Ohio Turnpike	2PP00047*BD	0.00	0.00	1992		100	0		
Lakeland Woods	2PG00087*DD	0.03	0.03	1969		100	0		

County
Williams

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Separate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Mid Toll Exit One	2PR00108*BD	0.04	0.00	1996		100	0		
Nettle Lake	2PG00046*CD	0.11	0.01	1996		100	4		
Norlick Place	2PG00067*ED	0.05	0.05	1972		100	0		
Pioneer Wastewater Treatment Works	2PB00006*HD	0.50	0.24	1997	1997	100	3		0
South Central Sewer District	2PH00018*BD	0.13	0.71	2001		100	3		
Village of Edon Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PA00031*ED	0.20	0.08	1994	1994	100	1		
Village of Montpelier	2PD00003*ID	1.00	0.00	1958	1971	40	7	60	1
Village of Stryker	2PB00009*FD	0.35	0.17	1965	1991	100	3		

County

Williams

Current Community Wastewater Information

Facility Name	OEPA No.	Design Flow (MGD)	Annual ADF (MGD)	Year Constructed	Year Last Modified	% Sanitary Seperate Sewer	# Sanitary Lift Stations	% CSOs	# Combined Lift Stations
Village of West Unity	2PB00021*ID	0.33	0.26	1998	0	100	2		0
Carey WWTP	2PD00038*HD	0.91	0.58	1936	1986	100	4		
Upper Sandusky WWTP	2PD00039*ID	2.00	1.54	1956	1995	65	9	35	2
Village of Nevada WWTP	2PA00070*BD	0.09	0.05	1996		100	2		
Village of Sycamore Wastewater Treatment Plant	2PB00000*BD	0.16	0.02	1994	1994	100	7		