

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

<u>Area(s) Addressed</u>	<u>WQM Plan Content</u>	<u>Comments</u>
All	<p>In the <u>WQMP</u> for the nondesignated planning area, municipal and industrial sources were inventoried; land use summaries at the basin, township and facilities planning area levels were prepared; population projections at the county, facilities planning area and incorporated levels were completed. The initial projections were revised, based on public comment and 1970 census data, and republished as part of the 1982 update to the Water Quality Management Plan.</p> <p>In the <u>WQMP</u>, population projections in five year increments were developed at the township, facilities planning area, existing service area and incorporated area level. These projections were revised, as appropriate, and republished as part of the 1982 update to the <u>WQMP</u>. In 1982, load reduction needs were developed and certified for significant dischargers on 108 WQL segments in the nondesignated planning area. Alternative waste treatment systems, assessment of land availability and capital costs and financial arrangements were developed for some, but not all, municipal waste treatment systems. The existing status of entities' Construction Grants efforts were included in the <u>WQMP</u> for the nondesignated planning area.</p> <p><u>Package Sewage Treatment Plants: Objectives and Recommendations for Program Improvements</u> reviews the current regulatory and administrative framework for management of package plant installation, operation and inspection in Ohio, and presents recommendations for program improvements. (1982)</p>	<p>Municipal waste treatment system needs must be assessed for those areas where stream use classifications are not being achieved and/or where municipal systems are not meeting NPDES permit limits. Specific assessments of municipal waste treatment system needs will be provided on a case-by-case basis through the preparation of WQBELs and issuance of NPDES permits.</p> <p>In 1992, Ohio EPA, in conjunction with U.S. EPA's 1992 National Needs Survey, collected information on municipal wastewater treatment needs, municipal stormwater needs, as well as nonpoint source pollution needs in the State of Ohio. The Needs Survey will be reported to Congress by U.S. EPA. The Division of Environmental and Financial Assistance coordinated this effort for Ohio EPA, which involved collecting and documenting information from within the Agency in conformance with criteria established by U.S. EPA, and entering this information into U.S. EPA's national database. This effort resulted in the documentation of \$5.9 billion of needs in Ohio to provide 20 year solutions to the identified pollution control problems.</p> <p>The review of Permit To Install (PTI) applications and the issuance of National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, the following criteria will be used to review proposals for new dischargers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) The application for a new wastewater treatment system must meet all applicable Ohio EPA and U.S. EPA laws, rules, and other requirements.2) The application must be consistent and comply with the requirements and conditions of any grants or loans awarded by the state of Ohio and/or U.S. EPA.3) The application should include an evaluation of different options for handling of wastewater which are designed to minimize the degradation of the waters of the state. In reviewing the application, Ohio EPA will encourage the implementation of practical options with minimum impact on the waters of the state. The applicant is required to evaluate options with no discharge to waters of the state (connecting to existing sewers, land application, etc.). If any of the no

discharge options are judged to be practical and cost effective, the applicant will be required to implement such option. 4) The selected option for handling of wastewater is required to comply with all antidegradation requirements. (OAC 3745-1-05) 5) Package treatment plants will only be approved as temporary systems, which will be required to be abandoned when public sewers become available. 6) Ohio EPA will take into consideration overlapping service areas. Ohio EPA will discourage projects which may result in overlapping service areas. However, Ohio EPA may approve such projects in order to eliminate existing unaddressed water pollution or public health problems. 7) Ohio EPA will consider existing 208 planning and planning areas to the extent that the source(s) of the new dischargers seeking permits were specifically anticipated and addressed in the planning process so that a specific entity was actually assigned responsibility for undertaking and providing treatment for the discharge. Where 201 planning has been carried out and a specific alternative has been implemented, Ohio EPA will consider existing 201 planning areas to the extent that service to the entire planning area was the alternative chosen for implementation.

Specific assessments of needs of industrial waste treatment systems holding NPDES permits were prepared. For the Scioto River Basin only, the inventory included an analysis of effluent data provided through LEAPS as well as facility data. In the 1980 WQMP, an inventory of industrial dischargers was provided on a case-by-case basis via the NPDES permit program, reflecting, where available, the wasteload allocations for selected watersheds.

Planning boundaries have been established consistent with State subbasin boundaries. In the Initial Water Quality Management Plan (IWQMP) for the nondesignated planning areas, facility planning areas and stream segments (originally classified by the State of Ohio in 1973) were identified, as were locations of significant dischargers and monitoring stations. The Water Pollution Control Loan Fund (WPCLF) was signed into law on May 26, 1989. This is a loan program which could make \$500 million available between 1989-1994 for municipal wastewater treatment improvements and nonpoint source pollution control projects.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

All communities receiving financial assistance from the (WPCLF) are required to complete a facilities plan prior to signing a loan agreement. The facilities planning process contains the basic elements of planning found in water quality management plans, but at a more specific level. The WPCLF facilities planning process includes joint delineation of a planning area by the applicant and Ohio EPA prior to the initiation of facilities planning. Planning areas are designed to incorporate areas that might feasibly be served by types of projects for which facilities planning is being done.

Once the planning area for a project has been defined, facilities planning includes identification of the water pollution problems present in the area, and an evaluation of the most feasible methods of addressing those problems. Solutions to identified problems which could feasibly be included as part of the proposed project are evaluated using a cost-effectiveness analysis of alternatives. The project alternative selected for funding is the alternative determined to be cost effective for the planning area in question.

The selected alternative is evaluated by Ohio EPA in accordance with the state environmental review process, as required under ORC Section 6111.036, to ensure that the funded project will not have significant adverse impacts to the environment.

The facilities planning process for projects funded by the WPCLF program constitutes an update of the water quality management plans for the areas covered by the facilities plans. The loan agreements signed by municipalities receiving WPCLF loans commits them to constructing their projects in accordance with the approved facilities plans for their projects.

Ashtabula/Grand

The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Cowles Creek, and Coffee Creek (Austinburg, Geneva) contains an inventory of municipal and industrial dischargers for the study area. Existing municipal wastewater treatment needs are identified. A recommendation that an industrial needs survey be conducted for the area is made in the report.

Currently, the areawide planning agencies responsible for water quality management planning in the designated portions of the state are given an opportunity to comment on WPCLF projects through the State Clearinghouse review process prior to loan award and to accept projects by resolutions of their respective boards. It is noted, however, that separate IGR Clearinghouses may exist within some areawide planning agencies boundaries. For that reason, all entities requesting WPCLF \$ will be directed to ensure that their applications are sent directly to the appropriate areawide planning agency and to the IGR Clearinghouse if a separate agency exists. In the future, these planning agencies will be asked to incorporate the following language in their board resolutions accepting WPCLF projects, "The project is consistent with the areawide waste treatment management plan and will be incorporated into the plan at its next update." Ohio EPA should provide guidance to the areawides regarding criteria to be used in this consistency review. For the non-designated portions of Ohio, the facilities planning process will be relied upon to ensure consistency with water quality management plans. (Refer to Appendix B for a list of projects for which facilities plans were prepared and approved and have been funded through the WPCLF).

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

Central Ohio River Tributaries	The <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Cross Creek/Yellow Creek</u> (Wintersville, Richmond) contains an inventory of municipal and industrial dischargers for the study area.
Great Miami	Wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) Existing municipal wastewater treatment requirements are addressed in the following CWQRs: <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Nettle Creek, Mad River</u> (St. Paris)(1984); <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the East Fork Whitewater River</u> (New Paris)(1985); <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the South Fork Great Miami River</u> (Belle Center)(1985); <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Blue Jacket Creek</u> (Bellefontaine)(1987).
Hocking	Wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) The <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Upper Hocking River Basin</u> (Lancaster, Amanda, New Lexington, Junction City, Bremen, Sugar Grove) evaluated the municipal and industrial wastewater treatment needs for the study area. (1985)
Huron/Vermillion	Industrial wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) The <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the East Branch Vermilion River</u> (New London) (1985) and the <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Rattlesnake Creek/Huron River</u> (Norwalk, Milan, Imperial Clevite) (1987) evaluated the municipal and industrial wastewater treatment needs for the study areas.
Little Beaver	Industrial wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982)
Little Miami/Southwest Ohio River Tributaries	Wasteload reductions were developed for significant discharges as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) The <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Little Beaver Creek</u> (Montgomery County Eastern Regional WWTP)(1985) and the <u>Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the East Fork Little Miami River Basin</u> (New Vienna, Lynchburg, St. Martin, Fayetteville, Brown County-Lake Lorelei, Williamsburg,

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

Bethel, Clermont County-Amelia, Batavia) evaluates the municipal and industrial wastewater treatment needs for the study areas.

Maumee/Portage

Industrial wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Kopp Creek and Wierth Ditch, St. Mary's River Subbasin, Auglaize County (New Bremen)(1985); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for North Turkeyfoot Creek (Wauseon)(1985); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Muddy Creek (Lindsey, Hessville)(1985); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Tiffin River (Bryan)(1987) and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Upper Blanchard River (Findlay, Arlington, Dunkirk, Forest, Mt. Blanchard, Mt. Cory, Rawson)(1987) contain inventory and treatment needs of municipal and industrial discharges.

Muskingum

The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Rocky Fork of the Mohican River Subbasin (Mansfield)(1984); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Killbuck Creek (Wooster, Apple Creek, Hillcrest, Shreve, Millersburg, Killbuck, Berlin Development Center, Guggisberg Cheese, Owens-Illinois Co.)(1987); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Licking River (Utica, Pataskala, Hebron, heath, Newark, Millersport, kaiser Aluminum, Licking County SD#1)(1987) contain inventories of existing municipal and industrial wastewater treatment needs are addressed in the reports.

Sandusky

Industrial wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Lower Sandusky River Basin (Tiffin) contains an inventory of municipal and industrial dischargers in the study area. Municipal and industrial wastewater treatment needs are addressed in the Report. (1984)

Scioto

Industrial wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Big Darby Creek (Plain City)(1984); The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Bokes Creek, Upper Scioto River Basin, (West Mansfield)(1984); The

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Upper Big Walnut Creek (Marengo, Sunbury, Galena)(1985); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Upper Scioto River (McGuffey, Kenton, Occidental Chemical, Rockwell International, Wilco, Inc.)(1987); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Whetstone Creek (Mt. Gilead, Cardington)(1987); the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Central Scioto River (Columbus-Jackson Pike WWTP)(1987); and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Walnut Creek (Baltimore, Gaylord Container Corporation, Canal Winchester, Fairfield County Mingo Estates, Reynolds Metals, Pickerington, Ashville, South Bloomfield)(1987) address existing municipal and industrial dischargers for the study area are contained in the Reports. (1984)

Southeast Ohio River Tributaries Existing municipal and industrial wastewater treatment inventories and needs are addressed in the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Elk Fork, Raccoon Creek Subbasin (McArthur)(1984) and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Little Raccoon Creek (Wellston North WWTP and Wellston South WWTP)(1985).

Wabash Municipal and industrial wasteload reductions were developed for significant dischargers as part of the wasteload allocation process. (1982) Existing municipal and industrial wastewater treatment inventories and needs are addressed in the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Beaver Creek (Celina).

EDATA The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Silver/Eagle Creek (Garrettsville, Hiram) and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Mahoning River (Youngstown, Warren, Niles, Girard, Campbell, Struthers, McDonald, Loellsville, Thomas Steel Strip, Copperweld Steel, Republic Steel-Warren and Youngstown, LTV Steel, Campbell, Ohio Edison-Niles, Mosquito Creek, Meander Creek, Boardman) was completed in 1983-1989. The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Yankee Creek (Brookfield Township WWTP, Hubbard WWTP) was completed in 1987.

The WQMP includes inventories of industrial, municipal and on-site wastewater treatment facilities. The Plan also identifies wastewater and sludge treatment needs for present flows and projects treatment

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

needs through 2005.

The Municipal Wastewater Treatment, Volume 1 (1977) developed a wastewater treatment plan for the EDATA planning area (Mahoning and Trumbull counties). This report evaluated present and projected population and waste flows, delineated existing sanitary sewer service areas and assessed treatment adequacy at existing treatment facilities. The report also assessed future wastewater treatment needs, developed treatment alternatives to meet present and projected needs, and recommended short and long term construction schedules for selected alternatives.

A technical report, Alternatives for the Ultimate Discharge of Wastewater Effluent and Disposal of Sludge (1977), evaluated alternatives for discharging and disposing of wastewater effluent and sludge residuals. The report considered local wastewater treatment capabilities and needs, sludge generation rates, and local environmental and land use compatibilities to develop selected alternatives for disposal including joint sludge disposal.

Volume Five of the WQMP, Industrial Wastewater Control, 1977, evaluates the compatibility of waste discharges from selected industrial dischargers with specific municipal treatment systems. Flow rates and pollutant loadings are included in the evaluation. The selected industrial dischargers have effluent which is representative of many industrial dischargers in the planning area.

The Annual Report Areawide Waste Treatment Management Plan Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, Ohio, 1980, reported the progress achieved in implementing the WQMP. Each of the 15 facility planning area (FPA) evaluations conducted for the WQMP were updated by reporting on planning and/or construction accomplishments since the 1978 certification of the WQMP.

The report, Industrial Residual Waste Disposal, 1980, researched industrial residual waste disposal practices in Mahoning and Trumbull counties. An inventory of industrial waste generators, disposal sites and disposal practices was conducted by identifying all potential

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

industrial waste generators (656 businesses were identified) and waste disposal sites. A survey was conducted for the identified industrial residual generators to identify in-plant and off-site waste residual management practices. The survey offered anonymity, yet businesses were reluctant to report due to fears that the information would be used to monitor specific industrial sites and regulate discharges. Recommendations for improved treatment and disposal practices were developed where applicable.

The Mill Creek Park Assessment Lake Newport, Identification of Pollutant Loadings to the Mill Creek Park Lake System, 1981, assembled available information concerning water quality, pollutant loadings and other point and nonpoint sources which degrade the water quality of lakes in the Mill Creek Park Lake System. The report identifies specific point and nonpoint sources of pollutants from construction activities, industrial dischargers, municipal wastewater dischargers, concentrations of on-site sewage treatment facilities, agricultural activities and urban storm water runoff. Loading estimates were developed but further assessment and quantification of loads is necessary to quantitatively establish and support development of a technically-based restoration plan.

In 1983, the WQMP was updated to evaluate the methods used to process and dispose of municipal sludge. This report, Disposal of Municipal Wastewater Treatment Sludge, 1983, evaluated compliance with sludge disposal regulations, compared costs of alternative sludge disposal methods (landfilling, land application, and incineration) to review and revise WQMP recommendations for municipal sludge handling.

In 1986, the report An Inventory of package Wastewater Treatment Plants in Mahoning County, Ohio, documented the following information for 90 package wastewater treatment plants in Mahoning County: plant owner and operator, latitude and longitude of facility, location of facilities identified on USGS maps, watershed and receiving stream, entity responsible for operation and maintenance, size and type of system, design and actual flow, and available inspection comments.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

A Status Report on Facility Planning Areas (1990) was conducted in Mahoning and Trumbull Counties. Information was collected on population, land development and economic trends to assess future wastewater treatment needs.

The Existing Facilities Assessment Report for Mahoning and Trumbull Counties (1990) provided a detailed description of the processes and equipment at each wastewater treatment plant in Mahoning and Trumbull counties.

The Assessment Report to Review Local Efforts to Construct Facilities (1990) was prepared to update the planning strategy to construct wastewater treatment facilities by providing information on what was actually constructed versus what was planned.

The Residual Disposal Assessment Phase I and Phase II Reports (1990) surveyed residuals and potential impacts upon surface and ground waters.

A Residual Sludge Disposal Seminar (1990) was held to discuss the findings of the Residual Disposal Assessment report.

A Reclamation Site Inventory of Northeast Ohio (1991) was conducted to determine suitable locations for the land application of sludge.

A Package Plant Survey for Mahoning and Trumbull Counties (1991) was conducted to identify the location, type, ownership and design discharge of package plant on record at the Ohio EPA Northeast District Office.

Developed an Industrial Database Directory for the City of Campbell, Ohio (1992). This is the first phase in the development of a pretreatment program for Campbell, Ohio.

EDATA conducted a Farm Bureau Survey of Trumbull County, Ohio (1992) to determine the agricultural producers attitude toward land application of sewage sludge.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

MVRPC

The revised WQMP contains a thorough analysis of the Region's municipal point sources and identifies those which are not meeting NPDES limits and are therefore negatively affecting water quality. The Plan also describes the status with regard to facilities planning and presents the recommended alternatives and implementation schedules. All facilities planning is based on approved population projections. Average flows and wasteloads are projected for each municipal point source through the year 2000.

Facility planning area (FPA) evaluations have been completed for Shawnee Hills in the Little Miami Basin (Greene County), the Village of New Lebanon in the Lower Great Miami Basin (Montgomery County) and the Village of Ansonia in the Stillwater River Basin (Darke County). Each of these includes a community analysis, an assessment of the existing WWT situation and WQ impacts, recommendations for improving wastewater treatment, and suggested financing alternatives.

The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Great Miami River (Dayton to the Ohio River) and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Stillwater River (Ansonia, Versailles, Bradford, Greenville, Arcanum, W. Milton, Englewood, Union), prepared by Ohio EPA, address existing industrial wastewater treatment needs. The WQMP contains an inventory and analysis of industrial institutional and other point sources. Flows are projected through 2005. Industrial control measures are presented, along with an implementation strategy.

A 1984 assessment of industrial point source dischargers in the MVR updates WQMP data for these entities. The study identifies, basin by basin, the number of industrial dischargers and their flow volumes for third quarter 1984 and contrasts this with comparable data for 1981, thus establishing trends over this time period. It also includes information on parameters monitored and identifies violations for third quarter 1983 (low flow conditions). Total industrial discharges are compared with municipal discharges for each basin.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

The 1984 assessment was further updated in 1990 with the publication of the report: An Inventory of Municipal, Industrial, and Other Point Source Dischargers in the Miami Valley Region; Upper Great Miami River Basin, Lower Great Miami River Basin, Little Miami River Basin, Twin Creek Basin, and Stillwater River Basin.

NEFCO

Volume III contains descriptions of existing treatment facilities in all FPAs and assessments of treatment and collection needs within all FPAs. Volume III also contains an inventory of "package" treatment plants.

Anticipated treatment needs and financial arrangements for needed construction are described for each of the 39 FPAs in the FPA summaries in Volume Three. Volume Three incorporates the State's MPPL by describing the anticipated costs on pp. 463 to 468. Financial arrangements also are described in Volume Three, pp. 465-473. Industrial waste treatment needs including a summary of discharges are described in Volume Three, pp. 473-509. An inventory of industrial dischargers (as of 1981) is included on the watershed assessments in Volume Two. Open space and recreation facilities are described in Volume Two, pp. 141-158. In addition to the plan, evaluations of wastewater treatment needs were prepared in 1985 for Shreve FPA and the Village of Richfield. The reports described current needs and recommended steps to address those needs. Finally, NEFCO updated its inventory of semi-public plants in 1985.

The Assessment of Wastewater Treatment Needs in Rootstown Township, Portage County, Ohio (1986) report assesses the need for improved wastewater treatment facilities in Rootstown Township in the south-central portion of Portage County, Ohio. The report is intended to assist the Portage County Sanitary Engineer in its planning for the township, most of which is within the Ravenna Facilities Planning Area (FPA). Six alternatives for construction and/or improvement, five of which involve central treatment facilities to serve the developed

Facility planning areas need to be evaluated and revised to reflect current conditions. The package plant inventory has been expanded under the current 205(j) contract. FPA summaries need to be updated to reflect status of facilities planning, especially for communities which are not expected to obtain sewage treatment construction grants because of their position on the MPPL. An evaluation of treatment needs has been conducted for the FPAs for the Villages of Richfield and Shreve under the 205(j) contract.

Incorporate pretreatment requirements and pretreatment programs in effect within the planning area into the Clean Water Plan in next annual plan update. FPA summaries need to be updated to reflect the status of facilities planning and construction and the Plan should describe the status of localities whose position on the MPPL is such that reliance on federal sewage construction grants is unrealistic. Evaluation treatment needs have been completed by NEFCO for Richfield in Summit County and Shreve in Wayne County and for Hartville in Stark County and Rootstown Township in Portage County. An inventory of agricultural sludge generators and disposal within NEFCO areas was completed in FFY 85. Two reports have been completed for portions of the NEFCO area which document the existing situation regarding the use of on-site sewage disposal.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

portions of the township were studied. The report also evaluates alternative approaches to upgrading existing home sewage disposal systems.

The Countywide Onsite Systems - Home Sewage Disposal Assessment and Implementation Strategy for Stark County, Ohio Summary of Recommendations (1987) and the Countywide Home Sewage Disposal Systems Assessment and Implementation Strategy for Portage County (19) reports presented a series of recommendations which included the installation of new systems, septic system permits, management of existing systems, septage disposal management, septic tank cleaning programs, nuisance abatement programs, public education and the need for further study.

The Industrial Sludge Inventory (Agri-industry) Data Analysis and Recommendations (1987) report is an inventory of all the potential and known producers of agricultural waste products in the NEFCO region (Portage, Stark, Summit and Wayne Counties). NEFCO identified the distribution of these industries' activities and evaluated the various disposal methods for their waste products.

Starting in SFY 1991 NEFCO prepared a study of the water quality impact(s) of septage spreading for two existing sites in Stark County.

NOACA

Population projections in five year increments were prepared for all minor civil divisions in the original designated planning area (7 counties). (Interim Report on 208 Water Quality). Projects completed since 1978, the availability of federal service areas and facility planning areas were also determined and mapped (NOACA Water Quality Management Plan Volume 2: Introduction and Technical Analysis). Wasteload projections were prepared in 1978 and revised in 1981 NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A34, Sewage Treatment Plant Load and Flow Projections, 1980.

This facility planning area determination effort involved (a) an extensive analysis of areawide wastewater treatment needs within the designated planning area, (b) the delineation of facility planning boundaries within the designated planning area and (c) an assignment of wastewater management responsibilities, to area management

Revise and incorporate into Plan a statement of current area municipal wastewater treatment needs in light of changes in funding resources and current Clean Water Act Objectives.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

agencies. This analysis provided a basis for designated management agency certification, facility planning area certification and Construction Grant-WQMP consistency reviews by NOACA staff.

Area dischargers were inventoried during the original plan development phase NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A09, Dischargers Inventory User's Manual, 1978.

Point sources were inventoried during the initial plan development phase NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A09, Dischargers Inventory User's Manual, 1978, municipal wastewater loads and flows were developed, and updated NOACA WQM Technical Appendix, A34, Sewage Treatment Plant Load and Flow Projections, 1980. A comprehensive areawide inventory of and projections of employment, population and land use was completed (Interim Report on 208 Water Quality (1977)). In addition, areawide inventories of sewer outfalls (NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A05, Computer Inventory of Storm Sewer Outfalls, 1978), fish and fish habitat (NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A21, Analysis of Stream Habitats, Vol. I, 1978; Analysis of Stream Habitats, Vol. II), benthos (Noaca WQM Technical Appendix A30, Survey of Benthic Invertebrates in the NOACA 208 Planning Area, 1979) small lakes (NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A29, Computer Process for the Inventory of Small Lakes in the NOACA Area, 1979), and on-site systems (NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A17, Environmental Health Subplan Technical Component, 1978) was completed. Community level population projections for year 1985 through 2005 for the counties of Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain and Medina were prepared based on the 1980 Census, and incorporated in 1984 Update Northeast Ohio Lake Erie Basin Water Quality Management Plan.

NOACA's Original 1975 designation as a 208 Planning Agency encompassed five river basins in seven counties: Black, Rocky, Cuyahoga, Chagrin and Grand River basins in the counties of Lorain, Medina, Cuyahoga, Summit and Portage (Lake Erie drainage only), Lake and Geauga. In 1980, Summit and Portage counties were redesignated to NEFCO by the Governor with U.S. EPA approval. NOACA assisted in FPA definition during 208 Plan development stage.

Updates and refinements to treatment plant data, population distribution within facility planning areas, land use, or other data needed for water quality planning or pollution control should be developed as needed.

Recommendations for municipal treatment plants and wasteload allocations should be reviewed and updated to reflect changing population projections, land use, water quality standards and other based data. Facility planning areas for which improvements are needed, but which have not yet received federal funding need to be assessed to determine their current needs, treatment alternatives and funding options. An inventory of industrial dischargers needs to be updated and maintained.

NOACA is coordinating the development of its GIS data base information system area water quality management agencies. NOACA is also providing support to the planning, development and implementation of the storm water permits program in cooperation with Ohio EPA.

Update current facility planning area boundaries and current discharger locations and monitoring station locations, current contributing source locations, such as landfills, WWTP residual disposal sites, hazardous waste sites.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

Mapping of area storm sewer outfalls NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A05, Computer Inventory of Storm Sewer Outfalls, 1978 and stream dischargers NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A09, Dischargers Inventory User's Manual, 1978 was also completed in this phase. To provide a framework for small watershed planning and implementation, NOACA also developed a mapping of over three hundred subbasins in the planning area NOACA WQM Technical Appendix A07, Delineation of Study Area Subbasins, 1978.

OKI

The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for Fourmile Creek (City of Oxford, Great Miami River Basin) and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Great Miami River (Dayton to the Ohio River) were completed by Ohio EPA during 1982 for selected point source dischargers in the subbasin. The CWQR, integrating biological assessments, wasteload modeling, and economic assessments, makes recommendations regarding stream use designations and effluent limitations.

The Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the Great Miami River (Dayton to the Ohio River) and the Comprehensive Water Quality Report for the East Fork Little Miami River Basin (New Vienna, Lynchburg, St. Martin, Fayetteville; Brown County-Lake Lorelei, Williamsburg, Bethel, Clermont County-Amelia, Batavia), prepared by Ohio EPA, address existing industrial wastewater treatment needs.

The locations of continuous and intermittent point sources are identified in the basin chapters. Continuous point source discharge locations, including both municipal and industrial are shown on Plate XI-1 and on the more recent 1984 "Primary Sewerage System Map" prepared by OKI. The 1983 Public and Semi-Public Wastewater Treatment Plant Inventory also contains updated information on point source discharges, (locations, ownership, design capacities, and NPDES permit status). Municipal wasteloads are presented in the basin chapters along with estimates of loads from all major sources. Industrial wasteloads, final NPDES requirements, and some recommendations for industrial wasteload reductions based on water quality assessment are also identified in the basin chapters. Population projections for FPAs and incorporated places are presented in

Updates and refinements to treatment plant data, population distribution within FPAs, land use, or other data needed for water quality planning or pollution control should be developed as needed. Recommendations for municipal treatment plants and wasteload allocations should be reviewed and updated to reflect changing population projections, land use, water quality standards, and other base data. FPAs for which construction is recommended, but which have not yet received federal funding, need to be assessed to determine their current needs, treatment alternatives and funding options. An inventory of industrial dischargers needs to be updated and maintained. Industrial wasteloads have not been projected, nor have industrial pretreatment and sludge management arrangements been studied. Studies of the latter could include both inventorying existing levels of industrial waste and

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

"Attachment 30" of OKI's report The Population Element of the WQM Program, 1973-1980. To reflect the results of the 1980 Census, the State revised county projections and OKI revised projections accordingly for FPAs and minor civil divisions, which are provided in the 1984 WQM Plan Update report. The Methodology for Small Area Population Projections.

projecting its level into the future.

Recommendations for decommissioning, upgrading, expanding, and constructing municipal wastewater treatment plants are presented for each FPA in Chapter XI, are shown graphically in Plate XI-1, and are indicated in the recommended wasteload allocations in the basin chapters. Treatment needs for 24 FPAs are further analyzed in separate reports that were developed by OKI as "preliminary facility plans". Treatment needs in the form of specific improvement projects are listed in the 1984 report, FY 84 Construction Grant Activity for the OKI Region, which identifies projects that are one the States's priority list but outside its funding range, and also identifies FPAs for which projects have never been considered a funding priority. OKI then conducted related Facility Planning Area Evaluations for two small communities in Butler County (Millville and McGonigle) where federal funding assistance is unlikely in the foreseeable future; reports of the same name review these two areas' existing problems and present control recommendations alternatives.

Pollution problems associated with the lack of adequate sewage treatment facilities were identified and alternatives studies for two communities in An Assessment of the Wastewater Treatment Needs of the Hunter Area in Warren County, Ohio (1986) and An Assessment of the Wastewater Treatment Needs of Kings Mills in Warren County, Ohio (1986). Updates to the WQM Plan included assessments of wastewater treatment capabilities and needs in Status of Wastewater Treatment Plants .1 MGD or Greater in Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren Counties, Ohio (1987) and Status of Wastewater Treatment in Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren Counties, Ohio (1990). Water Service Areas Maps for Butler, Clermont, Hamilton, and Warren Counties, Ohio (1987) delineated areas with and without water service, identified agencies providing service, and areas of ground water or surface water use by water suppliers.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

TMACOG

Published and distributed a Sludge for Garden Use (1985) pamphlet which provides guidelines for applying municipal sludge to a garden.

TMACOG prepared a series of Sewerage Facility Studies for Small Communities (1984 thru 1988). These studies were prepared for villages or unincorporated areas that have public health and/or water quality problems resulting from failed home septic systems and the lack of any public sewerage treatment facility. Studies have been completed for the following villages: Bloomdale, Cygnet, Harbor View, Hoytville, Neapolis, Portage, Rocky Ridge, Rudolph and Wightman's Grove.

TMACOG conducted the Interchange-Five Package Sewage Treatment Plant (1985) study to help resolve problems created by the high concentration of package plants in the area. TMACOG assessed the condition of each package plant and surveyed the ditches to which the plants discharges.

TMACOG started working on package sewage treatment plant inventories in 1984. These Package Plant Inventory Updates were field checked for Wood, Ottawa and Sandusky counties in 1987.

TMACOG prepared a non-technical diagram on Extended Aeration for Laymen (1987) to show how a package plant works and how to keep it working. In 1987, TMACOG conducted an Extended Aeration Seminar on the proper operation and maintenance of extended aeration treatment plants.

In 1987, TMACOG updated the Public Wastewater Treatment Chapter of the Areawide Water Quality Management Plan to: 1) incorporate sewer and treatment plant improvements since 1980, 2) reflect current plans for systems improvements, and 3) discuss remaining public sewerage problems and issues.

TMACOG Region Facility Planning Areas for Public Wastewater Treatment Services; 1990 Census Tract and Block Equivalency Tables; (April 1992). For each wastewater treatment Facility Planning Area, maps and charts indicate which 1990 Census blocks make up that FPA.

Facility planning areas need to be evaluated and revised to reflect current conditions.

MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL WASTE TREATMENT 130.6(c)(3)

This information will be used to determine the 1990 population of each FPA.

Village of Wayne, Ohio; Sewerage Facilities Study; (July 1990). Includes evaluation of the options for providing a sewerage system, cost estimates, recommendation, and steps needed to begin implementation.

Cross-Reference Guide for Water Quality, Transportation, and Demographic Data in the TMACOG Region; (March 30, 1990). Lays the groundwork for linking various data. Tables for each political division relate Census tracts to Transportation Analysis Zones and watersheds.

TMACOG Water Quality, Transportation and Demographic Data; (April 1990). A list of data for the TMACOG region available in the TMACOG library either in print or on computer files. Sample pages of the data are included.

City of Toledo, Ohio; Combined Sewer Overflows and Water Quality; (April 1991). A report on the impact of combined sewer overflows on local water quality; how the problem has been addressed to date; and recommended actions.

Gypsum, Ohio; Ottawa County, Portage Township; Sewerage Facilities General Plan, Interim Report; April 1991. TMACOG Element Number 189.30. Options, cost estimates, and recommendations for sewerage the village.

Areawide Water Quality Management Plan, Chapter III; Public Wastewater Treatment Services; May 1991. Includes a discussion of areawide wastewater treatment issues and how they are being addressed, areawide policies, a description of regulatory and non-regulatory programs, and the public wastewater treatment status and future needs in the six counties covered by the Water Quality Management Plan.