Area(s) Addressed	WQM Plan Content	Comments
All	In the WQMP for the nondesignated planning area, those agencies with legal authority to construct, operate and maintain treatment works were identified. Also, at the basin level, the general legal, financial and administrative capabilities were summarized and evaluated for various water quality management functions. The 1982 and 1984 management agencies update identified additional point and nonpoint source management agencies. The 1985 report, Designated Water Quality Management Agencies, continues this process-additional agencies were identified and the status of existing agencies provided. All communities receiving assistance from the Ohio Water Pollution Control Loan Fund (WPCLF) are listed as management agencies in Appendix B (1989-1992). Specialized water quality management plan reports, such as the Ohio Nonpoint Source Management Program (1992), listed in the other elements of this summary contain analysis of management agencies and recommendations for carrying out the Water Quality Management Plan. In addition, recommendations are made regarding intergovernmental cooperation and coordination in the implementation of the WQMP recommendations. Where appropriate, recommendations for needed legislative or regulatory changes are presented. Ohio EPA has reached several milestones toward completion of remedial action plans (RAPs) for Ohio's four Areas of Concern (the lower Maumee, Black, Cuyahoga and Ashtabula Rivers). One of the major requirements for completion of an acceptable RAP is considerable public involvement in the actual development of the plan. In order to achieve this objective, the Ohio EPA has held public meetings in all four areas to explain the RAP process and invite public participation. The public is a very significant player in every step of	Management agencies will be identified and assessed in conjunction with Water Quality Management planning to implement point and nonpoint source control programs. This identification and assessment is a major element of the Ohio Nonpoint Source Management Program which is part of the WQMP. Programs funded through Section 319 of the CWA are listed and management agencies identified in appropriate elements in the WQMP. Implementation statements from management agencies should be secured and, where appropriate, updated (ongoing). Management agencies' effectiveness in carrying out assigned responsibilities and provision of technical/management assistance should be assessed (ongoing). The procedure for the designation of management agencies listed in Attachment D will be reviewed in future WQM Plan updates.

the RAP process.

In addition to the RAPs, Ohio EPA continued to work closely with the International Joint Commission (IJC) and USEPA to meet the other objectives of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. As outlined in the Great Lakes International Surveillance Program for Lake Erie (GLISP), monthly water quality monitoring was conducted on the 12 major Lake Erie tributaries and selected public water supply intakes. Sampling to monitor the concentrations of toxic substances in fish tissue and sediment was also done at selected sites.

Under the Great Lakes Governors Toxic Substances Agreement, an interagency work group has been established to address emerging fish contamination and advisory issues and to coordinate the control of toxic substances with the other Great Lakes states. These activities were also complimentary to the objectives of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

The Ohio EPA continued to work with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other state and federal agencies to ensure environmentally sound harbor dredging and sediment disposal operations. The continued rise in the popularity of lakefront usage has increased the demand for dockage, and the number of requests for 401 water quality certifications allowing the expansion of existing marinas, or creating new ones, has risen proportionately.

There are several areas where Ohio EPA efforts and capabilities must be expanded to include Lake Erie waters. Biological criteria for inland rivers and streams in the state were developed and adopted into Ohio's Water Quality Standards in 1990. However, these criteria currently do not apply to the river mouths, harbors or nearshore areas of Lake Erie and tributaries. Ohio EPA desires to develop biocriteria for river mouth areas within the next three to five years, depending on the availability of resources. We also believe that the biocriteria approach is workable for the nearshore and open lake provided the appropriate evaluation tools and indicators are selected and calibrated. Ohio EPA has submitted several proposals to gain funding to accomplish this task.

Ongoing chemical and biological assessments of direct Lake Erie dischargers need to be continued to ensure that NPDES limits are protective of the environment and public health. A more intensive fish tissue sampling program and human health risk assessment procedure is needed, especially since the public use of the harbor and nearshore areas has dramatically increased. Additional sampling will be needed in the Areas of Concern to further define the extent of toxics contamination and cause and effect relationships. Continued monitoring is also needed to track loadings from Lake Erie tributaries to the lake proper.

Summaries and significant activities of RAPs for the Cuyahoga River, Maumee River, Ashtabula River and Black River follow:

Ashtabula Basin

The Ashtabula River RAP process was formally initiated in early 1988 with the establishment of a local advisory council and technical and communications committees. The council and committees are composed of volunteers representing the many stakeholders in the area. Meetings occur bimonthly.

Since the clean-up of Fields Brook is being addressed under Superfund, the focus of the RAP is on restoring the Ashtabula River. Since the RAP began, the following studies have been completed: 1) an intensive river investigation included sediment, water quality and fish tissue analyses; 2) preliminary investigations for a Natural Resource Damage Assessment claim including a biological assessment; 3) an investigation of the occurrence of tumors in brown bullhead; and 4) preliminary investigations for conducting a pilot demonstration on the treatment of contaminated sediments as required under the Assessment and Remediation of Contaminated Sediments program (ARCS). Results of these studies were used for the Stage 1 RAP Investigation Report completed in 1992.

The majority of public involvement activities for the Ashtabula River RAP have focussed on the Stage 2 process. The primary action needed to restore the river is dredging. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will not dredge the entire river due to high costs, concerns about setting a

precedent by "cleaning-up" toxic materials, and an administrative directive to concentrate maintenance efforts on commercial navigation channels. However, the Corps will conduct minimal interim dredging of nontoxic sediments to temporarily alleviate the navigation hazard in the recreational channel as an interim measure until plans can be made for the removal of toxic sediments. The efforts of the RAP have concentrated on finding an environmentally acceptable disposal site for these sediments.

The RAP has also focused on locating a disposal site in the harbor for future maintenance dredge spoil and an upland site to contain the toxic sediments from the river. Ohio has committed $7 million toward the cleanup effort, contingent upon receiving federal funds. The RAP council has initiated and participated in numerous activities to promote the goals of the RAP process.

Black River Basin

The Black River RAP was the last to begin, but may already be ahead of the others with the initial clean-up. Several remedial activities have already taken place and include reducing a substantial portion of the pollution problems identified by the 1982 Comprehensive Water Quality Report. USX was required to remove PAH contaminated sediments from the Black River, the Lorain WWTP was expanded, and the Elyria WWTP was upgraded. A follow-up monitoring effort is scheduled for 1992.

The Coordinating Committee has been appointed. There is a team of technical experts who will research and write reports from which the Coordinating Committee will develop the Stage 1 RAP. The information from the 1992 intensive survey will be used by the technical team as the principal basis for their reports.

A number of public events have been held as part of the Black River RAP process; i.e., tours, workshops, volunteer opportunities. Plans are underway to implement many more public outreach activities.

Cuyahoga Basin

The RAP process for the Cuyahoga River was initiated in 1987. The Cuyahoga Coordinating Committee was appointed by the Ohio EPA and is a 35 member group responsible for developing the Remedial Action Plan. This committee has 1) selected a steering committee; 2) formed a nonprofit corporation to seek funding, support the RAP development, and to enhance public involvement; 3) formed a technical committee to oversee the write-up of the RAP document; and 4) formed

a community involvement committee to inform, educate and solicit input from the general public.

Significant activities completed include: 1) the Stage 1 draft report which documents impairments to beneficial uses and sources of pollution in the Area of Concern; 2) an annotated bibliography of documents related to the RAP process; 3) 2 of 3 years of fish tissue collection analysis for contamination (fish sampled from the nearshore area in 1990 showed no levels of contamination that exceed FDA actions levels); 4) a fecal coliform survey; 5) 2 years of intensive water quality data collection to develop a water quality model for the navigation channel; 6) a grant received from the Gund Foundation to support RAP development and the RAPs efforts in community involvement; and 7) a grant received from the Cleveland Fund to do a public opinion poll.

Significant activities in progress include: 1) development of a fecal coliform die-off model; 2) a public opinion poll; 3) review of the completed draft Stage 1 report; and 4) development of the Stage 2 Planning process (the Stage 2 report that will evaluate options and select remedial actions is scheduled for completion in 1993).

The Cuyahoga RAP group played a major role in recommending a designated use for the Cuyahoga Ship Channel. U.S. EPA requested Ohio establish a designated use for this area so water quality standards could be developed.

Great Miami River Basin

Efforts were made to ensure maximum public involvement in the Phase I Indian Lake Diagnostic/Feasibility Study particularly in the development, evaluation and selection of alternatives. These efforts included 1) contracting with the Indian Lake Development Corporation to produce and distribute a project information brochure and to conduct a survey of lake uses, 2) conducting timely meetings of the Indian Lake Steering Committee, 3) helping District Conservationists to solicit input from the farming community on the proposed remediation efforts, 4) conducting a public meeting/information session on the project with a subsequent public comment period, and 5) presenting Ohio EPA findings and updates at three consecutive Indian Lake Dredge Day gatherings.

Maumee Basin

The Maumee River the RAP process has served to focus activities on remedial action that have been planned and implemented and to involve local citizens in the process. The Maumee River Remedial Action Plan

	Advisory Committee and nine subcommittees were established to develop: 1) the investigation report; 2) the Water Quality Problem Matrix; and 3) a draft set of recommended remedial actions, which all have been completed. To date, a logo has been designed, a quarterly newsletter has been produced, a Maumee RAP slide presentation has been developed, and the Stage 1 Report has been completed and sent to the U.S. EPA and IJC for review.	
	Since the Stage 1 Report has been completed, the Advisory Committee has disbanded and a new committee has been formed. The new group is called the Implementation Committee and they will negotiate the different alternatives of each action. This group will coordinate public education and facilitate public participation.	The Maumee RAP Implementation Committee will also be instrumental in developing and implementing the Stage 2 process.
Mill Creek	A Public Advisory Group was created during the Winton Lake Phase I Diagnostic/Feasibility Study process. Each of the political subdivisions were represented within the affected drainage area of Winton Lake. Four categories of participants were represented on the Public Advisory Group. They included: public officials, citizens and groups with substantial economic interest in restoration proposals, public interest groups and private citizens.	
Muskingum	A Phase I Diagnostic/Feasibility Water Quality Study in Dillon Lake and its Watershed is currently being conducted. Ohio EPA received a Clean Water Act Section 314 Clean Lakes Program Grant to conduct the study. The study will determine the causes and extent of pollution, evaluate possible solutions, and recommend the most feasible and cost effective measures for restoring and protecting water quality at Dillon Lake, the Ohio EPA has collected water quality data for the lake and watershed, sediment samples from the lake bottom and physical and biological data. The Muskingum SWCD and the USGS are also collecting data from Dillon Lake.	The Ohio EPA invited County, State and Federal agencies and local citizens interested in Dillon Lake to participate in a Technical Advisory Committee. The Committee facilitates public involvement in the Clean Lakes Program and evaluates various lake restoration methods and watershed management plans designed to improve Dillon Lake's water quality. The inlake and watershed management plans recommended by the Committee will become the framework for an application for funding for a Clean Lakes Phase II implementation project.
EDATA	The report, 208 Areawide Waste Treatment Management Plan for Mahoning and Trumbull Counties, Volume 2, WQMP (1977), recommended an interagency management structure to implement various components of the technical plans to abate point and nonpoint source pollution in the two-county area. The management plan was	The WQMP as a process for water quality planning is being expanded with the reestablishment of an Areawide Water Quality Policy Advisory Committee (AWQPAC) for Ashtabula, Mahoning and Trumbull counties. The WQMP is being updated to include a public participation strategy for EDATA which includes the redevelopment of the

selected after evaluating and defining alternative management structures, presenting these to local and regional units of government, and developing the selected alternative in response to their impact. This process built upon an initial comprehensive evaluation of wastewater treatment needs, presented in Municipal Wastewater Treatment, Volume One, WQMP, and summarized in this report (Volume 2). Each management alternative was evaluated for its technical and administrative ability to implement wastewater treatment and nonpoint source abatement needs in all facility planning areas.

The recommended plan established six regional wastewater management districts to manage eight regional wastewater treatment plants. The treatment plants were either in the planning stage or already constructed. These six regional management areas would coordinate wastewater treatment for all municipalities in their regional planning areas with the municipalities retaining authority over existing local plants and revenue authority until it is feasible to phase these plants out. The management plan proposed the eventual establishment of two county-wide management agencies to coordinate the six regional wastewater management areas, and implement regionally coordinated point and nonpoint source abatement programs.

The report, Nonpoint Source Abatement Sub-Plan, Volume 4 for WQMP, 1977, extensively reviewed nonpoint source sources and causes in Mahoning and Trumbull counties. Recommendations for activities to abate nonpoint source pollution were identified as were management agencies with the capability or authority to conduct such activities. The recommendations included new activities and/or programs to be carried out under existing authorities of these agencies.

The report, Identification of Pollutant Loadings to the Mill Creek Park Lake System, 1987, reviews the role each management agency can perform in implementing programs or activities to reduce both point and nonpoint source input to the lake system. The report also identifies point and nonpoint source loading sources and recommends mitigation activities to control those loads.

The report, Identification of Nonpoint Source Pollution Loadings to the AWQPAC and its involvement as a citizens group with implementation of the WQMP. The WQMP needs to be updated to identify the status of the management agencies' WQMP implementation structure. The present structure and the implementation activities currently being performed by each management agency need to be identified. The AWQPAC will continue to meet.

Mill Creek Park Lake System (1987) also identified the management agencies responsible for abating nonpoint source pollution in the watershed. The report recommended that regulatory powers to control construction site erosion be adopted.

The report, Agricultural Education to Abate Sources of Nonpoint Pollution, 1984, evaluates the abilities of management agencies to implement nonpoint source controls under existing programs and recommends expanded programs and authorities for these management agencies.

Made an evaluation of products that EDATA accomplished with local funding for several communities in Mahoning and Trumbull counties. (1990)

MVRPC

The WQMP establishes a management structure that brings together three types of designated management agencies which are responsible, with the prescribed regulatory framework for various aspects of water pollution control. The management structure was formerly comprised of the Water Resources Policy and Technical Advisory Committees and MVRPC. DMAs and other participating agencies were represented at various levels in this structure. In the 1984 WQMP Update, MVRPC took the initial steps in reorganizing their Water Quality Management Planning structure and updated and verified existing DMA implementation statements.

The new structure consists of an Areawide Water Resources Committee and five Basin Councils, one for each of the five sub-drainage areas of the Miami Valley Region. Each Basin Council is comprised of those DMAs identified in the AWQMP, representatives of private industry, related organizations and citizens. The new structure provides a means for basin-oriented water quality concerns to be identified and addressed within the framework of the AWQMP.

Updates to the AWQMP include the reports: 201/208 Consistency Review, North Regional Facilities Planning Area Boundary Change (1989) and 201/208 Consistency Review, Village of Clifton/Village of

With all types of water pollution--point and nonpoint source--the water quality objectives can be achieved only through the combined actions of federal, State and local governments. the various agencies created by them and the private individuals they represent. The WQMP should continue to develop the means and mechanisms through which the actions of implementors will be focused on water quality problems in the Miami Valley Region. As such, the Plan must 1) identify specific water quality problems; 2) present viable alternatives for addressing these problems; 3) identify the specific implementing parties; and 4) present a schedule which relates the priority of water quality with the timing of pollution control actions, how they will be funded and who is responsible for that implementing action.

	Cedarville Facilities Planning Area Modifications (1992) as well as other reports mentioned in Attachment B.	
NEFCO	Volume One includes a description of the areawide management structure. The watershed reports identify specific functions to be carried out by agencies identified in Volume One to address nonpoint source pollution described in those reports. Clean Water Plan (Volume 3) Facilities Planning Areas Summaries Update (1990) report calls for NEFCO to review Volume 3 of its Clean Water Plan and to update the section dealing with Facility Planning Area (FPA) summaries. The FPA summaries described the existing status of the FPAs, problems identified, recommendation and priorities, and the NEFCO water quality management planning activities pertaining to the FPAs. This report also includes information on possible changes in population projections and recommend any new FPAs if necessary. The following FPAs in the NEFCO region were included in the update. Portage County: Atwater, Aurora, Hiram-Garrettsville, Hudson-Streetsboro, Kent, Mantua, Ravenna and Windham. Stark County: Alliance, Beach City-Wilmot, Brewster, Canal Fulton, Canton-Nimishillen Basin (Canton Regional, Louisville and Project 428 area), East Sparta, Hartville, Massillon, Minerva, Navarre, and Waynesburg-Magnolia. Summit County: Akron, Barberton-Wolf Creek, Fish Creek, Franklin-Green, NEORSD Southerly CVI, Springfield No. 91, Twinsburg. Wayne County: Apple Creek, Creston, Dalton, Doylestown, Marshalville, Mt. Eaton, Orrville, Rittman, Shreve, Smithville, West Salem and Wooster. The Hartville Facilities Planning Area Evaluation (1986) study examined six semi-public wastewater treatment plants and one municipal plant within the FPA and two package plants outside of the FPA.	Continue to convene monthly meetings of the Water Quality Management Committee. Obtain new and revised implementation statements from local management agencies which describe specific responsibilities of each agency. Provide a forum for the discussion of federal and state environmental programs and for communication between Ohio EPA and NEFCO members. Develop specialized forums as appropriate to focus on particular water quality issues and areas of concern. NEFCO, NOACA< EDATA and Ohio EPA NEDO have committed to holding environmental round table meetings on a biannual basis to increase awareness, communication and coordination of various environmental issues.

	The Water Quality Planning Implementation Summary (FY 1985-1989) report summarized the degree of implementation for selected water quality products prepared by NEFCO with water quality management planning funds. The report is organized according to the nine planning elements. A Sippo Lake Advisory Committee was formed during the Clean Lakes Program Phase I Diagnostic/Feasibility study. The committee facilitates public involvement in the Clean Lakes Program and evaluates various lake restoration methods to improve Sippo Lake's water quality. Members of the committee include NEFCO, the Stark County Park Board, Ohio EPA, local universities and Sippo Lake residents.	
NOACA	The NEOLEB 208 Water Quality Plan (1979) originally recommended a two-tier management structure comprised of an areawide (seven county) fifty-nine member policy board (NEOLEB), and advisory Councils on Water Quality (CWQ), the Chagrin/Grand, Black/Rocky and Cuyahoga River basins, respectively, CWQs include all designated management agencies within the appropriate river basin (Continuing Planning and Coordination Subplan). Redesignation of Summit and Portage counties to the NEFCO 208 planning area in 1980, created an obstacle to full implementation of the management structure statements recommended. However, the NEOLEB 208 Policy Board continued to oversee plan implementation pursuant to 1979 plan adoption, and CWQs were established in both the Black/Rocky and Chagrin/Grand basins. Agreements to implement the NEOLEB 208 Plan were obtained from forty-six (46) area management agencies between 1980-1982. In 1984, the NEOLEB Policy Board and the NOACA Policy Board voted to merge NEOLEB functions into NOACA, extending NOACA Board membership to include all NEOLEB Board members. (1984 Update Northeast Ohio Lake Erie Basin Water Quality Management Plan.)	Provide management structure through the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency Policy Board and Water Quality Committee. Incorporate findings of Cuyahoga River and Black River Remedial Action Plan as they relate to management agencies. Continued support of the NOACA Board and the Water Quality Committee provides an essential forum for the oversight and execution of water quality management planning goals by designated management agencies in the NEOLEB planning area. The Cuyahoga River Remedial Action Plan process and the Black River Remedial Action Plan process are major basin level planning initiatives which provide new directions for water quality management in the planning area.
OKI	FPA revisions are described in formal amendments adopted since the plan's publication, and included in OKI's 1984 report, Water Quality Management Plan Update. These revisions are also shown on a "Primary Sewerage System Map" prepared by OKI in 1984. All	Future changes to FPA boundaries need to be documented through formal plan amendments. DMAs must be supported in their efforts to implement plan recommendations, a process requiring coordination with and assistance to wastewater treatment management agencies,

agencies with managerial responsibilities for water pollution control are identified in Chapter XII of the original plan, which includes descriptions of agency responsibilities. Arrangements for coordinating water quality management and planning are described in more detail in OKI's 1984 Water Quality Management (WQM) Update report. The 1984 WQM update report (covering the period from June, 1977 to October, 1983) and 1985 WQM update summary (covering the period from November, 1983 to September, 1985) summarize OKI work undertaken to update, refine and supplement the WQM plan, and are intended to provide convenient reference documents for management agencies and other more recent WQM updates were prepared for the periods including October 1985 through July 1989, August 1989 through November 1990 through March 1992.

agricultural conservation agencies, health departments, and other agencies or organizations as appropriate. The plan will be amended through formal processes, and plan updates should be informed of WQM progress through information provided to the media. Efforts will be made to obtain State certification and U.S. EPA approval of the plan.