OHIO (REGION 5)

A Snapshot of Ohio's TMDL Program (August 2008)

The Basics

Key Agency/Department & website	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency www.epa.state.oh.us/dsw/tmdl/index.html
TMDL Program Structure/Placement	Housed in Division of Surface Water; integrated

By the Numbers

Number of Impaired Waters		267
Number of Causes of Impairment		1,001
Top Five Causes of Impairment	1. Habitat Alterations 2. Pathogens 3. PCBs 4. Sediment 5. Organic Enrichment/Oxygen Depletion	
Approximate Number of TMDLs Developed Annually		120
Total Number of TMDLs Approved (1995 to present, incl. any est'd by EPA)		790
Total Number of TMDLs Approved in 2005/2006/2007		271/208/238
2008 303d/Integrated Report Submission Status (Date)		EPA has taken final action
Approximate Number of FTEs Working on TMDL Issues		48 (includes most monitoring, modeling staff)

TMDLs

EPA Under Consent Decree to Develop TMDLs?	N (completed)
Broad-Scale? (*e.g.*, watershed, multi-jurisdictional, etc.)	Y

Non-TMDL Options

Use of Non-TMDL Options to Address Impaired Waters?	N

Funding

Approximate Annual Budget for TMDL Program	$4.6 million
Primary Source(s) of TMDL Program Funding	state fees (discharge, tipping fees); federal 319 funds

TMDL Implementation

TMDL Implementation Required?	N

Innovations

Example(s) of Any Innovative Approach(es) Employed

--using load duration curves and habitat index tool to simplify analyses

--working with local watershed planning efforts where possible; expanding program authority (*e.g.*, watershed-specific construction storm water permit); pursuing water quality trading options in 3 watersheds

--using federal and state abandoned mine lands programs to address acid mine drainage issues; working on pilot project with US Forest Service

--working with university professor on US EPA grant on implementation effectiveness (serving as an example state)

--Ohio views TMDLs as an integrating function rather than as a separate program; TMDLs string together programs (monitoring, permitting, grants) using a matrix management structure to create interdisciplinary teams of technical staff for projects

TMDLs that Represent a Particular Achievement

Project	**Features**
Middle Cuyahoga	- 2 dam removals/ modifications - wonderful story of local action after a TMDL; funding put together from various sources: "win/win" - clearly the TMDL was the catalyst; would not have happened w/o TMDL - good source material available (city website, video, printed materials;319 success story on web)
Sugar Creek	- farmer's learning circles and monitoring program - social aspects; "agroecology" - trading program w/ SWCD personnel acting as inspectors - monitoring done for TMDL revealed problem that was addressed immediately via permit, before TMDL completed - involvement of university research/extension facility that has put together extensive grants (NSF, etc.)
Bokes Creek	- channel restoration completed to help stream process excessive nutrients from over-application of manure from egg farm - collaboration among city (water supply), industry, state, contractor
Upper Sandusky	- monitoring done for TMDL revealed problem that was addressed immediately via permit, before TMDL completed - involvement of university for monitoring grants, follow-up projects
Euclid Creek	- "opportunity" project: TMDL project added when watershed coordinator expressed interest in collaboration. TMDL and WAP developed in tandem - urban watershed (rain barrel program, etc.)
Big Darby	- focus on protecting watershed under development pressure

	- TMDL as one component of intense local planning effort - construction storm water permit to address maintaining pre-development conditions (*e.g.*, recharge)

Barriers

Top Three Barriers to TMDL Development

1. lack of resources; loss of staff due to budget cuts
2. weak collaboration, both internally and externally
3. knowledge gaps; technical uncertainty

Top Three Barriers to TMDL Implementation

1. balancing value of clean water resources with water use (*e.g.*, development, industry (energy and mining)), compounded by current economic conditions
2. lack of regulation of NPSs
3. funding in general