

**M E M O R A N D U M**

**TO:** Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

**FROM:** Tom LaPlante, Water Quality/Environmental Planner

**DATE:** July 28, 2020

**SUBJECT:** Draft Responsiveness Summary for NEFCO's Clean Water Plan Draft Chapter 3

**Preface**

This responsiveness summary has been completed with input from the ERTAC to meet NEFCO's water quality planning work program contract with Ohio EPA. The purpose of this responsiveness summary is to summarize the significant public comments submitted on NEFCO's Clean Water Plan (208 Plan) draft Chapter 3 and NEFCO's response to the comments.

**Background**

At the request of the Ohio EPA, NEFCO began updating its Clean Water Plan (208 Plan) Chapter 3, *Wastewater Management Facilities Planning*, in early 2018, requesting that the region's wastewater management agencies (MAs) review their respective facilities planning areas (FPAs) from the last approved update (2011), and update them with input from local governments to reflect current and twenty-year projected conditions. After nearly 18 months of NEFCO engaging in discussions with MAs, county commissioners, county and city engineers, county planning agencies, local health districts, and others; editing proposed Chapter 3 text; compiling proposed FPA updates received from MAs and adding these to NEFCO's geographic information system (GIS), the ERTAC recommended on November 6, 2019 that the draft Chapter 3 update be considered by the NEFCO General Policy Board for public comment release.

The NEFCO Board released draft Chapter 3 for public comment on November 20, 2019 and it was posted on NEFCO's website on December 2, 2019 along with an interactive online map that allowed the public to post comments through February 7, 2020. During this sixty-day public comment period, NEFCO also held four evening meetings, one in each county of the NEFCO region, for the purpose of collecting public comments. The Stark County meeting was held on January 21, 2020; the Portage County meeting was held on January 22, 2020; the Summit County meeting was held on January 28, 2020; and the Wayne County meeting was scheduled to be held on January 23, 2020, but was moved to February 3, 2020 at the request of a Wayne County Commissioner. At least two weeks prior to these four meetings, NEFCO posted the meeting dates on its website, and sent press releases with information about the Clean Water Plan draft Chapter 3 and the meeting dates to the region's local newspapers.

**Responsiveness Summary**

This responsiveness summary summarizes the significant written and verbal comments for NEFCO's 208 Plan draft Chapter 3 update that were received from the online map

postings, public meetings, e-mails and USPS mail. It includes actions that NEFCO took in response to each significant comment, and NEFCO staff's ultimate response to each of these comments. Minor comments regarding spelling and typographical errors, and comments not directly related to this update are not included.

NEFCO staff organized this responsiveness summary in two Microsoft Excel spreadsheets: The first spreadsheet contains the comments received from the interactive online map; the second one contains the comments received from non-online map sources, such as public meetings, e-mails, and USPS mail.

### **Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Interactive Online Map**

The responsiveness summary spreadsheet for online map comments shows these column headers, starting from top left to right: comment number; commenter; comment; FPA; county; geographical area; comment category; action taken in response to comment; and NEFCO staff's ultimate response to the comment. The comment number correlates to the comment number shown with the posted blue comment flag on the interactive online map, which may be found at NEFCO's website ([necoplanning.org](http://necoplanning.org)) by hovering over "Environmental," then clicking on "Clean Water Plan Update – Draft" on the dropdown menu. The online map has existing and proposed FPA boundary layers, existing and proposed wastewater prescription layers, and posted comment layers, among other layers, that can be turned on and off from the menu on the right side of the map. The FPA, county, and geographic area are provided to facilitate locating the comment flag numbers on the online map.

Fifty-four comments, all from MAs and County Planning Departments, were posted to the online map. Of these fifty-four comments received,

- **Forty-four percent** were related to Stark County;
- **Forty-one percent** were related to Wayne County;
- **Thirteen percent** were related to Summit County; and
- **Two percent** were related to Portage County.

NEFCO staff met with MAs to get clarification of their comments as needed and consulted the ERTAC for guidance on how to handle the more complex comments.

All fifty-four comments are shown in the spreadsheet with the commenter's name. By grouping these comments into standardized comment categories and responses, NEFCO staff determined the following:

- **Twenty percent** of the fifty-four online map comments involved a requested FPA boundary adjustment that either had a written agreement from the affected MA or was a simple FPA boundary adjustment to make it conform to parcel boundaries within the MA's own jurisdiction, which NEFCO staff responded to by accepting those proposed FPA boundary adjustments in accordance with ERTAC guidance.
- **Twenty-seven percent** of the comments involved requested FPA boundary adjustments that had already been completed by NEFCO, but one commenter was unaware of this until NEFCO staff met with the MA to get clarification; which

NEFCO staff responded to by confirming that no change was needed to the proposed FPA boundary.

- **Eighteen percent** of the comments involved requested wastewater prescription changes, which NEFCO staff responded to by accepting those proposed prescription color changes in accordance with ERTAC guidance.
- **Fifteen percent** of the comments involved a requested FPA boundary change without a written agreement from the MA of the adjacent affected FPA, which NEFCO staff responded to by reverting the proposed FPA back to the current NEFCO Board-approved FPA in accordance with ERTAC guidance.
- **Thirteen percent** of the comments involved a requested adjustment to the locations of wastewater treatment plants plotted on the online map, which NEFCO staff responded to by changing the plotted locations of the proposed wastewater treatment plants in accordance with ERTAC guidance.
- **Six percent** of the comments involved a question about another areawide planning agency's FPA, which NEFCO staff responded to by making no change to that FPA; and two comments that involved NEFCO Board-approved FPA amendments that weren't posted on the online map, which NEFCO staff responded to by posting them on the final draft online map.

By meeting with MAs to get clarification of their comments as needed, applying the Clean Water Plan Chapter 3 policies, and consulting the ERTAC for guidance on how to handle the more complex comments, NEFCO staff responded to each of the fifty-four online map comments in a clear and consistent manner.

### **Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received**

The responsiveness summary spreadsheet for non-online map comments shows these column headers, starting from top left to right: date comment received; commenter; comment; FPA; county; geographical area; comment category; and NEFCO staff's response to the comment. Twenty-seven comments were received from public meetings, e-mails, and USPS mail. Of these twenty-seven comments received,

- **Thirty-seven percent** were related to Wayne County;
- **Fifteen percent** were related to Stark and Summit Counties, each;
- **Eleven percent** were related to Portage County;
- **Fifteen percent** were related to an FPA within both Portage and Summit Counties; and
- **Seven percent** were related to all four NEFCO region counties.

NEFCO staff met with MAs to get clarification of their comments as needed and consulted the ERTAC for guidance on how to handle the more complex comments.

All twenty-seven comments are shown in the spreadsheet with the commenter's name. By grouping these comments into standardized comment categories and responses, NEFCO staff determined the following:

- **Twenty-six percent** of the twenty-seven comments involved prescription text contact information updates, which NEFCO staff responded to by updating the prescription text with the new contact information that was provided by the commenter.

- **Nineteen percent** of the comments involved a requested FPA boundary change without a written agreement from the MA of the adjacent affected FPA, which NEFCO staff responded to by reverting the proposed FPA back to the current NEFCO Board-approved FPA in accordance with ERTAC guidance. (Note: Some commenters that posted a comment on the online map in this comment category also duplicated their comment in this comment category by emailing it or by submitting it via USPS. NEFCO staff responded to duplicate comments from the same commenter in this spreadsheet.)
- **Nineteen percent** of the comments involved requested minor wastewater prescription changes, which NEFCO staff responded to by accepting those proposed prescription color changes in accordance with ERTAC guidance.
- **Seven percent** of the comments involved suggested minor text updates, which NEFCO staff responded to by adding the proposed text.
- **Seven percent** of the comments involved suggested substantive text updates that were not posted for the sixty-day public review, which NEFCO staff responded to by suggesting that the commenter submit the proposed substantive text update during the next Chapter 3 update.
- **Eleven percent** of the comments involved requested substantive wastewater treatment prescription changes that still needed public review, which NEFCO staff responded to by not changing the current NEFCO Board-approved prescriptions.
- **Seven percent** of the comments involved a requested FPA change with a written agreement from the adjacent MA, which staff responded to by accepting those proposed the proposed FPA boundary changes in accordance with ERTAC guidance.
- **Four percent** of the comments involved a question that was raised at the Summit County public meeting regarding whether there any new areas in the City of New Franklin where sewers are expected, which NEFCO staff responded to by answering that there are no proposed Franklin-Green FPA updates; therefore, new sewers would only be where the current FPA map indicates they will be within the next twenty years, which are the orange planning areas.

By meeting with MAs to get clarification of their comments as needed, applying the Clean Water Plan Chapter 3 policies, and consulting the ERTAC for guidance on how to handle the more complex comments, NEFCO staff responded to each of the twenty-eight non-online map comments in a clear and consistent manner.

**(Please see the responsiveness summary spreadsheets for online map comments and non-online map comments that follows this memo.)**

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
47	Tia Rutledge, Planning Manager of Portage County Water Resources	This area is sewer for the mobile home park. Forgot to include in my updates. Please note that the collections system is private but PCWR owns the WWTP (wastewater treatment plant).	None	Portage	Charlestown, Twp. (Mahoning River watershed)	New information not posted for 60-day comment period. No "Balance of County" wastewater treatment prescriptions in the Mahoning River watershed.	Reviewed comment. Discussed white areas with no written wastewater treatment prescriptions with MA <sup>3</sup> and ERTAC <sup>4</sup> on 3/4/2020.	Proposed prescription color <sup>5</sup> change--from white to yellow, due to area being sewer, but sewer area has no proposed prescription text. For this 2020 update, the white area will remain unchanged.
1	Michael Ciconte II, GIS Coordinator, Stark County Metropolitan Sewer District (SCMSD)	This area should be orange for future sewer.	None ("Balance of County," proposed)	Stark	Marlboro Twp.	Proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA <sup>5</sup> color changes.	Accepted "Balance of County" prescriptions and changed cream area to orange per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
2	Michael Ciconte II, GIS Coordinator, SCMSD	This area should be orange for future sewer.	None ("Balance of County," proposed)	Stark	Marlboro Twp.	Proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA color changes.	Accepted "Balance of County" prescriptions and changed cream area to orange per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
20	Kris Griffith, Civil Engineering Technician, City of Canton, Engineering Department	The yellow square area should be orange for future sewer. This area is bounded to the north by Georgetown St, west by Marietta, south by the orange rectangle, and to the west (actually east) by the green boundary.	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Canton, City of	Proposed prescription color change.	Reviewed comment. Sent email on 2/25/2020 asking for needed clarification (no reply) Spoke with commenter on 3/10/2020.	Changed yellow area to orange per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
21	Kris Griffith, Civil Engineering Technician, City of Canton, Engineering Department	The (current) yellow section, south of Sherrick Run, should be orange, not yellow.	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Canton, City of	Proposed prescription color change.	Reviewed comment. Sent email on 2/25/2020 asking for needed clarification (no reply) Called and left voicemail on 3/10/2020.	Changed yellow area to orange per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
22	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please move the FPA line to conform with the green prescription area.	Alliance	Stark	Lexington Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
23	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please move the FPA line to conform with the green prescription areas (parcels).	Alliance	Stark	Lexington Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
24	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line to conform with the parcel line.	Alliance	Stark	Washington Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
25	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw FPA line to conform with parcels. A portion of Harrisburg should not be within the FPA area. See Stark County's map.	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Nimishillen Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
26	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw FPA line to conform with parcels.	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Nimishillen Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
27	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please Redraw FPA line to conform with the parcels with the green prescription.	Minerva	Stark	Paris Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
28	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line to conform with the parcel. Also the white area should be a green prescription.	Minerva	Stark	Paris Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight; and proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA color changes.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed, but the requested prescription change was made (white area was changed to green prescription) per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
29	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line to conform with the parcels in the green prescription.	Minerva	Stark	Paris Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. NEFCO staff examined further.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
30	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw FPA line to conform with the parcel line.	East Sparta	Stark	Canton Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
31	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw FPA line to conform with the parcel line with the green prescription.	East Sparta	Stark	Pike Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
32	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line to conform with the parcel with the green prescription.	Beach City-Wilmot	Stark	Sugar Creek Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
33	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please place the FPA line along the Township border.	Canal Fulton	Stark	Jackson Twp.	Proposed adjacent FPA boundary change.	Met with MA for clarification. Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely not pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAS would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved.	No change: For this 2020 update, the Canal Fulton FPA will remain unchanged due to there not being mutual agreement by both MAS regarding the proposed change per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
34	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line along the "blue" line as shown.	Canal Fulton	Stark	Lawrence Twp.	Proposed adjacent FPA boundary change.	Met with MA for clarification. Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely not pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved.	No change: For this 2020 update, the Canal Fulton FPA will remain unchanged due to there not being mutual agreement by both MAs regarding the proposed change per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
35	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line along the parcel boundary.	Hartville	Stark	Lake Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
36	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please move the FPA line along Edison Rd. NW.	Hartville	Stark	Lake Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
37	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line along the parcel boundary.	Hartville	Stark	Marlboro Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
38	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line along the parcel boundary (SR 44).	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Marlboro Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions



208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
39	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line along the parcel boundary.	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Nimishillen Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
40	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	Please redraw the FPA line along the parcel boundary.	Canton-Nimishillen Basin	Stark	Nimishillen Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
41	Scott Ellsworth, Assistant Sanitary Engineer, SCMSD	I have new prescriptions for those areas in Stark County NOT included in an FPA. Please let me know (how to proceed).	None ("Balance of County," proposed)	Stark	Marlboro Twp.	New information (proposed "Balance of County" not posted for 60-day comment period.	Met with MA for clarification. Discussed white areas with no written prescription with MA3 and ERTAC4 on 3/4/2020.	Accepted proposed "Balance of County" prescriptions per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
43	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORS D)	Is this in NOACA's Medina FPA or is it "no planning?"	NOACA's Medina County FPAs	Summit	Richfield Twp.	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	Reviewed comment and NOACA's Medina County FPA map. Staff sent an email to, and spoke with Summit County DSSS on 3/10/2020.	This is NOACA's Medina County FPA, which which has NEFCO prescription colors in Summit County.
44	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, NEORS D	These sewer parcels on the east side of Chamberlin are sewer, but they include a PS that pumps to the Macedonia system and NEORS D. If these parcels are tributary to the PS, they should be CVI FPA. If connected to a different sewer trib to Twinsburg, please explain.	CVI, Twinsburg	Summit	Twinsburg, City of	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	Staff sent an email to the City of Twinsburg on 3/6/2020. Staff spoke with a representative of the City on 3/10/2020. Staff sent a second email to the City on 3/18/2020.	For this 2020 update, the CVI FPA will remain unchanged due to there not being mutual agreement by both MAs regarding the proposed change.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
45	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, NEORS	Why is the current proposed FPA not parcel-aligned?	CVI, Hudson-Streetsboro	Summit	Hudson, City of	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved. Staff sent an email to, and spoke with Summit County DSSS on 3/10/2020.	Updated final draft map to reflect Summit County DSSS' instructions, per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. (Received written agreement from Summit County DSSS and instructions for correcting proposed FPA on 3/13/2020.)
46	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, NEORS	This subdivision should be in the CVI FPA, since we provided an Acceptance of Flow letter in 2016. It is connected through Berks Way.	CVI, Hudson-Streetsboro	Summit	Hudson, City of	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved. Staff coordinated with Summit DSSS by email. Staff spoke with Summit DSSS on 3/10/2020.	Updated final draft map to reflect Summit County DSSS' instructions per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. (Received written agreement from Summit County DSSS on 3/13/2020.)
48	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, NEORS	The following additional parcels south of SR 303 are connected to the NEORS system per our records: PPNs 3003843, 3002424, 3003829, 3003830, and 3006489. Should be included in the CVI FPA.	CVI, Hudson-Streetsboro	Summit	Hudson, City of	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved. Staff coordinated with Summit DSSS. Staff spoke with Summit DSSS on 3/10/2020.	Updated final draft map to reflect the comment, plus added PPNs 3003118, 3003189, 3000172 per Summit County DSSS' instructions and per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. (Received written agreement and instructions from Summit County DSSS on 3/13/2020. DSSS also wanted PPN 3009934 added to the CVI FPA. This parcel was not added since it extends a great distance across wetland.)

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
49	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, NEORS	This Western Reserve Academy parcel (PPN3000426) is within the NEORS's sanitary service agreement area with Hudson and Summit County DSSS. Topo and proximity to existing sewers do not demonstrate reason for removal from CVI FPA.	CVI, Hudson-Streetsboro	Summit	Hudson, City of	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved. Staff coordinated with Summit DSSS. Staff spoke with Summit DSSS on 3/10/2020.	Updated final draft map to reflect the comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. (Received written agreement from Summit County DSSS on 3/13/2020.)
50	Mary Maciejowski, Community Discharge Permit Manager, NEORS	There is/was an FPA modification in this area which is not reflected, involving transfer from Fish Creek and Hudson-Streetsboro to CVI FPA. See attached.	CVI, Hudson-Streetsboro	Summit	Hudson, City of	Task completed by NEFCO; commenter oversight.	Verified the amendment was approved on 12/18/2019 (FPA amendments approved after 11/5/2019 are not shown on the map--see footnote on online map homepage).	Updated final draft map to reflect what has already been approved by the NEFCO Board.
3	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Should be displayed as yellow (to match pdf).	Burbank	Wayne	Congress Twp.	Proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA color changes.	Changed orange area to yellow per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
4	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	This parcel should be yellow, as it is currently sewer.	Burbank	Wayne	Congress Twp.	Proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA color changes.	Changed orange area to yellow per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
5	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	This area should be orange for future sewer.	Burbank	Wayne	Congress Twp.	Proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA color changes.	Changed crème area to orange per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
6	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	The yellow should be orange in this portion of the FPA.	Apple Creek	Wayne	East Union Twp.	NEFCO oversight.	Met with MA for clarification. Explained that this was already approved by the NEFCO Board.	Updated final draft map to reflect what has already been approved by the NEFCO Board.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
7	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Not the corner, but this small sliver north of US 30 should be shown in "cream" and not in "yellow."	Wayne County Lincoln Way	Wayne	Sugar Creek Twp.	Proposed prescription color change.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle proposed FPA color changes.	Changed yellow area to cream per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
8	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Wrong location for the WWTP, should be on neighboring parcel.	Wayne County Lincoln Way	Wayne	East Union Twp.	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
9	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	This is the more accurate location for the wastewater treatment plant.	Wayne County Lincoln Way	Wayne	East Union Twp.	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
10	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Please indicate at this location the wastewater treatment plant for Fredericksburg.	Fredericksburg	Wayne	Fredericksburg, Village of	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
11	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Smithville Village has agreed to adjust their FPA boundary line to follow the Wayne County Airport FPA boundary. Please follow the FPA boundary to the other place where the line converges.	Wayne County Airport, Smithville	Wayne	Wayne Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.
12	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Smithville Village has agreed to adjust their FPA boundary line to follow the Wayne County Airport FPA boundary. Please follow the FPA boundary to the other place where the line converges.	Wayne County Airport, Smithville	Wayne	Wayne Twp.	Task completed by NEFCO prior to 60-day posting of map; commenter oversight.	Met with MA for clarification.	No change to proposed FPA boundary (blue line) needed.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
13	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Please remove this WWTP, as this is a private treatment plant.	Smithville	Wayne	Green Twp.	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
14	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Please add Eastwood wastewater treatment plant.	Wayne County Lincoln Way	Wayne	East Union Twp.	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
15	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Move this wastewater treatment plant to location to the north (see other comment).	Apple Creek	Wayne	East Union Twp.	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
16	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Actual location of WWTP for Apple Creek.	Apple Creek	Wayne	East Union Twp.	Simple proposed WWTP location adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS map.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed WWTP location to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
17	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	The FPA boundary line is not in the correct location. It should be moved to the road frontage (SR 585).	Doylestown	Wayne	Chippewa Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
18	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	The FPA boundary line is not in the correct location. It should be moved to the road frontage to include the orange area (Alvin Rd) <b>(Project the FPA boundary line west from Alvin Rd to include the orange area).</b>	Smithville	Wayne	Green Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
19	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	The FPA boundry line is not in the correct location. It should be moved to the road frontage (SR 585). <b>(Project the FPA boundary line west from Alvin Rd to include the organge area).</b>	Smithville	Wayne	Green Twp.	Simple proposed FPA boundary adjustment to account for change from pdf to GIS to parcel boundary.	Met with MA for clarification. Asked ERTAC for guidance on how to handle such minor adjustments that were always intended.	Changed proposed FPA boundary (blue line) to reflect comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.
42	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	Would support moving the Canal Fulton FPA boundary to the Stark/Wayne County line.	Canal Fulton	Wayne	Baughman Twp.	Proposed adjacent FPA boundary change.	Met with MA for clarification. Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely not pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved.	No change: For this 2020 update, the Canal Fulton FPA will remain unchanged due to there not being mutual agreement by both MAs regarding the proposed change per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
51	Joel Montgomery, Director of Administration, City of Wooster	This small addition to the Wooster FPA is proposed to facilitate Wooster's ongoing, strategic planning efforts for smart growth. Wooster's detailed, Comprehensive Plan establishes a plan for industrial and related residential growth adjacent to similarly developed areas, and in areas served by adequate utilities. This area is immediately adjacent to existing developed areas and the current Wooster Corporation limits, and is anticipated to develop within the next 20 years.	Wooster, Smithville	Wayne	Wayne Twp.	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA.	Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely <u>not</u> pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or the FPA boundary change could not be approved. NEFCO's Executive Director spoke with this commentor on 3/12/2020.	Staff melded the Wooster FPA boundary with the Smithville FPA boundary per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020, which calls for all affected MAs to agree in writing when proposed FPA boundary lines overlap adjacent FPAs. ("Melded" explanation: Proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that didn't overlap the Smithville FPA were accepted, and proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that affected Wayne County Office of Environmental Services without its written approval, reverted back to the current approved Wooster FPA per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020.)
52	Craig Sanders, Councilman At-Large, City of Wooster	As an elected member of Wooster City Council, this proposed change could be very important to the growth of our community in the future. I support the proposed 2020 FPA areas.	Wooster, Smithville	Wayne	Wayne Twp.	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA.	Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely <u>not</u> pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved. NEFCO's Executive Director spoke with the City of Wooster Director of Administration on 3/12/2020.	Staff melded the Wooster FPA boundary with the Smithville FPA boundary per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020, which calls for all affected MAs to agree in writing when proposed FPA boundary lines overlap adjacent FPAs. ("Melded" explanation: Proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that didn't overlap the Smithville FPA were accepted, and proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that affected Wayne County Office of Environmental Services without its written approval, reverted back to the current approved Wooster FPA per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020.)

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

208 Plan Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Comments Received from the Online Map

DRAFT  
4/17/2020

Comment Number <sup>1</sup>	Commenter	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>2</sup>	County	Geographical Area	Comment Category	Comment Response Action Taken	NEFCO Staff Response to Comment
53	Trevor Hunt, Director, Wayne County Planning Department	The County hopes to have a resolution between Smithville and Wooster regarding the FPA boundary dispute.	Smithville, Wooster	Wayne	Wayne Twp.	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA	Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely <u>not</u> pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. Met with MA for clarification. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or no FPA boundary change will be approved.	Staff melded the Wooster FPA boundary with the Smithville FPA boundary per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020, which calls for all affected MAs to agree in writing when proposed FPA boundary lines overlap adjacent FPAs. ("Melded" explanation: Proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that didn't overlap the Smithville FPA were accepted, and proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that affected Wayne County Office of Environmental Services without its written approval, reverted back to the current approved Wooster FPA per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020.)
54	Thomas Poulson, Mayor, Village of Smithville	The Village of Smithville is opposed to the change of the red line in our FPA. We refer you to our statement that we emailed to Tom LaPlante. If you are going to override the decision made by the Wayne county planning commission, that you review the Wayne County Comprehensive plan and understand the value placed on agriculture and preserving it in Wayne County. Consider the precedence and the effect on the local process.	Smithville, Wooster	Wayne	Wayne Twp.	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA.	Examined Chapter 3 policies 3-6a and 3-6b, which indicate that NEFCO will have no choice but to likely <u>not</u> pick one over the other, since these policies don't suggest that clearly as a method. Staff spoke with commentor on 2/4/2020 at NEFCO meeting. On 3/4/2020, NEFCO staff asked ERTAC for advice on how to respond to all FPA overlaps. ERTAC directed that both MAs would need to agree to the proposed FPA boundary change no later than 3/20/2020 or the FPA boundary change could not be approved.	Staff melded the Wooster FPA boundary with the Smithville FPA boundary per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020, which calls for all affected MAs to agree in writing when proposed FPA boundary lines overlap adjacent FPAs. ("Melded" explanation: Proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that didn't overlap the Smithville FPA were accepted, and proposed Wooster FPA boundary changes that affected Wayne County Office of Environmental Services without its written approval, reverted back to the current approved Wooster FPA per ERTAC's guidance on 3/4/2020.)

<sup>1</sup>Means nth comment number from online map

<sup>2</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>3</sup>Management agency (MA)

<sup>4</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>5</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions



CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
6/27/2019	Steven J. Schreiber, Chairman, Bath Township Water & Sewer District	Commenter sent a letter regarding "The Reserve at North Revere," which is a residential subdivision that is expected to be sewered within 20 years, but is now in a cream <sup>2</sup> and yellow area on the 208 Plan.	Akron	Summit	Akron (part), Bath Twp. (part)	Proposed wastewater treatment prescription color change.	Changed cream and yellow areas of this newer residential subdivision to orange per ERTAC <sup>3</sup> guidance on 3/4/2020.
9/6/2019	Tia Rutledge, Planning Manager of Portage County Water Resources	Commenter sent NEFCO staff an email clarifying that all geographical areas within Portage County that are outside of any FPA, but within the Mahoning River Basin, have no wastewater prescriptions and should be mapped as white, not the current green color.	None	Portage	All geographical areas within Portage County that are outside of any FPA, but within the Mahoning River Basin	Proposed wastewater treatment prescription color change (from current NEFCO Board-approved green to white, meaning no prescription).	Changed green area to white, which is the appropriate color since this geographical area has no wastewater treatment prescription.
12/13/2019	Mark Cozy, City Manager, City of Canal Fulton	Change City Manager name	Canal Fulton	Stark	Canal Fulton, City of	Contact information update	Updated contact information
12/16/2019	Michael Jones	Change Sanitary Engineer name	Bolivar	Stark	Bolivar, Village of	Contact information update	Updated contact information.
12/17/2019	David White, Planning Engineer, Summit County Engineer's Office	Suggest that the previously updated map of the NEFCO Region FPAs (Appendix 3-1) show the appendix number within each FPA boundary; for example "3-28" within the Barberton-Wolf Creek FPA, etc.	All	Portage, Stark, Summit, and Wayne	Portage, Stark, Summit, and Wayne Counties (all of)	New information. Substantive text update received after the 208 Plan's Chapter 3 Update underwent ERTAC review and was posted on NEFCO's website.	Considered, but suggest that the commenter submit this comment during the next 208 Plan update.
12/17/2019	David White, Planning Engineer, Summit County Engineer's Office	The County column of the Fish Creek FPA (3-30) shows "Summit" but appears that it should be "Summit, Portage."	Fish Creek	Portage, Summit	Hudson, City of (part); Stow, City of (part); Munroe Falls, City of (part); Tallmadge, City of (part); Brimfield Township (part); Suffield Township (part); Rootstown Township (part); Franklin Township (part)	Text update; NEFCO oversight	Updated the Chapter 3 Appendices 2019 Update table: The County column of the Fish Creek FPA (3-30) now shows "Summit, Portage."

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
12/30/2019	Robert Brooker, Mayor, Village of Marshallville	Change Plant Supervisor name	Marshallville	Wayne	Marshallville, Village of	Contact information update.	Updated contact information
1/8/2020	Greg Harwell, GIS Analyst, City of Twinsburg	Attached is an area that is not delineated clearly on the mapping. (He attached an orthophoto of the Twinsburg FPA and Hudson Streetsboro FPA overlaps at the intersections of Twinsburg Road and S.R. 91; Old Mill Road and S.R. 91).	Twinsburg, Hudson-Streetsboro	Summit	City of Twinsburg, Twinsburg Twp.	Proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA.	Updated final draft map to reflect the comment per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. (Received written agreement from Summit County DSSS on 3/13/2020.)
1/9/2020	Jim Troike, Stark County Sanitary Engineer	Change Sanitary Engineer phone and fax numbers	All	Stark	Stark County	Contact information update.	Updated contact information.
1/9/2020	Jim Troike, Stark County Sanitary Engineer	Change Village Administrator name	Brewster	Stark	Brewster, Village of	Contact information update.	Updated contact information.
1/19/2020	Rob Kastner, Wayne County Office of Environmental Services	"Balance of Wayne County Prescriptions" that were approved by the Wayne County Planning Commission on 2/14/2018 are not on NEFCO's website.	"Balance of Wayne County"	Wayne	Wayne County (all)	New information (proposed "Balance of County" prescription text) not posted for 60-day comment period; and not received by NEFCO.	Met with commentor for clarification and offered two options: Option 1: Submit the information and NEFCO will consider posting it for the 30-day comment period; Option 2: Submit the information for the FY2021 update.
1/22/2020	George Smerigan, Planning Consultant for the Village of Doylestown	Change Mayor name.	Doylestown	Wayne	Chippewa Twp.	Contact information update.	Updated contact information.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
1/22/2020	George Smerigan, Planning Consultant for the Village of Doylestown	Doylestown has new proposed FPA boundary information, expanding the current boundary into Chippewa Twp. to the west.	Doylestown, Balance of Wayne County	Wayne	Chippewa Twp.	Proposed FPA boundary change; and new information that hasn't had input from Wayne County Office of Environmental Services, the Wayne County Planning Department, Chippewa Twp. or the public.	No change to FPA boundary. Written reponse sent: NEFCO's Executive Director responded with an email sent on 2/6/2020 giving the Village guidance on the process for submitting the proposed FPA update during the next 208 Plan Chapter 3 update.
1/22/2020	Gene Roberts, Director of Portage County Water Resources; Tia Rutledge, Planning Manager of Portage County Water Resources; and James Greener, Portage Soil & Water Conservation District	The draft Portage County FPAs map doesn't show the FPA name "Hudson-Streetsboro FPA." (Comment received at NEFCO draft 208 Plan Chapter 3 update public meeting in Portage County on 1/22/2020.)	Hudson-Streetsboro	Portage, Summit	Streetsboro, City of; Shalersville Township (part), Freedom Township (part); Hudson, City of (part), Twinsburg Township (part).	Text update; NEFCO oversight.	Updated the previously updated NEFCO Region FPAs map (Appendix 3-1); the the previously updated Portage County FPAs map (Appendix 3-2), and the previously updated Hudson-Streetsboro FPAs map (Appendix 3-6).

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
1/22/2020	Mary Helen Smith, Environmental Health Director, Portage County Health District	The comment was regarding the eastern third of the draft Portage County FPAs and prescriptions map being shown as white; and staff's reasoning for making it white for this update when the current NEFCO Board-approved Portage County FPAs and prescripton map shows the same area as green. (Comment received at NEFCO draft 208 Plan Chapter 3 update public meeting in Portage County on 1/22/2020. Note: White areas are areas without a wastewater treatment prescription. Green areas are areas that will be served by a POTW or by home sewage treatment systems and semi-public sewage disposal systems.)	None	Portage	All geographical areas within Portage County that are outside of any FPA, but within the Mahoning River Basin	Geographical area outside of any FPA without wastewater treatment prescriptions.	Staff explained to the commenter that the white area means "no wastewater prescription" and that since no "Balance of County" prescriptions exist, the current NEFCO-Board approved map is incorrect; and that the draft map has the geographical area correctly colored white.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
1/28/2020	Genny Hanna, City of Akron Engineering Bureau, Environmental Division	The proposed Akron FPA boundary changes reflect existing agreements and the parcels that are already tributary to Akron's wastewater treatment plant. (Comment from NEFCO draft 208 Plan Chapter 3 update public meeting in Summit County on 1/28/2020 and comment on subsequent dates when NEFCO staff asked for clarification of the proposed Akron FPA boundary changes.)	Akron, Barberton, Wolf Creek, Fish Creek, Springfield 91, CVI	Summit, Portage	All or part of the following political subdivisions: The Cities of Akron, Barberton, Cuyahoga Falls, Fairlawn, Hudson, Munroe Falls, Stow, and Tallmadge; the Villages of Lakemore, Mogadore and Silver Lake; the Summit County townships of Bath, Boston, Copley, Coventry, and Springfield; and the Portage County townships of Brimfield, and Suffield.	FPA overlaps or other FPA boundary adjustments needing written agreement from affected MAs <sup>4</sup> per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.	Staff requested that the City of Akron obtain written approval from MAs that were being affected by the proposed Akron FPA boundary changes. Staff helped coordinate this by providing screenshots of the FPA overlaps and other FPA adjustments to the City of Akron and to the MAs as needed. Proposed Akron FPA boundary adjustments were accepted only with written approval from affected MAs. Proposed Akron FPA boundary changes that were not accepted in writing by affected MAs have been reverted to the current FPA boundary that has been approved by the NEFCO General Policy Board.
1/28/2020	Barry Ganoe, Zoning and Planning Administrator, City of New Franklin	Are there any new areas in the City of New Franklin where sewers are expected? (Comment from NEFCO draft 208 Plan Chapter 3 update public meeting in Summit County on 1/28/2020.)	Franklin-Green	Summit	New Franklin, City of	Information request.	Staff responded by answering that there are no proposed Franklin-Green FPA updates; therefore, new sewers would only be where the current FPA indicates they will be within the next twenty years.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
2/5/2020	Mike Steiner, Member of Wooster Growth Corp.	"Please accept this email as my confirmation of support for the Clean Water Plan recently submitted by the City of Wooster Administration...I have great confidence in their assessment and recommendations. "	Wooster	Wayne	Wooster, City of; East Union Twp. (part); Franklin Twp. (part); Green Twp. (part); Wayne Twp. (part) and Wooster Twp. (part)	Written support of a proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA, and other proposed Clean Water Plan updates submitted by the City of Wooster.	The proposed Wooster FPA overlap needs written approval from the affected MA per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. No such written agreement exists. Therefore, the Wooster FPA cannot overlap the Smithville FPA.
2/5/2020	Joel Montgomery, Director of Administration, City of Wooster	Commenter sent memo that conveys that the City of Wooster supports the proposed Wooster FPA overlap into the Village of Smithville's FPA; and defends the proposed FPA overlap as smart, strategic growth within the City's 3-mile limit that could provide jobs and revenue to the City tax base, which funds all City infrastructure. The memo also conveys that the City could provide sewer within a reasonable time to the overlap area whereas the Village could not. (This comment was also provided orally by City of Wooster officials at the draft 208 Plan Chapter 3 update public meeting in Wayne County on 2/4/2020.)	Wooster, Smithville	Wayne	Wayne Twp. (part)	Written support of a proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA.	The proposed Wooster FPA overlap needs written approval from the affected MA per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. No such written agreement exists. Therefore, the Wooster FPA cannot overlap the Smithville FPA.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
2/5/2020	Tom Poulson, Mayor of the Village of Smithville	Commenter sent a letter and an e-mail that conveys that the Village of Smithville believes that disputes in FPA lines are best handled at the County level; and if the precedent is set to allow communities to bypass local decisions, then there is no reason for communities to work together to resolve their differences. (This comment was also provided orally by Mayor Poulson at the draft 208 Plan Chapter 3 update public meeting in Wayne County on 2/4/2020.)	Wooster, Smithville	Wayne	Wayne Twp. (part)	Written objection to a proposed FPA overlap with an adjacent FPA.	The proposed Wooster FPA overlap needs written approval from the affected MA per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020. No such written agreement exists. Therefore, the Wooster FPA cannot overlap the Smithville FPA.
2/7/2020	Robert Hempel, Registered Sanitarian, Wayne County Health Department	"I noticed that the Wayne County FPA prescriptions prohibit spray sewage treatment systems. However, the state sewage rules allow spray sewage systems. It's my understanding that the prescriptions should not be more stringent than the state sewage rules."	All	Wayne	Wayne County (all)	New information. Substantive text update received after the 208 Plan's Chapter 3 Update underwent ERTAC review and was posted on NEFCO's website.	Considered this substantive text update that the commenter should submit this comment during the next 208 Plan update.
2/7/2020	Rob Kastner, Wayne County Office of Environmental Services	The commenter submitted Wayne County's comments regarding suggested Chapter 3 text modifications that were emailed to NEFCO on May 2, 2018 following the Chapter 3 subcommittee meetings in 2017 and 2018.	All	Portage, Stark, Summit, and Wayne	Portage, Stark, Summit, and Wayne Counties (all of)	Substantive text update, which was previously received and considered for this Chapter 3 update.	Considered this substantive text update and may have made some of the text modifications, but not all.
2/12/2020	Bradley Kosco	Remove City of Hudson as Secondary MA in Chapter 3, Table 3-2, and Appendix 3-6, I-C-II.	Hudson-Streetsboro	Portage	Portage County: Streetsboro, City of; Shalersville Township (part), Freedom Township (part); Summit County: Hudson, City of (part), Twinsburg Township (part).	Contact information update.	Removed City of Hudson as Secondary MA.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)

CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
2/12/2020	Allan M. Michelson, Attorney at Law and Solicitor for the Village of West Salem	The Village of West Salem desires that the West Salem FPA be maintained in its existing boundary rather than reduced to the proposed FPA boundary. Please direct me to the parties responsible for review and consideration of this request.	West Salem	Wayne	West Salem, Village of; Congress Twp.	Information request and written opposition to proposed FPA boundary after the February 7, 2020 public comment deadline and after there was agreement between the Wayne County Planning Commission, the Village of West Salem, and Congress Twp.	No change to proposed FPA boundary. Written response sent: NEFCO's Executive Director responded with a letter sent on 2/21/2020 giving the commenter the information that he requested and directing him to Wayne County Planning Commission meeting minutes and input from the Wayne County Planning Department that indicate the Village and Congress Twp. were in agreement regarding the location of the updated FPA boundary.
2/12/2020	Lance Cole, Project Manager, City of Wooster-Engineering Division	The Nelson Avenue neighborhood should have an orange prescription color, not yellow as NEFCO's 208 Plan currently shows. (Summary of email received from commenter on 2/12/2020.)	Wooster	Wayne	Wayne Twp. (part)	Proposed wastewater treatment prescription color change; and new information that hasn't had input from the Wayne County Planning Commission, Wayne Twp. or the public.	Considered, but suggest that the commenter submit this comment during the next 208 Plan update.
3/4/2020	Tony Demasi, City Engineer, City of Cuyahoga Falls	Attached (to email dated 4/1/2020) is the area (at the intersection of Kellybrook and Antoinette Drives) in Cuyahoga Falls we discussed (at the 3/4/2020 ERTAC meeting). This area in orange was sewerred in 2005, and all but three (3) properties have connected to the new sewer.	Akron	Summit	Cuyahoga Falls, City of	Proposed wastewater treatment prescription color change.	Changed orange areas to yellow per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)



CWP Chapter 3 2020 Update: Responsiveness Summary for Significant Non-Online Map Comments Received

DRAFT  
7/28/2020

Date Received	Commenter(s)	Comment	FPA(s) <sup>1</sup>	County(-ies)	Geographical Area	Comment Category	NEFCO Staff response to Comment
3/24/2020	Tia Rutledge, Planning Manager of Portage County Water Resources	Two small areas in Portage County shown as white (Sugar Bush Knolls and Rte 59 in Ravenna FPA) should be green. (Comment sent to NEFCO GIS Specialist)	Ravenna, Hudson-Streetsboro	Portage	Sugar Bush Knolls, Village of; Ravenna Twp.	Proposed wastewater treatment prescription color change; and inadvertent omission during original update mapping	Changed white areas to green per ERTAC guidance on 3/4/2020.

<sup>1</sup>Facilities planning areas (FPAs)

<sup>2</sup>Colors relate to wastewater treatment prescriptions

<sup>3</sup>Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee (ERTAC)

<sup>4</sup>Management agency (MA)