



Response to Comments

Project: Auburn Road Bridge Replacement; Section 401 Water Quality Certification
Ohio EPA ID #: 103709

Agency Contacts for this Project

Division of Surface Water Contact: Joe Loucek, (330) 963-1258,
joseph.loucek@epa.state.oh.us

Public Involvement Coordinator: Kristopher Weiss, (614) 644-2160,
kristopher.weiss@epa.state.oh.us

Ohio EPA held a public hearing on May 5, 2011, regarding a water quality certification application submitted by the Geauga County Engineer. This document summarizes the comments and questions received at the public hearing and/or during the associated comment period, which ended on May 12, 2011.

Ohio EPA reviewed and considered all comments received during the public comment period. By law, Ohio EPA has authority to consider specific issues related to protection of the environment and public health. Often, public concerns fall outside the scope of that authority. For example, concerns about zoning issues are addressed at the local level. Ohio EPA may respond to those concerns in this document by identifying another government agency with more direct authority over the issue.

In an effort to help you review this document, the questions are grouped by topic and organized in a consistent format. For purposes of clarity and presentation, attached are the original preferred alternative site map and the minimum degradation alternative site map that Ohio EPA approved through this water quality certification.

Response to Comments

Comment 1: There was one comment by a Township Trustee and a response to that comment by the County Engineer. The comment was that the Township's fire and emergency services were on one side of the bridge and about two-thirds of the community were on the other side of the bridge. Requiring ambulatory and fire services to use the detour could

result in unreasonable delays in response time. The County Engineer responded at the hearing that bypass bridges were no longer being utilized because they resulted in additional impacts to water resources and generally increased the cost of the project.

Response 1: The County Engineer determined that an emergency bypass could be built within the footprint of the originally proposed impacts. The Township Trustees and Fire Chief both responded in writing that this was an acceptable resolution to the issue.