



MODULE 7

Non-Regulatory Policies

(Education and Outreach, Incentives,
and Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies)



Implementation Resource Guides

A Compendium of Eight Modules

Look for all eight modules in our Drinking Water Source Protection series. You can find them at www.conservation-ontario.on.ca

MODULE 1



MODULE 1
Establishing a Risk Management Office

MODULE 2



MODULE 2
Understanding Where Policies Apply

MODULE 3



MODULE 3
Land Use Planning

MODULE 4



MODULE 4
Annual Reporting & Information Management

MODULE 5



MODULE 5
Risk Management Plans

MODULE 6



MODULE 6
Prohibition

MODULE 7



MODULE 7
Non-Regulatory Policies
(Education and Outreach, Incentives,
and Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies)

MODULE 8



MODULE 8
Other Obligations

Module 7: Non-Regulatory Policies (Education and Outreach, Incentives, and Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies)

Implementation Resource Guide

5/05/2014

NOTE TO READER: This document is one of a series now under development by staff at conservation authorities and Conservation Ontario in support of source protection plan implementation. The final set of documents will cover a variety of tools related to source protection plan implementation, but not all will apply in your municipality. To determine what policies apply in your municipality please consult your local source protection plan and with your local source protection authority. Note that this document has not been reviewed by legal counsel and is not presented as legal advice.

Table of Contents

A: General Information	5
i. Overview of Non-Regulatory Policies	5
Education and Outreach Policies	6
Incentive Policies	6
Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies, Including Specify Actions.....	7
ii. Legal Effect and Implications	7
iii. Roles and Responsibilities.....	8
iv. Timelines	8
B: Implementation of Non-Regulatory Policy Tools	8
i. Education and Outreach	8
Objectives and Expected Outcomes	9
Resources and Tools	10
Methods, Budget and Evaluation	11
Example.....	14
ii. Incentives	16
Objectives and Expected Outcomes	17
Resources and Tools	17
Methods, Budget and Evaluation	18
Example.....	20
iii. Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies, Including Specify Actions.....	21
Purpose of Policies	22
Further Information	22
References	23

A: General Information

This module aims to provide information to municipalities, and other implementing bodies, on the implementation requirements for the following types of source protection plan policies:

- education and outreach policies (which may be included in plans as ‘threat’ policies or as general education and outreach policies)
- incentive policies (which may be included in plans as ‘threat’ policies or as general education and outreach policies)
- Section 26, Paragraph 1 policies (as set out under Ontario Regulation 287/07 of the Ontario *Clean Water Act, 2006*), which are always ‘threat’ policies and include policies that:
 - specify actions to be taken,
 - establish stewardship programs,
 - specify and promote best management practices (BMPs),
 - establish pilot programs, or
 - govern research.

At the end of this module, you should have a general understanding of the municipality’s role in implementing these types of policies, as well as where to look for further information.

The information contained in this module is current as of the time of writing.

i. Overview of Non-Regulatory Policies

Source protection plans may contain policies that rely on education and outreach, incentives, or the other non-regulatory tools (Section 26, Paragraph 1 of Ontario Regulation 287/07) to manage drinking water threats. The use of these tools is not limited by the legislation and, therefore, they can be used broadly to address significant, moderate, or low drinking water threats.

When they address significant threats, these tools can be used in combination with regulatory tools. However, many plans use them as a stand-alone approach. There is considerable variability in how these policies have been used across Ontario. You should become familiar with your local source protection plan(s) to determine how these policies are to be implemented.

The following sections provide brief descriptions of the non-regulatory policy tools, and provide some examples of how they have been used in local source protection plans.

Education and Outreach Policies

Education and outreach policies are intended to increase public awareness of the benefits of drinking water source protection and encourage positive changes in behaviour. They have also been used to improve landowner acceptance of policies in source protection plans. Education and outreach policies may be specific to significant drinking water threats, or they can be used as a broad approach to influence behaviour related to source protection in general. The distinction of whether or not the policy addresses a significant drinking water threat is important when an implementing body is considering if the policy is legally binding on the municipality, which is discussed in more detail in Section A (ii).

Education and outreach programs can take many forms, from the simple and relatively economical, such as mailing letters or fact sheets, to comprehensive programs such as classroom programming or site visits. An education and outreach program could include written materials, community outreach, and/or special activities.

Most education and outreach policies contained in source protection plans do not prescribe methods, allowing the implementing body the flexibility to design a program and deliver it in a manner that is both effective and efficient. Section B (i) of this module provides some general guidance on how to develop and implement education and outreach policies to meet the requirements of local source protection plans. However, you should always refer to your local education and outreach policies to determine whether there are prescribed methods to which the education and outreach program must adhere.

Incentive Policies

Incentive policies can provide the positive motivation for a voluntary change in behaviour. They are not limited to financial incentives; they could include things like discounted products or community recognition. For example, an incentive policy may set out requirements for municipal household hazardous depot days when it is free to drop off hazardous waste, while the rest of the year it must be brought to a transfer station with a tipping fee.

Similar to education and outreach policies, incentive policies may be applied to specific drinking water threats, or they can be used generally in a source protection plan. Whether or not an incentive policy addresses a significant drinking water threat is important when considering if the policy is legally binding on the municipality, which is discussed in more detail in Section A (ii).

Incentive policies may be general or particular in nature. For example, incentives may be used as a complement to all threats or a group of threats, or they may be used to address a specific drinking water threat, at a specific risk level. Like education and outreach, many incentive policies have been written to provide implementing bodies with flexibility in developing and delivering incentive programs. Section B (ii) of this module provides some guidance on developing an incentive program to meet the requirements of source protection plan policies.

Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies, Including Specify Actions

The last group of non-regulatory policies is often described as the “other” policies. These “other” approaches are authorized under Section 26, Paragraph 1 of Ontario Regulation 287/07 and always relate to one or more drinking water threats:

- specify actions to be taken,
- establish stewardship programs,
- specify and promote best management practices,
- establish pilot programs, or
- govern research.

These policy approaches may be applied alone or in combination with other policy approaches to reduce the risk from specific drinking water threat activities.

See Section B of this module for further information about the “other” policy tools.

ii. Legal Effect and Implications

Source protection plan policies will have a range of legal effects. The requirements of municipalities and other implementing bodies named in each policy vary according to the risk level of the drinking water threat the policy is addressing, the type of policy tool being used, and the implementing body.

When education and outreach, incentives, or one of the “other” tools are used to address a significant drinking water threat, and municipalities, local boards, or source protection authorities are identified as the implementing body, the policy is legally binding and they must comply with the obligations set out in the policy; these policies can be found in List E, in the Appendix of each source protection plan. For example, if an education and outreach policy addresses a significant drinking water threat and identifies a municipality as the implementing body, the municipality is legally required by Section 38 of the *Clean Water Act* to implement the actions described in the policy. A municipality could encounter increased civil liability if the public experiences harm due to a failure to take appropriate action.

Where these tools are used for moderate and low threats, or when general (e.g. non-threat) education and outreach or incentive policies are included in plans, these policies have no legal effect; these policies are included in List J within the Appendix of each source protection plan. While public bodies are not legally required to implement these policies, the public and other stakeholders may still expect these policies to be implemented to the extent possible, given the inclusive and consultative process of source protection plan development and the transparent nature of annual reporting that follows implementation.

To determine the legal effect of any policy, reference the source protection plan.

iii. Roles and Responsibilities

There is flexibility in determining who will implement education and outreach, incentives, and the “other” category of policies. Local source protection committees selected the implementing bodies for non-regulatory policies in the source protection plans, and there is considerable variability between areas/regions.

Implementing bodies include municipalities, conservation authorities, source protection authorities, local boards, health units, planning authorities, provincial ministries, etc. Staff members at the local source protection authority can be contacted, or the local source protection plan can be consulted, to find out which combinations of implementing bodies have been identified in the source protection plan policies.

If a municipality falls into more than one source protection region, municipal staff will need to understand the non-regulatory policy requirements for each region in the municipality. For more information about understanding where source protection plan policies apply, refer to Module 2: Understanding Where Policies Apply.

iv. Timelines

Conformity dates for non-regulatory policies are highly variable. In some cases, there is a requirement to implement policies within the first year that a plan takes effect. In other cases, it may be several years. In any case, it is important to begin planning and budgeting for this work as early as possible. The sooner teams initiate these policies, the earlier they can implement protective measures.

B: Implementation of Non-Regulatory Policy Tools

i. Education and Outreach

Well-designed education and outreach programs can be an effective way to raise public awareness about where drinking water comes from, the importance of protecting it, and what residents, businesses and visitors can do to help keep it safe. Depending on the nature of the policies in the source protection plan, an education and outreach initiative can help ensure people know:

- where vulnerable drinking water areas are located,
- what activities could pose a threat in these areas,
- what actions can help protect drinking water, and
- what other programs, if any, exist to help them start these actions or projects.

Source protection plan policies may actually require several education programs depending on the threat activity, circumstances, policies, and audiences. Where an activity or condition is assessed as a low or moderate threat to drinking water, an outreach program may be delivered fairly broadly, with an emphasis on general best management practices when taking part in activities that could impact drinking water. However, where an activity is assessed as a significant threat to drinking water, a more detailed and individualized program with an emphasis on risk mitigation and/or other property owner requirements might be needed. Again, local source protection plans should be consulted before education and outreach programs are developed. The plans are available online or from local source protection authorities. Education and outreach has been used in source protection plans to:

- **Complement other mandatory policies.** E.g. An education program that precedes the requirement for a risk management plan. In this way, landowners can receive information about risks to drinking water, the need for a risk management plan, and the role of a municipal Risk Management Official.
- **Complement existing programs.** E.g. Providing information on septic system care and maintenance to keep septic systems functioning properly between five-year mandatory inspections that are now required under the Ontario Building Code.
- **Address significant threats when the source protection committee has decided to use non-regulatory tools to address the threat.** E.g. Providing education to residential landowners who store fuel in highly vulnerable areas around municipal drinking water supplies.
- **Address low or moderate threats that cannot be addressed through regulatory measures.** E.g. Encouraging risk reduction when there are outdoor, above-ground heating oil tanks. This kind of education and outreach can add more protection to water, even when a threat is not assessed as significant.
- **Address threats at the household level where the activities do not constitute a significant threat, but the source protection committee may have been concerned about the potential for cumulative impacts from many households.**
E.g. Many homeowners in one community might use excessive amounts of road salt on their driveways.
- **Raise general awareness of the vulnerable areas.** Encourage good stewardship practices, and promote financial incentive programs, when and where available, that help property owners initiate these practices.

Objectives and Expected Outcomes

When designing an education and outreach program, municipalities and implementing bodies should consider the learning expectations (or outcomes). In short, what do property owners need to know? A well-designed program includes expectations of what the property owner will

understand. The learning needs and expectations will also depend upon the type of threat and the details of the policy.

Some plans may describe in detail how education and outreach must be delivered, while others will have left the details up to the implementing bodies to decide. When it comes to educating property owners about science, legislation, and new rules that impact them, a flyer in the mail may not be enough to meet requirements. It is extremely important to understand the expected outcomes of education and outreach policies. Refer to local source protection plans and explanatory documents for further information. The source protection plan and explanatory document includes:

- the need for each education and outreach program,
- the desired outcome,
- the body implementing the policy,
- the compliance date,
- the details for how education and outreach should be carried out.

Resources and Tools

Municipalities and other implementing bodies are encouraged to identify existing education materials and capacity, partners in the municipality, and opportunities to expand upon existing programs to address the objectives of the source protection plan policies. The implementing body can then benefit from, and build upon, established partnerships, existing relationships with property owners and residents, current program resources (e.g. staff capacity), and watershed knowledge that has already been developed (e.g. assessment reports, watershed characterizations, watershed report cards, professionally developed education programs).

Examples of existing education programs include:

- Education materials (fact sheets, DVDs, resource guides, etc.) developed by health units, conservation authorities, provincial ministries, and Conservation Ontario (see Conservation Ontario's drinking water source protection tool kit): <http://www.conservation-ontario.on.ca/uncategorised/140-source-protection-program-outreach-toolkit>
- Environmental Farm Plans: A voluntary environmental education and awareness program delivered by the Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition. The Ontario Farm Environmental Coalition is also developing a Farm Source Water Protection Framework for farmers to use to understand the source water risks and existing protective measures on their properties, and to understand what additional measures, if any, may be appropriate. <http://www.omafra.gov.on.ca/english/environment/efp/efp.htm>

- Stewardship Guides for Rural Non-Farm and Seasonal/Shoreline Residents (University of Guelph and Partners):
 - Stewardship Guide for the Lake Huron Coastline:
 - <http://theguide.huronstewardship.on.ca/index.php>.
 - The Rural Landowner Stewardship Guide for the Lake Huron Watershed:
 - http://theguide.huronstewardship.on.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=3&Itemid=7
- Adult education program about drinking water source protection developed by the Ausable Bayfield Maitland Valley Drinking Water Source Protection Region (2007) – Modules available online at <http://www.sourcewaterinfo.on.ca/>

Local source protection plans may outline how to implement education and outreach policies, or the policies may give municipalities the latitude to design their own programs (sometimes in cooperation with another body, such as a health unit or conservation authority). Municipalities are encouraged to contact personnel from the local source protection area(s) about materials that are already available and plan and budget for any resources that are still needed.

Methods, Budget and Evaluation

Some of the most effective communications methods for use in education and outreach programs include:

- direct site visits, by appointment, with landowners and residents,
- local public meetings, workshops, or events (with a purposeful, engaging format and information), such as an Open Well event where property owners in wellhead protection areas are invited to see their local municipal well and find out how their drinking water is protected, treated, and distributed,
- direct, addressed letters to landowners and residents (no junk mail)
- phone calls to landowners and residents that produce meaningful results (e.g. tracking information, explaining how a workshop can provide them with information they need to know about policy impacts, soliciting commitments to sign up for a newsletter or attend a workshop, etc.).

An education/ outreach program could also include:

- written materials (e.g. brochures, fact sheets, mass-distributed flyers)
- online materials (e.g. electronic newsletters and e-mail marketing, websites)
- social media (e.g. Facebook postings, Twitter feeds, YouTube videos)
- community outreach (e.g. presentations to community groups, schools, industry organizations)

- special activities (e.g. workshops, demonstrations/tours, videos, school/community programs)
- media liaison/relations (e.g. news releases and photos, meetings with editors to suggest editorial content about protecting water, production of newsworthy content with a drinking water message, interviews)

To develop an appropriate strategy for education and outreach and determine whether more than one strategy is required, carefully consider these questions.

- What education and outreach is required for properties with significant drinking water threat activities or conditions?
- What (if any) education and outreach is recommended for moderate and low threats?
- Will different land uses (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural) require different education?
- If education and outreach is required in combination with other policy tools, how will it be delivered?
- How will education and outreach be delivered when it is being used as a stand-alone tool?
- Is the education and outreach going to be delivered region-wide, area-wide, or municipality-wide?
- Is the education targeted to specific vulnerable areas?
- Are there different education requirements for different drinking water threat activities?
- Should education and outreach involve the municipal Risk Management Official, and if so, what role would he/she provide?
- What is the audience's literacy level? Are materials in English sufficient, or do they need translation? What communications channels does the audience prefer (e.g. large files or small files, mobile devices or computers, social media or e-mail, meetings or in-person site visits, e-mail or phone, etc.)?

Are there any reporting requirements for the implementation of the education and outreach policy? For example, the policy may require a report back on the policy progress to source protection authority.

The answers to some of these questions may be available in the education and outreach policies set out in local source protection plans.

Once a delivery strategy has been developed, the next step is determining the budget. Consider the following list when developing a budget for implementation and delivery of education and outreach policies.

Staffing Considerations

Estimate staffing costs by determining the level of staffing needed and the amount of staff time required. Some questions to consider:

- Who will need to be involved in the education and outreach program?
- What internal staff are needed, what external consultants or services (e.g. website designer and maintenance, graphic designer, printing supplier, meeting facilitators, translators)?
- Who of the following people need to be involved, and how much of their time is required?
 - chief administrative officer
 - general manager
 - project manager
 - financial administrator
 - educator
 - communicator
 - stewardship professional
 - risk management official/inspector
 - geographic information systems specialist
 - information systems specialist
 - provincial government staff
 - health unit staff
 - administrative assistant
 - front office staff

Other Budget Considerations

Other considerations that will impact your budget:

- mileage
- meeting/workshop/event costs (rentals, hospitality, meals, etc.)
- printing (education guides or worksheets, letters, guides, flyers, fact sheets, maps, etc.)
- mailing (postage, envelopes, stationery, etc.)
- computers and software
- overhead expenses (telephone, heating, insurance, etc.)
- advertising
- evaluation of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of education and outreach

Based on available financial and staffing resources, the education and outreach strategy may require adjustments. Keep in mind that most education and outreach policies allow implementing bodies some flexibility.

Evaluation

An educational design best practice is to evaluate and/or assess what the audience has learned. A mailed pamphlet from the municipality may cover the required content for a property owner, but it can easily go unread. Good education and outreach programs include a combination of strategies to appeal to different types of learners and convey messaging in a way that demonstrates how threats can impact them and encourages them to take action.

Municipalities can choose the evaluation tool they will use to determine that the property owner has demonstrated understanding of the knowledge expectations, and that the source protection plan policy has been effectively delivered. While this may be good practice, it should be noted that source protection plans do not necessarily require an evaluation of the effectiveness of policy implementation. Check the education and outreach, as well as associated monitoring policies, for the requirements. If education and outreach is being used to address significant threats, it is prudent for municipalities and other implementing bodies to document information on the effectiveness of the education and outreach policy. In addition, the municipality (as the implementing body) makes this information available to source protection authorities so they can assess the success of policy implementation in achieving objectives. For more information about annual reporting requirements, please refer to Module 4: Annual Reporting and Information Management.

Example

Consider the following example of a source protection plan policy and implementation strategy for education and outreach to address the drinking water threat that septic systems pose.

Education and Outreach Policy Example – Septic Systems Assessed as Significant Threats

Municipalities shall implement an outreach and education program for property owners who own or operate a septic system that is a significant drinking water threat. Delivery of this education and outreach program should be in conjunction with the new mandatory septic re-inspection program required under the Ontario Building Code.

After considering the education policy, the municipality has determined the following implementation policy details and associated deliverables:

- There are 100 property owners with septic systems identified as significant threats.
- Send a letter to property owners to inform them inspections are required under the Ontario Building Code within five years, provide information on how to maintain a septic system to help protect drinking water, include an invitation to an information workshop,

and inform them that a staff member will be contacting them by phone to answer any questions and confirm their attendance at the workshop.

- Liaise with other implementing bodies and subject matter experts to learn about existing septic educational materials; design, prepare and print materials for mail-outs and workshop.
- Phone each of the 100 property owners.
- Hold a workshop that educates property owners about inspection requirements, and how to upgrade their systems, and whether financial incentives are available. Schedule property visits for those people who request them.
- Have appropriate staff members conduct the requested site visits.
- Record the outcomes of education and outreach program in database.
- Have a project manager oversee work and have administration keep records, issue cheques, etc.

Sample Budget			
– Direct Delivery of Education and Outreach to 100 Significant-Threat Septic Properties			
Staffing – Internal			
Staffing	Hours	Hourly Rate	Cost
Education staff	30 days X 7 hours = 210 hours	\$55/hour (Including salary, benefits, computer fee/depreciation, overhead – heating, insurance, telephone, information technology, etc.)	\$11,550
Other staff (administration/project management, finance, office, mapping/information technology, communications, etc.)	6 days X 7 hours = 42 hours		\$2,310
Total internal staffing costs:			\$13,860
Staffing – External			
Educational design services	20 hours	\$60/hour	\$1,200
Graphic design	10 hours		\$600
Expert speaker for workshop			\$500
Total external staffing costs:			\$2,300
Non-Staffing Costs			
Mileage	2,000 km X 0.45		\$900
Meeting hall rental			\$150
Supplies			\$250
Printing			\$300
Total of non-staffing costs:			\$1,600
Total cost to deliver direct education and outreach to 100 significant-threat properties:			\$17,760

Based on these estimates, a program of direct education and outreach to owners of 100 properties with septic system threats would cost a total of \$17,760, or \$177.60 for each property reached. This example shows a relatively comprehensive education and outreach program that uses a variety of tools and resources. The cost to implement the policy may be

less or more than the estimates shown. Budgeting for this policy may depend on the scope and depth of the program, the expectations for the program, and the requirements of the education policy.

Depending on the scope of the education and outreach policies prescribed by local source protection plans, and the capacity of the municipality, the budget for delivery of education and outreach may be quite similar or very different to the one outlined here. This was simply provided for illustrative purposes.

Local implementation of education and outreach will vary across Ontario and will depend on local source protection plan requirements, as well as local needs and conditions. Always consult source protection plans before developing any education and outreach strategies. Contact local source protection authorities for further information, advice and guidance.

ii. Incentives

Like education and outreach, incentives are a tool that can be used to increase public and stakeholder awareness about the importance of drinking water source protection and/or actions that could reduce the risk of a particular threat activity. Such programs can be used to address one threat, a group of threats, or all threats, and can complement other policy tools.

Source protection planning incentive policies may simply support the continuation of existing programs. For example, most source protection plans encourage the Province of Ontario to continue funding for the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program, a financial incentive program for property owners in the most vulnerable areas.

It is common for source protection plan policies to cite other programs, such as the Environmental Farm Plan, Well Aware, or county clean water projects.

Incentive policies, found in local source protection plans, generally fall into one of two categories:

1. Policies that promote and support existing programs (as discussed),
2. Policies that direct implementers to create new targeted programs.

The following sections of this module will provide some general guidance on how to implement incentive policies that fall into the second category. Incentive programs are rarely created without some kind of education component. Indeed, many source protection plans have incentive policies that are combined with education and outreach, and other non-regulatory policies to manage drinking water threats. As such, much of the guidance provided in Section B (i) is relevant here. Therefore, this section includes only additional information relevant to incentives. Refer to B (i) for further information.

Objectives and Expected Outcomes

The intent of incentive policies is to promote or encourage specific actions or behaviours. People who voluntarily adopt changes are far more committed than those who are forced to make a change. Incentive programs, which can include monetary incentives (e.g. cost-sharing, grants, and loans) as well as non-monetary incentives (e.g. partnerships, technical assistance, recognition programs, information and education) promote this change in behaviour.

It is important to always consult incentive policies in local source protection plans to determine the local objectives and expected outcomes.

Resources and Tools

As part of its commitment to safe drinking water, the Ontario Ministry of the Environment launched the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program in 2007. This financial incentive program has helped property owners and businesses take action to reduce threats to local municipal drinking water sources. Valuable lessons from this program can help guide the development of future incentive programs to address drinking water threats.

Based on the success of the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program, these are the key characteristics of a successful incentive program:

- local delivery and accountability, with local community support
- communicating simple, clear, and consistent messages – directly to target audiences of eligible landowners – about the program
- availability of technical support and advice to landowners that includes project planning, assistance in completing applications, providing resource information, lists of local contractors, follow-up to ensure projects have been implemented according to eligibility guidelines
- monitoring, evaluation, and reporting
- maintaining contact with landowners regarding opportunities to involve them in demonstration and promotion of successful projects to others in the watershed.

Conservation authorities and the Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association have a long history of delivering other targeted watershed-based financial incentive programs.

Municipalities across the province have supported a number of these programs with funding and technical support, which is often administered by conservation authorities.

The following aspects are common to most of these programs:

- funding is usually accessed through a formal application process and, for most programs, project review and approval is conducted by a local steering committee, or project review committee, made up of local stakeholders

- programs are geared to local land uses
- Assessment Reports, watershed report cards, and other watershed studies may help identify priority areas
- conservation authority extension staff and Soil and Crop Improvement Association field staff are among stewardship professionals who can provide advisory services to landowners to facilitate project implementation and reduce the amount of paperwork required
- a list of eligible best management practices is created
- all programs are cost-shared; landowners share in at least part of the cost - although, in some cases, several programs can be 'stacked' to cover all the landowner's direct costs,
- most programs require site inspection by staff prior to approval and after project completion, and many programs include a monitoring component to assess long-term effectiveness
- funds are transferred after project completion and submission of documentation.

A list of some financial incentive programs, including a tool that links to each watershed, can be found at: <http://www.conservation-ontario.on.ca/what-we-do/watershed-stewardship/watershed-stewardship-programs>

For further information, guidance, or support, municipalities should contact their local Source Protection Authority office.

Methods, Budget and Evaluation

When developing a strategy for implementing an incentive program, consider first the following five guidelines as recommended by Gardner and Stern (1996):

1. **Use incentives to reward positive behaviour** – Whenever possible, use incentives to reward people for desirable behaviour, such as financial rewards, rather than penalizing people for undesirable behaviour, such as fines.
2. **Make the incentives visible** – For an incentive program to be effective, people must be aware of it. Consider how incentives will be promoted and communicated.
3. **Be cautious about removing incentives** – If incentives are used to motivate a particular behaviour, keep in mind that once the incentive is removed, the internal motivations that people have for engaging in an activity can be undermined.
4. **Carefully consider the size of the incentive** – Study the experience of similar incentive programs to determine the size of the incentive to use.
5. **Use non-monetary incentives** – Although most incentives are monetary, non-monetary incentives, such as social recognition or acknowledgement, can also elicit a strong response.

Financial incentives can remove some of the barriers to adoption, but intrinsic motivation is extremely powerful. Municipal development of an incentives program may include barrier and benefit research, choice theory, community-based social marketing, audience research, and other tools to understand the motivations of property owners to adopt an action, or to decide against an action. For more information on the effectiveness of these tools, review the community-based social marketing information by environmental psychologist Dr. Doug McKenzie-Mohr at <http://www.cbsm.com>.

Incentive programs that are created as a result of agency partnerships may allow those agencies to pool resources, reduce efforts, and increase the size of the incentives being offered. When developing an incentive program, implementing bodies should consider any potential partnerships that could offer these types of benefits. Examples of partnership agencies include:

- conservation authorities
- Ontario Soil and Crop Improvement Association
- stewardship organizations
- local agencies
- general farm organizations and commodity groups
- industry, commerce and other business organizations
- international, national, provincial, and local foundations
- federal, provincial, county, and municipal governments
- community groups including service clubs, business organizations, trail organizations, etc.
- Ducks Unlimited Canada
- local stewardship or woodlot committees
- provincial and local organizations of seasonal and/or shoreline residents

Another way to increase the size of incentives is to combine the incentive program with other funding initiatives. Funding programs may change from period to period. Some examples of other funding programs that may correspond with drinking water source protection incentives include:

- federal agricultural cost-share programs when available,
- funding associated with the development and implementation of Environmental Farm Plans,
- municipal (county or regional) clean water projects,
- Trees Ontario, and
- provincial programs when available.

A professional consultant may provide advisory services to organizations or landowners to assist in all aspects of project implementation, from planning and design through to completion. Another very useful tool for determining which best management practices will reduce threats to drinking water is the provincial Risk Management Measures Catalogue. The catalogue is an online resource created by the Province of Ontario which sets out a list of measures that can be taken to reduce the risk of all drinking water threat activities. The catalogue can be accessed through the following link:
<http://www.trcgauging.ca/RmmCatalogue/>.

Municipalities and other implementing bodies should be ready to satisfy the associated monitoring and reporting requirements outlined in source protection planning policies including program achievements, statistics, project numbers, and reduction in drinking water threats.

Example

For source protection areas with significant drinking water quantity threats, local source protection plans may contain policies that direct municipalities to implement an incentive program to reduce water consumption.

Due to weather conditions and extra water use in the summer months (from the watering of lawns and gardens), the demand on municipal water services can increase significantly. As a result, many municipalities already employ some kind of water conservation measure. Municipalities could consider providing financial incentives for the purchase of water conserving products, such as rain barrels and low flow toilets, a measure that has already been employed with much success in several communities across Ontario (see Waller et al. (1996) for further information about municipal water conservation efforts).

Case study:

The City of Kitchener provides stormwater credits for reductions in utility bills:
http://www.kitchener.ca/en/livinginkitchener/Stormwater_credits.asp.

iii. Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies, Including Specify Actions

Ontario Regulation 287/07 spells out the “other” policy tools to deal with drinking water threats that may be included in a source protection plan. These tools include policies that specify certain actions, establish stewardship programs, best management practices, pilot programs, and policies that govern research. The use of Section 26, Paragraph 1 tools in source protection plans is more limited than the use of the other policy tools that were available to source protection committees (except for “specify action” policies). Their use is also quite variable from one area to another. The following section describes each of the Section 26, Paragraph 1 policy tools.

Specify Actions

The most common of the “other” tools, and which has been used widely in all source protection plans, is the “specify actions” tool. The “specify actions” tool is quite broad, and covers actions that do not fall within the other policy tool categories, regulatory or non-regulatory. For example, policies which direct a municipality to establish a road salt management and reduction plan uses the specify actions tool, as does a policy which requires routine septic system inspections. This tool is also used in policies that set out actions which rely upon other municipal authorities (e.g. the *Municipal Act*), such as policies which direct a municipality to pass a by-law requiring properties connect with municipal services where wastewater services exist.

Stewardship Programs

Stewardship programs often include financial and practical technical assistance for landowners to complete a variety of environmental projects. Stewardship policies in source protection plans are generally used in combination with education and outreach, best management practice, and/or incentive policies.

Stewardship programs can include:

- developing technical tools to monitor and assess the state of the watershed,
- providing advice and technical assistance in completing on-the-ground projects,
- promoting community involvement in projects,
- building partnerships with all levels of government, environmental groups, businesses, residents and landowners, and
- creating educational resources.

Best Management Practices

Best management practices are measures taken to mitigate or prevent impacts to water quality or quantity. Best management practices policies in source protection plans have frequently been combined with stewardship, incentive, and education and outreach policies.

Pilot Programs

Pilot program policies can be used to implement an activity/project as a test or on a trial basis, before it is put into broader use. Pilot programs have been used as a policy tool by only two source protection committees: the Saugeen Grey Sauble Northern Bruce Peninsula Source Protection Committee and the Cataraqui Source Protection Committee.

Research

Additional research may be required to determine new, innovative methods or technologies for addressing certain threats, or to better understand where targeted actions to address threats would have the most benefit to source water (e.g. issue contributing area). Policies that govern research have primarily been used as a stand-alone tool in source protection plans to investigate local threats and issue contributing areas.

Purpose of Policies

In general, the Section 26, Paragraph 1 policy tools have been used in a variety of ways which differ considerably from one source protection area to another. Despite this variability, these tools have primarily been used in combination with other policies to provide a comprehensive approach to managing drinking water threat activities.

Further Information

For full details about the ways that these non-regulatory policies have been used in local source protection areas, and any implementation requirements, local source protection plans and explanatory documents should be referenced. Local source protection authority staff can also provide additional information, advice and guidance with respect to these policies.

References

Gardner, G.T. and Stern, P.C. (1996). *Environmental problems and human behavior*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lauzon, Dr. Al and Smith, Ian, Co-Chairs, Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program Advisory Panel (2007); *Advisory Panel on the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program Final Report*. Ontario Ministry of the Environment:
http://www.ene.gov.on.ca/environment/en/resources/STDPROD_080838.html

McKenzie-Mohr, Doug (2011). *Fostering Sustainable Behavior: An Introduction to Community-Based Social Marketing* (Education for Sustainability Series). New Society Publishers.

Waller, D.H., Scott, R.S., Gates, C., and Moore, D.B. (1997). *Canadian Municipal Water Conservation Initiatives*. Toronto: ICURR Publications.