



South Georgian Bay Lake Simcoe Source Protection Region

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

---

## Implementation Resource Guide

17/7/2013

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 .....	3
i. Overview of Non-Regulatory Policies .....	3
Education and Outreach Policies .....	4
Incentive Policies .....	4
Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies, Including Specify Actions .....	5
ii. Legal Effect and Implications .....	5
iii. Roles and Responsibilities.....	6
iv. Timelines .....	6
B: Implementation of Non-Regulatory Policy Tools .....	6
i. Education and Outreach .....	6
Objectives and Expected Outcomes .....	8
Resources and Tools .....	8
Methods, Budget and Evaluation .....	9
Example.....	13
ii. Incentives .....	15
Objectives and Expected Outcomes .....	15
Resources and Tools .....	16
Methods, Budget and Evaluation .....	17
Example.....	19
iii. Section 26, Paragraph 1 Policies, including Specify Actions .....	19
Purpose of Policies .....	20
Further Information .....	21
References .....	22

## 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 municipal 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 noted above (Section 26, Paragraph 1 of Ontario Regulation 287/07) to achieve their desired outcome of managing drinking water threats. The use of these tools in a Source Protection Plan is not limited by the legislation and, therefore, they can be broadly used to address significant, moderate, or low drinking water threats.

Often these tools have been used in combination with other, more regulatory tools when addressing significant threats. However, in many plans these tools have been used 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 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 considering if the policy is legally binding on the municipality, which is discussed in more detail below in the section entitled “Legal Effect and Implications”.

Education and outreach programs can take many forms, from the simple and relatively economical, such as the mailing out of 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 purposefully, so that there is flexibility to design a program and deliver it in a manner that is both effective and efficient for the implementing body. 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. Incentive policies don't just focus on monetary incentives, but could include things like discounted products or community recognition. For example, an Incentive policy may set out requirements for municipal household hazardous depot days, a day 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 below in the section entitled “Legal Effect and Implications”.

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 how incentive programs are developed and delivered. Section B (ii) of this module provides some general

guidance on how to develop 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, in the case of an education and outreach policy that 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 because of a failure of the municipality to take appropriate action in relation to significant threat policies that rely on these tools.

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 them, 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 which will follow plan implementation.

The legal effect of any policy can be determined by referencing the lists of policies contained in the Appendix of every 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 from region to region.

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, and in other cases, it may be several years. In any case, it is important to begin planning and budgeting for this work early. The sooner education and outreach, incentive, stewardship, and other such programs are initiated, the earlier protective measures can be implemented.

## **B: Implementation of Non-Regulatory Policy Tools**

---

### **i. Education and Outreach**

Well-designed education and outreach programs can be an effective way of raising awareness about where drinking water comes from, the importance of protecting it, and what residents, businesses and visitors can do to help. 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 (not significant) 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. Below are some examples of how education and outreach has been used in local Source Protection Plans:

- **To complement other mandatory policies.** An example would be an education program that precedes the requirement for a Risk Management Plan. In this way, information can be provided about risks to drinking water, the need for a Risk Management Plan, and the role of a municipal Risk Management Official, prior to the Risk Management Plan being established.
- **To complement other existing programs.** An example is to provide information on septic system care and maintenance in order to keep septic systems functioning properly between five-year mandatory inspections that are now required under the Ontario Building Code.
- **Address significant threats where the Source Protection Committee has decided not to use regulatory tools (for example, Section 57 Prohibition or a Risk Management Plan) to address the threat.** An example may be 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, but plan policies recommend that education be provided.** An example is to encourage 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.**

An example of this is where 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

One of the first things municipalities and implementing bodies should consider when designing an education and outreach program is the learning expectations (or outcomes). In short, what do property owners need to know? A well-designed education and outreach program would include expectations of what the property owner will understand. The learning needs and expectations will also depend upon the type of threat, or group of threats, the education and outreach policy is addressing, and the details of the policy.

Each Source Protection Plan will have its own education and outreach policies. 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. Education and outreach activities may be more complex than just putting a flyer in the mail. When it comes to educating property owners about science, legislation, and new rules that impact them, notification alone may not be enough to meet the education and outreach requirements of local Source Protection Plans. It is extremely important to understand the expected outcomes of local education and outreach policies. This information can be found by referring to local Source Protection Plans and explanatory documents. The Source Protection Plan and explanatory document can explain:

- 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 what education materials and capacity already exist, what partners exist in the municipality, and where there may be 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, DVD's, 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/source\\_protection/Source\\_Protection\\_Program\\_Outreach\\_Toolkit.htm](http://www.conservation-ontario.on.ca/source_protection/Source_Protection_Program_Outreach_Toolkit.htm).
- 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 farms 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](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 – without excess materials that could appear to be ‘junk mail’,
- phone calls to landowners and residents that produce meaningful results (e.g. tracking information, explaining why a workshop can provide them with information they need to know about policy impacts, eliciting 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, etc.),
- online materials (e.g. electronic newsletters and e-mail marketing, websites, etc.),
- social media (e.g. Facebook postings, Twitter feeds, YouTube videos),
- community outreach (e.g. presentation to community groups, schools, industry organizations, etc.),
- special activities (e.g. workshops, demonstrations/tours, videos, school/community programs, etc.),
- 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, etc.)

Prior to making decisions about methods, the following questions should be carefully considered in order to develop an appropriate strategy for education, and to determine whether more than one strategy is required:

- 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 education be different for different land uses (e.g. residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural,
- if education and outreach is required in combination with other policy tools, how will it be delivered,
- how will education and outreach be delivered where 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 the municipal Risk Management Official be involved in education and outreach, and if so, what role would they provide,
- what is the literacy level of the audience, are materials in English sufficient, or do they need translation, and what communications channels does the audiences 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.), and
- are there any reporting requirements for the implementation of the policy; i.e., for providing information back to the Source Protection Committee or Source Protection Authority on the implementation of the education and outreach policies required in an associated monitoring policy?

Keep in mind that some of the answers to these questions may already be prescribed in the education and outreach policies set out in local Source Protection Plans.

Once the details of education and outreach have been considered, and a delivery strategy has been developed, the next step is to determine the budget. The following is a list of items that should be considered in order to develop a budget for implementation and delivery of education and outreach policies:

### Staffing Considerations

Staffing costs can be estimated by determining the level of staffing needed and the amount of staff time required. Below are 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), and
- which of the following people needs 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,
- geographic information systems specialist,
- information systems specialist,
- provincial government staff,
- health unit staff,
- administrative assistant, and/or
- front office staff?

### Other Budget Considerations

Other considerations that will have an impact to your budget include:

- 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, and
- follow-up evaluation of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of education and outreach.

Once a budget has been estimated, the education and outreach strategy may need to be re-evaluated and adjusted based on the resources available. Keep in mind that most education and outreach policies allow for flexibility in the way that they are implemented.

### Evaluation

A best practice in educational design is to have an evaluation and/or assessment of what the audience has learned. If a municipality sends a large pamphlet to a property owner, they may have 'covered' all the content they wanted to cover – but have they 'uncovered' the understanding a property owner needs in order to understand the impact of policies and how they will have to manage risk in order to protect water?

Municipalities may choose to consider the kind of evaluation tool they think is necessary to determine that the property owner has demonstrated their 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 evaluating the effectiveness of policy implementation is not necessarily a requirement of local Source Protection Plans – 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, this information should be made available to Source Protection Authorities in order for them to assess if implementation of these policies has been successful in achieving policy objectives. For more information about annual reporting requirements, please refer to Module 4: Annual Reporting and Information Management.

## Example

Consider the below example of a Source Protection Plan policy and implementation strategy for education and outreach to address the drinking water threat posed by septic systems.

### **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 following implementation details have been determined:

- there are 100 property owners with septic systems identified as significant threats,
- send letter to property owners to inform them inspections are required under the Ontario Building Code within five years, provide them with information on how to maintain their septic system in good working condition 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 if they are coming to the workshop,
- liaise with other implementing bodies and subject matter experts to see what septic educational materials are already available; design, prepare and print materials for mail-outs and workshop,
- phone each of the 100 property owners,
- hold a workshop where property owners can find out about inspection requirements, and how to upgrade their systems, and whether financial incentives are available, and book property visits for those who request them,
- have appropriate staff conduct requested site visits,
- record outcomes of education and outreach program in database, and
- have a project manager oversee work and have administration keep records, issue cheques, etc.

<b>Sample Budget</b>			
– Direct Delivery of Education and Outreach to 100 Significant-Threat Septic Properties			
<b>Staffing – Internal</b>			
<b>Staffing</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Cost</b>
Education staff	30 days X 7 hours = 210 hours	\$55/hour	\$11,550
Other staff (administration/project management, finance, office, mapping/information technology, communications, etc.)	6 days X 7 hours = 42 hours	(Including salary, benefits, computer fee/depreciation, overhead – heating, insurance, telephone, information technology, etc.)	\$2,310
<b>Total internal staffing costs:</b>			\$13,860
<b>Staffing – External</b>			
Educational design services	20 hours	\$60/hour	\$1,200
Graphic design	10 hours		\$600
Expert speaker for workshop			\$500
<b>Total external staffing costs:</b>			\$2,300
<b>Non-Staffing Costs</b>			
Mileage	2,000 km X 0.45		\$900
Meeting hall rental			\$150
Supplies			\$250
Printing			\$300
<b>Total of non-staffing costs:</b>			\$1,600
<b>Total cost to deliver direct education and outreach to 100 significant-threat properties:</b>			\$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 than the above estimates – or it may be more. 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. Source Protection Plans should always be consulted first before any education and outreach strategies are developed; local Source Protection Authorities should be contacted for further information, advice, and guidance.

## ii. Incentives

Like education and outreach, incentives are a tool that can be used to inform the public and stakeholders, and increase 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.

There are many incentive programs that are already in existence, and source protection planning incentive policies may simply support the continuation of these programs. For example, most Source Protection Plans encourage the Province of Ontario to continue funding for the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program, a financial incentives 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 above).
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 as stated above. Incentive programs are rarely created without some kind of education component included. 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 the previous section is relevant here as well. The reader should refer to the guidance included in the education and outreach section for further information. Only additional information relevant to incentives is presented here.

### 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.

However, it should be stressed that the incentive policies in local Source Protection Plans and explanatory documents should always be consulted first 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. Depending on the type of project, grants are provided to cover anywhere from 25 to 80 per cent of the project costs. The Ministry of the Environment has not committed to funding the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program beyond 2013. However, valuable lessons can be drawn from this program to help guide the development of future incentive programs to address drinking water threats.

Based on the success of the Ontario Drinking Water Stewardship Program, the following key characteristics of a successful incentive program have been developed:

- 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, and
- 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 in 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, and
- 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.conservationontario.ca/stewardship/programs.html>.

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** – Wherever 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** – In order for an incentive program to be effective, people must be aware of them. Consideration should be given to 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 in order 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 that may exist – but intrinsic motivation is extremely powerful. Municipal development of an incentives program may include consideration of 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, and
- provincial and local organizations of seasonal and/or shoreline residents.

Another way to increase the size of incentives is to couple the incentive program with other funding initiatives. Funding programs may be available and 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.

To determine which best management practices to promote through an incentive program, municipalities may wish to consult a stewardship professional. Stewardship professionals 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, reduction in drinking water threats, etc.

### Example

For source protection areas where significant drinking water quantity threats have been identified, 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 of this, many municipalities already employ some kind of water conservation measure. Municipalities could consider coupling their water conservation efforts by 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](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 include policies that specify certain actions to be taken, establish stewardship programs, best management practices, pilot programs, and policies that govern research. The reliance on the Section 26, Paragraph 1 tools in Source Protection Plans is more limited than the use of the other policies tools that were available to source protection committees (except for "specify action" policies). Their use is also quite variable from one area to another. Each of the Section 26, Paragraph 1 policy tools is described below.

#### 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 been primarily 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 been primarily used in combination with 'Other' policy tools to provide a comprehensive approach to managing drinking water threat activities.

### **Further Information**

For full details about the ways that these non-regulatory tools 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 tools.

## 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](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.