

Thames – Sydenham and Region Drinking Water Source Protection Source Protection Committee Discussion Paper

Report to Chair and members
Thames – Sydenham and Region
Source Protection Committee

Agenda # 2010.10.7c.iii

Cc SP Management Committee

Date October 6, 2010

Prepared By Ingrid Vanderschot, SP Policy Advisor
Chris Tasker, SP Project Manager

Re: Source Protection policy development framework

Background

- This discussion paper is intended to provide staff with direction on how to organize the policy discussion and development process.
- Of overriding importance is the need to establish a framework which makes for **efficient** policy development, given the deadlines to complete the Source Protection Plan
- To structure how we prioritize and establish this policy development framework there is a need to consider:
 - the mandatory and optional policies to be included in the SPP as outlined in the CWA and Regulation 287/07;
 - the implementers of the potential policies and how to involve them in the process;
 - the public's need for simple access to the policies which affect them;
 - the approaches that are permitted by the regulation existing expertise from other applications of these approaches;
 - the similarities and difference amongst the three SPAs within Thames-Sydenham Source Protection Region;
 - timelines for the SPP and the amended AR.

Discussion

In order to have a clear and focused approach to policy development, the range of policies being developed in the SPP need to be broken down and prioritized. This will allow for an efficient policy development process.

In considering how policy development can be broken down, it will be important to consider the various types of policies which can be included in the SPP. It will also be important to give consideration to both mandatory and non-mandatory policies, although the Source Protection Committee may want to determine the extent to which non-mandatory items will be considered. The following is a general list of the **types of policies** which can be considered:

- significant threat policies
- existing threat policies
- future threat policies
- moderate/low threat policies
- monitoring policies for significant threats
- monitoring policies for mod/low not to become significant,
- monitoring policies for issues
- transport pathways policies
- spills prevention policies
- the range of 19 water quality and 2 water quantity threats
- threats not yet identified in AR: (e.g. conditions, IPZ3, water quantity, etc.)
- policies governing incentive and outreach programs (including for systems not included in the terms of reference)

Organization of policy discussions

The organization or structure of the policy discussions will be very important in establishing an efficient and effective process for policy development.

Below are five options for organizing policy development discussions which could be considered by the SPC.

1. By *vulnerable area or system*.

Advantages

- allows for strong local influence
- fosters local ownership of policies
- better in SPR with only a few systems;

Disadvantages

- duplication of policies and effort
- high number of systems, especially in UTRSPA
- significant potential for inconsistency between systems across the region
- lack of capacity to support policy development at this level

2. By municipality

Advantages

- allows for strong local influence
- fosters local ownership of policies

Disadvantages

- significant potential for inconsistent policies
- duplication of effort
- lack of capacity to support policy development at this level

3. By SPA

Advantages

- facilitates development of individual SPP for each SPA

Disadvantages

- potential for inconsistent policies between SPAs
- duplication of effort

4. By general land use.

(such as: Municipal, agricultural, residential, commercial, industrial, aggregate, recreational)

Advantages

- allows focus by affected stakeholders
- limited number of categories

Disadvantages

- overlap/duplication with threats that apply to more than one land use (e.g. fertilizer and pesticide application, fuel storage)
- potential for inconsistency between how similar activities are dealt with in different land uses

5. By groupings of similar threats

Grouping similar activities by threat category or subcategory. For Example:

- waste disposal and sewage (Threats 1, 2)
- ASM, NASM, livestock grazing and confinement (Threats 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21)
- pesticide and fertilizer (Threats 8, 9, 10, 11)
- road salt and snow, deicing chemicals (Threats 12, 13, 14, 18)

Note: we do not have any threat de-icing chemicals (18) in the WHPA & IPZ in our region, however policies would still be required

- fuel (Threat 15)
- DNAPLS and organic solvents (Threats 16, 17)
- water quantity (Threats 19, 20)

Note: the ARs for the LTV and SCR SPAs do not identify water quantity threats, while none will be included in the UTRSPA AR until after the completion of the T3WB.

Advantages

- allows for consistency across the region;
- brings together relevant stakeholders;
- avoids duplication of effort (most efficient);
- local discretion can be allowed or restricted depending on how specific the proposed policies are;
- local municipal input can be through SPP municipal policy advisory committee.

Disadvantages

- If working groups are established for all of these threat groupings it would be preferred to have fewer working groups.

Working groups are one method of engaging stakeholders and implementers and drawing on their expertise in developing policy options. If policy development is effectively organized, working groups (where needed), will be able to be organized in the same manner to focus on specific aspects of policy development.

Other Policy Development Framework Questions

- Do we initially tackle one threat, work it through our process, and then tackle the others concurrently?
- Do we choose one of the top three threats as a starting point? The top three threats in the Thames-Sydenham by number of incidence are as follows:
 1. The establishment, operation or maintenance of a system that collects, stores, transmits, treats or disposes of sewage;
 2. The handling and storage of a dense non-aqueous phase liquid; and
 3. The handling and storage of fuel.
- When deciding what threats to place initial emphasis on, we should consider that:
 - Each of these threats is broken down into sub-threat categories which may require separate discussions. There are nine sub-threat categories relating to sewage, and only two sub-threats for each of the fuel and DNAPL threats.
 - There is momentum with MOE and other SPRs putting together information and examples on septic related sub-threats and fuel-storage threats. At this time, there is more opportunity to collaborate on these threats and benefit from existing information as we gain comfort with our policy development process.
 - There is less momentum with the DNAPL and organic solvent threats. There is less available background information and policy expertise to draw upon. Do we place early emphasis on developing these policies to allow more time for building knowledge and adjusting policies?
- Do we focus on general policies first for the entire SPR by threat and then fill in gaps where more detailed policies are needed for a particular area, system, or issue?
- Do we draft the three Source Protection Plans (for each SPA) concurrently or independently?