

Appendix K

Ohio SWAP Committee Recommendations & Conclusions

- SWAP for surface water systems should be integrated with ongoing watershed protection programs.
- SWAP for surface water systems should create an additional barrier to contamination in public water systems. It should stimulate efforts to better manage watersheds to provide high-quality surface waters.
- SWAP for surface water systems should provide information to enable the public water system to provide adequate treatment technology for any contaminant that is likely to appear in the system.
- SWAP should provide state-level guidance, coordination, and leadership for watershed management teams.
- SWAP needs to be integrated into other programs, such as land-use and water quality programs that are ongoing at the state and local levels. For example: SWAP should be integrated into county emergency response procedures -SWAP should be integrated into Ohio EPA's Drinking Water Program
- State agencies should serve as information sources to the public water systems, and assist in cooperative efforts.
- SWAP should use existing information to assess water quality and from this, provide an assessment of water quality for *drinking water purposes*.
- SWAP should stimulate education of both water customers and non-customers within the SWAP area, and lead to public awareness of the relation of watershed management to public water quality. It should be a lever to get people involved, to participate in the management process.
- SWAP should improve the ability to provide high-quality drinking water.
- SWAP should work across jurisdictional boundaries by providing incentives for cooperation.
- SWAP should be designed to work for all sizes of systems.

- SWAP should be flexible.
- SWAP should be designed to accomplish its objectives without placing unreasonable expectations on public water system operators. It should strive to minimize the burden on the public water systems.

The SWAP program and any related guidance documents should be understandable! They should be clearly written, and free of jargon and excessive acronyms.

- SWAP should recognize the interrelation of surface water and ground water systems, and take a broader approach to "source water" than simply what is coming down the river.
- SWAP should educate public water system managers about the benefits of watershed management, and encourage them to prioritize their own funding to address management.
- SWAP should be an ongoing process. A mechanism for ensuring continuity of effort should be built into the program.
- SWAP should create incentives for changing land uses to protect water.
- SWAP should recognize sensitivities over private property rights. The program should propose a range of protective strategies including encouragement of "smart development" that is compatible with SWP issues.
- SWAP should encourage existing state regulatory programs to review their own procedures to determine whether they aid (or inhibit) SWAP objectives.
- SWAP should include a mechanism for measuring success/failure.
- SWAP should include cost-effectiveness and funding considerations.
- SWAP should identify people who need to be involved in the planning process, at the state and local levels.
- SWAP should include provisions for accomplishing the assessment tasks within mandated timeframes.
- SWAP should be realistic in expectations.

- SWAP education—especially that directed at PWS managers--should focus on "What I have to do now, and how", as well as on future actions.
- SWAP education must provide for local buy-in and ownership of the effort by enabling recipients to perceive the benefits of SWAP.
- SWAP education should be incorporated into Consumer Confidence Reports.