

Oliver M. Brandes and David B. Brooks

A joint publication of

Friends of the Earth Canada, Ottawa, ON, and

the POLIS Project on Ecological Governance,

University of Victoria, Victoria, BC

Originally published in November 2005

Revised in May 2007



The Soft Path for Water In A Nutshell

CONTENTS

Executive Summary: The Soft Path for Water in a (Small) Nutshell	01
Avoiding an Arid Future	02
Choosing From Three Paths	04
Supply Management—Build It and the Water Will Flow	06
Demand Management—‘The Best Source of New Water’	08
The Soft Path—Shifting the Approach	09
What Makes a Soft Path Soft?	10
Water As a Service	10
Ensuring Ecological Sustainability	11
Conserving Quality As Well As Quantity	11
Looking Ahead by Working Backwards	12
Getting From There to Here	14
Many Soft Paths, Not Just One	16
Soft Paths and Values	16
A Water Future Different From the Past	17
Water Soft Path Analysis in Canada	18
Further Reading	19
Annex: How to Create a Soft Path Plan	20

Acknowledgements

Many people have contributed to this publication. The authors wish to recognize the editorial and substantive contributions of Jill Austin, Toby Brooks, Susan Holtz, Tony Maas and Ellen Reynolds. Brad Hornick and Ellen Reynolds provided the creative flare for the design and layout. Thank you also to the Walter and Duncan Gordon Foundation for their generous financial support for both the POLIS Sustainable Water Project and Friends of the Earth Canada Soft Path Initiative.

Cover photo: Brad Hornick.

Printed on 100% recycled paper.





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY— THE SOFT PATH FOR WATER IN A (SMALL) NUTSHELL

Many Canadians believe that our fresh water resources are boundless. The truth is that only a small proportion of our water is renewable and located close to where most Canadians live. Continuing to take more and more water from nature while ignoring wasteful use at farms, factories and households will likely lead us to an arid future of our own making.

The best way to secure the future for fresh water is to develop a plan that draws all “new” water from better use of existing supplies and to change habits and attitudes.

The “soft path” is a planning approach for fresh water that differs fundamentally from conventional, supply-focussed water planning. It starts by changing the conception of water demand. Instead of viewing water as an end product, the soft path views water as the means to accomplish certain tasks. The role of water management changes from building and maintaining water supply infrastructure to providing water related services, such as new forms of sanitation, drought-resistant landscapes, urban redesign for conservation and rain-fed ways to grow crops.

Reducing water demand provides the cheapest source of “new” water. It can also be implemented more quickly and is less environmentally damaging than any supply alternative. Most current demands can be met with far less water—and with water of lower quality—than is currently used. High-efficiency toilets, for example, can reduce the amount of water used with each flush by 75 per cent. Further reduction is possible by using reclaimed wastewater rather than drinking water to flush toilets—further yet with dry sanitation systems that eliminate water use altogether.

The soft path is a planning approach that allows us to unleash the full potential of demand management by changing water-use habits, technologies, and practices. As a matter of principle, the soft path works within ecological limits and promotes local public participation to ensure sustainability of our water resources.

Soft path planning looks 20 to 50 years into the future and proposes major changes in our water infrastructure and institutions. The focus is on designing and implementing policies and strategies today that can reduce or even eliminate the need for further supply-side developments for the foreseeable future. Simply put, the soft path offers various routes to guide our current water management onto a sustainable path for long-term ecological and social prosperity.



“Desertification” is the result of inappropriate land use.

AVOIDING AN ARID FUTURE

Although Canada ranks high among the nations of the world in per capita fresh water availability, a host of factors conspire to make our abundance more apparent than real:

- **Geography**—most of our big rivers flow northward, while we live mainly in the south.
- **Hydrogeology**—less than 2 per cent of the water in the Great Lakes is renewable; the rest is a stock that, if withdrawn, will not be replaced.
- **A Tradition of Over Use**—we are second only to the United States in per capita water use.
- **Poor Management**—we waste more water than we use productively.
- **Wild Cards**—climate change, (including diminishing glaciers and longer drought periods), ecosystem deterioration (including widespread loss of wetlands and aquifer subsidence); and new forms of pollution (including endocrine disrupters and pharmaceuticals) pose unknown future challenges.

Evidence of emerging problems is not hard to find. Box 1 outlines some of the current threats identified by Environment Canada. The Canadian belief that our water resources are boundless is deeply entrenched. We must be willing to rethink the ways our freshwater resources are supplied, distributed and, most importantly, used to avoid an arid future of our own making. Innovative water management and new consumption practices are critically needed.





The soft path offers just such an approach. It has great potential for changing the way we manage and use fresh water in Canada—a potential that leads to both prosperity and sustainability.

Box 1: Water Threats in Canada

- More than one quarter of Canadian municipalities have faced water shortages.
- Failure to protect water quality resulted in death in Walkerton, Ontario and illness in North Battleford, Saskatchewan (and elsewhere).
- About one third of Canadians depend on groundwater to supply our homes, but we know little about the extent or the nature of this resource.
- As a result of global warming, glaciers have lost half or more of their volume in the last 100 years, so river levels that are high today will likely be lower tomorrow.
- Falling water levels in the Great Lakes are causing significant economic losses and adverse effects on almost all uses.

Source: Environment Canada, 2004.



Many glacier volumes are 50 per cent of what they were 100 years ago.

CHOOSING FROM THREE PATHS

The spectrum of approaches to water management ranges from supply management at one end through demand management in the middle, and soft path at the other end. As summarized in Box 2, these approaches differ in philosophy, process and outcome. However, together they represent incremental steps toward a more sustainable water management regime.



This spectrum of water management approaches refers to the more traditional definition of demand management. Some municipalities are beginning to apply a broader, more integrated demand management approach—one that, over time, may shift water management along such a continuum toward a soft path.

Box 2: A Spectrum of Water Management Approaches

Policy	Dominant Discipline	Range of Policy Choices	Fundamental Question
Supply Management	Engineering	Policies based on presumed need for new infrastructure.	How can we meet projected water needs given current trends in water use and population growth?
Demand Management	Economics	Policies based on short-term cost-benefit calculations.	How can we reduce needs for water to conserve the resource, save money and reduce environmental impacts?
Soft Path	Multi-disciplinary	Policies based on stakeholder consultation and political review.	How can we deliver services currently provided by water in ways that recognize the need for economic, social and ecological sustainability?



Wetlands and swamps are complex ecosystems critical for water storage and purification.

<p>Planning Process</p>	<p>Outcome</p>
<p>Planners extrapolate from current consumption patterns to determine future “requirements” and then locate and develop new sources of supply to meet this projected demand.</p>	<p>Construction of dams, pipelines, canals, wells, desalination systems, and interbasin transfers, where necessary.</p>
<p>Planners incorporate efficiency and information programs together with improved pricing patterns to maximize use of existing infrastructure. Increasing capacity is only one option among others in a least-cost approach.</p>	<p>Efficiency gains through technical fixes and consumer education.</p>
<p>Planners model a sustainable future state for water use with attention to long-term economic and social prosperity. They then “backcast” to devise a feasible and desirable path to reach that state. Ecological sustainability is fundamental to all economic, political and socio-cultural choices.</p>	<p>Options to reduce water use through innovation, conservation, water reallocation and changing patterns of use and re-use. More water is left <i>in situ</i>.</p>

SUPPLY MANAGEMENT— BUILD IT AND THE WATER WILL FLOW


The traditional response to water scarcity is simply to develop more supply. In Roman times, and even earlier, centrally managed agencies built dams and dikes, or dug to groundwater, and then ran pipes, aqueducts and tunnels to farms, factories, and cities.

Supply management has produced huge benefits throughout history: potable water for almost everyone whenever and wherever it's wanted; irrigation for farmers to support growing markets; as much water as industry wants; and generally enough left over for swimming pools and gardens. The major uses for water in Canada are listed in Box 3.



Roman aqueduct.

Unfortunately, supply-side management also has many adverse consequences for our environment. Rivers that used to run free are now sluggish; water tables are sinking; and, natural habitat is disappearing. The promise of a safe, abundant supply of fresh water can no longer be guaranteed. In most cases, the best and cheapest sources of water have already been tapped, and costs (per cubic metre) to develop new water supplies are doubling every decade or so.




Ruskin Dam and Powerhouse, BC. (Photo courtesy of BC Hydro.)





Box 3: Who Uses All That Water?




Note 1: Withdrawals show the amount of water taken from surface or ground-water. Consumption shows the amount **not** returned to the same sources.


Note 2: No full data set for water use in Canada has been published since 1996.

Source: Human Activity and the Environment, Annual Statistics 2003, Statistics Canada.

Municipal Water Use by Sector, 1999



Water Use in the Home (winter*)



* In summer, 50% or more of water is used outside the home (e.g. water for lawns and gardens).

Source: Environment Canada web site www.ec.gc.ca/water accessed Oct. 2005.

DEMAND MANAGEMENT— THE BEST SOURCE OF ‘NEW’ WATER

Demand management¹ is a strategy that recognizes water limits and searches for cost-effective measures to cut water use. Greater efficiency (“more crop per drop” in the jargon of irrigation) can reduce the demand for water and save money. Common demand management measures include volume-based pricing, low-flow faucets and toilets, drip or sprinkler irrigation, and recycling and reuse. For example, low-flow toilets cut water use per flush by about 75 per cent—and those reductions can be increased even further if reclaimed wastewater, rather than drinking water, is used for flushing. Demand management has always been part of how water systems operate, although generally as a secondary or temporary option until additional supplies are secured. Demand management can no longer be viewed as a second best approach. It must become the priority for water management. In the face of current uncertainty and change, reducing the demand for water is our best “source” of “new” water.

Today’s increasing water costs greatly expand the potential for demand management—so much so that experts believe that cost-effective water savings of 20-40 per cent are readily available. Box 4 describes a recent California study that demonstrates how comprehensive demand management can be the cornerstone for a 21st Century approach to water management that saves money, protects the environment and promotes long-term societal prosperity.

Box 4: Taking Demand Management Seriously in California

A recent study of water use in California by the Pacific Institute (*Waste Not Want Not*) shows that total urban (residential, commercial, institutional and most industrial) water use could be cut by 30 per cent using “off-the-shelf” technologies. Equally important, the additional water can be obtained at lower cost and more quickly than any new supply project can be brought into operation. As a result, even if California continues to grow at its current rapid pace, no new supply projects would be required for at least another several decades.

Source: Gleick, Peter H. et al. 2003. *Waste Not, Want Not: The Potential for Urban Water Conservation in California, Oakland, California*: Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security. Available at www.pacinst.org.

¹Also referred to as demand-side management, or DSM, when implemented by a utility.



THE SOFT PATH— SHIFTING THE APPROACH

As demand management programs become more comprehensive and longer term, they approach a holistic way of thinking about water—the **soft path**.² As with demand management, the soft path strives for efficiency in water use, but goes beyond efficiency by fundamentally challenging today's patterns of freshwater consumption.

Demand management focusses on “how”—how to do the same with less water. The soft path, in contrast, focusses on “why”—why use water to do this in the first place?

- Why, for example, do we use water to carry away our waste? Demand management would urge low-flow toilets, but waterless systems are available—perhaps not for homes (because of the need for regular maintenance), but certainly for larger buildings. On-site methods of waste treatment and reuse are also available, with total freshwater savings of 80 to 90 per cent possible.
- Why do we use half the potable water that is piped to a house in the summer for watering lawns and gardens—and sidewalks? Demand management would urge more efficient sprinklers with automatic shut-offs, maybe even watering restrictions. The soft path goes further: recycling water from bathtubs and washing machines or, better yet, drought-resistant greenery that requires little or no watering once it is established.

By focussing on “why” the soft path greatly increases the number of possible solutions. The approach is broadly applicable, not just to houses and gardens, but also large buildings, factories, and farms—indeed across sectors and to entire cities.

² The soft path for water concept is adapted from the energy field. Amory Lovins coined the term “soft energy path” in a 1976 *Foreign Affairs* article, and eventually developed a planning approach that carefully calculated requirements for energy services with great emphasis on economic efficiency, environmental protection, and democratic management. For more information, see: Amory B. Lovins, 1977. *Soft Energy Paths: Toward a Durable Peace*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger/Friends of the Earth.



WHAT MAKES A SOFT PATH SOFT?

Four principles distinguish the soft path from conventional planning and management:

- Treat water as a service rather than an end in itself.
- Make ecological sustainability a fundamental criterion.
- Match the quality of water delivered to that needed by the end-use.
- Plan from the future back to the present.

Box 5: Why is This Approach Called a ‘Soft Path’?

The approach is called a “soft path” partly because it requires less steel and concrete, which makes it gentler on the environment. But it gets its name mainly because it relies more on human ingenuity and innovation to “solve” society’s water problems—working with nature rather than trying to overcome it.

Water As a Service

Except for a few relatively small human uses, such as drinking and washing (and much larger amounts used to support ecosystems), a soft path approach does not view water as a final product. Instead, water is viewed as a means to accomplish specific tasks, such as sanitation, attractive yards, or agricultural production. This change of perspective liberates water planners and managers from the constraints of merely supplying more water and permits them to innovate with alternatives to water-based services. The objective is not to flush toilets or to irrigate crops, but to



Drought resistant planting, Abkhazi Garden, Victoria, BC





Water is valued for itself, not just as a commodity.
(Photo courtesy of Brad Hornick)

remove wastes and to grow food. If we can achieve those goals with less supplied water, we have the potential to cut costs, protect the environment, and enhance local control.

When water is viewed as a service, managers don't focus exclusively on traditional technologies and infrastructure. They also promote education and social marketing, local reuse and recycling, urban re-design for conservation, and different modes of farm management. Changing practices and behaviour offers a range of ways to reduce water use while maintaining desired services.

Ensuring Ecological Sustainability

Soft paths recognize ecosystems as legitimate users of fresh water and as the foundation of much of our economy. Therefore, standard cost-benefit analysis is not sufficient to ensure basic ecological resilience and ecosystem health. Environmental constraints are built in from the start to limit the amount of water withdrawn from natural sources and to establish conditions on the quality of water returned to nature.

Of the many soft paths that exist (see below), each one must be tested for its affects, and any option—be it source or use—that puts environmental or social sustainability at risk must be rejected.

Conserving Quality As Well As Quantity

High quality water is critical to human health. However, water quality requirements vary with end-use. A contaminant that is toxic for one use may be benign or even beneficial for another. We don't want animal waste in our drinking water, for example, but we eagerly seek it for gardens and farms. Yet, in most of Canada, we irrigate with drinking water.



Green roofs in Sydney, Australia. (Photo courtesy of www.wsud.org.)

For both economic and physical reasons, it is almost as important to conserve the quality of water as to conserve its quantity. High quality water (think of it as drinking water) occurs much less frequently in nature—and is much more expensive to deliver to users—than low quality water. Fortunately, we only need small quantities of high quality water (mainly for household purposes and special industrial tasks), but huge quantities of lower quality water (mainly for irrigation on farms and cooling at generating stations and industrial plants).

Soft path policies are designed from the start to match the quality of water supplied to the quality required by the end-use. The key is to cascade water systems, ensuring that wastewater from one use becomes input for another use—from a washing machine to a garden, or from a cooling system to water for other industrial uses.

Looking Ahead by Working Backwards


Soft paths require a set of policy changes and program plans that will, over time, move society toward water sustainability. How that route is built is another unique characteristic of the soft path approach.

Traditional planning starts from the present and projects forward to the future. Soft path planning does just the reverse. First it defines a sustainable and desirable future state for society, at least as water sources and uses are concerned. It then works backward to identify policies and programs that will connect the future to the present. This technique is called “backcasting”—in contrast to forecasting—and is the most important (and most difficult) part of soft path planning.





Box 6: Planning for the Future with a Soft Path Approach



Suppose a community decides that no new water sources will be developed before 2050. The desired condition in this case is that all future water needs for population and economic growth will be met through efficiency and conservation. This sets in motion the strategic thinking needed to implement policy and program alternatives to ensure this end result. Box 6 illustrates how a backcasting approach to planning might work for this community.

Given their long-term focus, soft path scenarios for water must allow for the possible impacts of climate change, such as changing precipitation patterns, longer drought periods, and greater evaporation. The process of developing scenarios by working back from the future allows potential impacts of climate change to be incorporated in water planning today.

Backcasting is not so strange an exercise as might first appear. Think of planning a holiday. You do not leave home and drive aimlessly. Rather, you first choose a destination and figure out how to get there. Backcasting is an iterative process. You do it over and over until reasonably satisfied that the goal can be achieved in the most cost-effective and agreeable way possible.

GETTING FROM THERE TO HERE

Water soft paths depend on changing patterns of water use, the adoption of conservation attitudes, and building different water institutions and infrastructure. These changes will not happen overnight; they require careful analysis, planning, public consultation, and strategic implementation. Demand management plans may project forward to the next decade. Water soft paths look a generation (20 to 50 years) into the future—similar to new water supply projects. The fundamental focus over that period is to try to provide for our needs without using additional water. As demonstrated in Box 7, there are many ways to reduce demand. Soft paths look for the right mix of measures to suit local needs, conditions, and preferences. Four guiding priorities can help develop a soft path approach. Look for measures that:

- **Have long-lasting effects:** For example, ensure that buildings are designed from the start to be highly water efficient and to recycle (and perhaps treat) wastewater internally. Or at least “future proof” them with additional piping to allow reuse and recycling to be added later. It is much more expensive to retrofit for water efficiency after the building is constructed.
- **Influence major water consumers:** In many situations, water consumption is more important than water withdrawals. Lakeside industrial cooling, for example, takes huge quantities of water but returns it to the lake almost unchanged. In contrast, irrigation also takes huge quantities but returns only a small part of it to the water body. A small change in farm practice can make a large difference in the amount of water lost to the watershed.
- **Will affect or be seen by many people:** Although the glasses of water placed routinely on restaurant tables do not amount to much in total, being asked whether you want that water is a regular reminder that supplies are limited. Public buildings should serve as demonstration sites for water conserving technologies. They will signal to citizens the potential of new technology and give evidence of government leadership.
- **Involve as many stakeholders as possible in decision making:** The objective is not to find the water system with the lowest accounting cost. It is to find the lowest total cost that is consistent with community desires for safe and reliable water service, environmental protection, and democratic control—values that can only be assessed through meaningful public participation in decision making.

Box 7: Common Water Demand Management Measures

General Categories	Specific Examples
Socio-political strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and education • Water policy • Water-use permits • Landscaping ordinances • Water restrictions • Plumbing codes for new structures • Appliance standards • Regulations and by-laws • Turf limitation by-laws • Once-through cooling system bans
Economic strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebates for more efficient technologies (e.g. toilets, showers, faucets, appliances, drip irrigation) • Tax credits for reduced use • Full-cost recovery policies and life-cycle analysis • High-consumption fines and penalties • Pricing structures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seasonal rates • Increasing block rates • Marginal cost pricing • Daily peak-hour rates • Sewer and waste water charges
Structural and operational strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metering • Landscape efficiency • Soil moisture sensors • Watering timers • Micro and drip irrigation • Cisterns • Rain sensors • Efficient irrigation systems • Soaker hoses • Leak detection and repair in trunk lines • Repair teams to reduce leaks in buildings • Water audits • Pressure reduction • System rehabilitation • Efficient technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dual flush toilets • Low-flow faucets • Efficient appliances (dishwashers/washing machines) • Recycling and Reuse – ranging from cooling and process water, to grey water for toilets or irrigation, to treating and reclaiming wastewater for reuse

MANY SOFT PATHS, NOT JUST ONE

The analysis underlying soft path planning does not generally yield a single, best path. Different policy and program combinations will lead us to the desired future. The Annex provides a technical breakdown of the steps involved in a soft path analysis.

Soft path analysis can: identify possible paths, describe the advantages and disadvantages (where quantifiable, the benefits and costs), and determine the likely social appeal and political feasibility. It is up to society as a whole, operating through democratic means, to choose the path most appropriate to its collective values.

Soft Paths and Values

The strategies that emerge from a soft path plan are explicitly value-laden. Supply-based policies are also value laden, but these values are less obvious because they are based on existing policies and status quo approaches. Soft path strategies pay attention to costs but also include ecological sustainability and societal engagement as fundamental criteria. Since the soft path defines a future sustainable society in value terms, it considers future changes to institutions and consumption patterns resulting from actions, policies and reforms instituted today. Demands for water and the institutional arrangements that drive them can be influenced.

As with any strategic plan, soft path planning is not a one-time event. Rather, it will have to be revisited regularly as new industries arrive, values shift, and climate changes.



In Canada, we often irrigate with drinking water.





Dockside Green sustainable development in Victoria, BC.
(Illustration courtesy of Dockside Green Ltd.)

Periodic review (every five or so years) will identify new options and result in policy refinements. However, if the strategy and goals are clear from the start, the smaller adjustments, such as updating demand management technologies or population growth rates, will be relatively easy to accommodate.

A Water Future Different From the Past

It is not difficult to envision a better water future for Canada—one that is sustainable yet permits vigorous economic development and agreeable lifestyles for Canadians. However, conservation does not just happen. Our water past is not a good guide to our water future. It will take concerted action for Canada to move to sustainable use of fresh water. That is just what the soft path can provide—a process for defining where we want to go, and a plan to help us get there rather than continuing on today's unsustainable trajectory.

Canadians must take bold steps to change how we manage our limited fresh water in the future. This doesn't require immediate radical change, but it does require new thinking and getting an early start on implementing a step-by-step process that will, over the next 20 to 30 years, change the way water is managed in Canada.

WATER SOFT PATH ANALYSIS IN CANADA

Over the past few years, Friends of the Earth Canada has taken the lead in developing water soft path analysis for Canada. One study explored ways to adapt the method of soft path analysis from energy to water. Another study demonstrated that, although gaps in data are serious, they are not so significant to prevent detailed analysis.

On the basis of these early studies, FoE Canada undertook the world's first comprehensive water soft path study. With the support of a grant from the Walter and Gordon Duncan Foundation, the study looked at water soft paths at three scales: 1) Provincial scale analysis in Ontario;³ 2) Watershed scale for the Annapolis Valley in Nova Scotia,⁴ and 3) Municipal and community scale in British Columbia.⁵

Key findings show that, by adopting soft path planning but accepting current economic and population growth projections to 2030, water savings in Ontario of 20% or more from current use can be achieved across all the major industrial sectors. In Nova Scotia, savings of 50% can be achieved in the Annapolis Valley. Applying the soft path to urban areas suggest that savings of two-thirds of the water are possible, which implies that most communities could grow vigorously for the next 20 to 30 years but still require no new supplies of water. Results were also obtained for selected sectors and activities. For example, water use per tonne in the pulp and paper industry could drop by as much as 95% (but at the expense of greater energy use), and lifestyle changes to reduce the share of meat in our diets could reduce water use for food production by one-third to one-half.

In sum, the Canadian water soft path studies demonstrate the potential for developing strategies that will move our cities, regions, and provinces to safe, secure and sustainable water management.

Further project details and reports can be found at www.foe-canada.org or www.waterdsm.org, in the August 2007 issue of *Alternatives*, or on CD-ROM available from Friends of the Earth Canada.

³ Led by the Faculty of Environmental Studies at University of Waterloo in Waterloo, Ontario.

⁴ Led by the Arthur Irving Academy for the Environment at Acadia University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia .

⁵ Led by the POLIS Project on Ecological Governance at the University of Victoria in Victoria, British Columbia.





FURTHER READING

Demand Management and Water Soft Paths

Brooks, David B. 2005. Beyond Greater Efficiency: The Concept of Water Soft Paths. *Canadian Water Resources Journal*, 30(1): 83-92.

Gleick, Peter H. 2003. Global Freshwater Resources: Soft-Path Solutions for the 21st Century. *Science*, 302: 524-28.

Brandes, O. M., K. Ferguson, M. M'Gonigle, and C. Sandborn. 2005. *At a Watershed: Ecological Governance and Sustainable Water Management in Canada*. Victoria, BC: The POLIS Project in Ecological Governance, University of Victoria.

Brandes, O. M. and K. Ferguson. 2004. *The Future in Every Drop: The Benefits, Barriers, and Practice of Urban Water Demand Management in Canada*. Victoria, BC: The POLIS Project in Ecological Governance, University of Victoria.

Gleick, Peter H. et al. 2003. *Waste Not, Want Not: The Potential for Urban Water Conservation in California*. Oakland, California: Pacific Institute for Studies in Development, Environment, and Security.

Maas, Tony. 2003. *What the Experts Think: Understanding Urban Water Demand Management in Canada*. Victoria, BC: The POLIS Project on Ecological Governance, University of Victoria.

Current Canadian Water Issues

Environment Canada. 2004. *Threats to Water Availability in Canada*. Ottawa: Environment Canada. (The single best overview of our current situation.)

Environment Canada. 2003. Fresh Water Resources, in *Human Activities and the Environment: Annual Statistics 2003*. (A compendium of recent information and statistics.)

Bakker, Karen, ed. 2006. *EAU Canada: The Future of Water Governance in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press (forthcoming in spring 2006). (The individual chapters of this book will review Canadian institutions, problems, and options.)

P. H. Pearse, F. Bertrand, and J.W. MacLaren. 1985. *Currents of Change: Final Report – Inquiry on Federal Water Policy*. Environment Canada. (The last overall review of Canadian water policy, now 20 years old.)

ANNEX: HOW TO CREATE A SOFT PATH PLAN

Though many variations are possible, the basic steps for a soft path plan include:

Step 1: Identify Water Services—List all services provided by water (e.g. residential indoor and outdoor, municipal parks, cooling). Some questions to answer include: Who is going to need water? For what purpose or goal is water needed? What kind of water is needed to meet specific goals? How much water of a particular quality is needed to meet any given goal? This step is detailed and time consuming.

Step 2: Adopt a Projection for the Region—Look 25 to 50 years in the future by means of pre-existing (“official”) demographic projections, and expectations of regional and economic growth. Next, apply existing water use patterns to this projection (on a use-by-use basis), thus establishing a “business as usual” baseline.

Step 3: Establish a Desired Future Condition—Create a desired future pattern for water supply and use. For example, a municipality or regional district might assume all future growth will be offset by conservation or efficiency (i.e. no “new” water source will be developed until 2050). Because this step sets key conditions for planning, it should include input from the community and key stakeholders.

Step 4: Analyze Water Quantity and Quality—Establish the quantity of water required to provide the services identified for this projected future (Step 3) by applying as many of the water conserving options as can be adopted within the given time frame. Determine which uses require high quality water (notably drinking, cooking and bathing) and which uses can proceed with lower quality water (toilet flushing, gardening, most forms of agriculture, industrial applications, etc.). As with Step 1, this step is detailed and time consuming.

Step 5: Review Water Supply Options—Identify all current sources of water and determine whether any is being over-used or degraded. Be sure to include both surface sources and ground-water, and both public and private supplies. Reduce withdrawals of fresh water or releases of wastewater that threaten long-term renewable use, and reject any new sources of supply that cross major watershed boundaries or that create a serious threat to ecological, cultural or social values. Finally, indicate the relevant range of future supply adjustments that may result from climate change.





Step 6: Backcast—Create various soft paths by designing incremental policies and programs to get from “there to here.” In Step 3 you identified a desired future; in Step 4 you found ways to make that future work; and in Step 5 you defined supply constraints. What do we need to do now to get to that future? Check each option to see whether it seems economically feasible, socially acceptable and politically achievable. This iterative process is “backcasting” and illustrates the path for “getting from there to here.” It is the most innovative and most difficult part of the soft path analysis.

Almost all soft path backcasting includes at least two scenarios:

- In one scenario, demand management practices and smaller scale renewable sources are explored to the fullest extent possible within the limits of what is, or what is expected to be, cost effective. Suppose that some region has set a goal of no new water supply projects until 2050. The soft path analysis might suggest a policy mix including volume-based pricing, education and social marketing, rebates for low-flow toilets, recycled water for public parks and golf courses. Another possibility is some future urban design that promotes rainwater harvesting, integrated stormwater management and “smart” growth that reduces seasonal water demands for lawns.
- In a second scenario, demand management is supplemented by changes in personal habits, growth rates, and economic structure. If that same region wanted to preserve as much land as possible in a natural state, farmers could be urged to return to rain-fed agriculture, urban planning could be adjusted to reduce run-off, and water-intensive industries, such as manufacture of electronic chips or aquaculture, could be discouraged or prohibited.

How much backcasting is enough? It’s enough when results are at least reasonably persuasive—not to you, the analyst, but to those who will read your report.

Step 7: Write, Talk and Promote—Once you have reached conclusions, the last, but in many ways most important, step in soft path planning is to get those conclusions to the public and especially to people who influence and make key decisions about fresh water. Only your imagination and your energy should limit the types and the amount of effort put into promoting water soft path results.

Friends of the Earth Canada

Friends of the Earth (FOE) Canada is a charitable, non-profit environmental organization. Its mission is to serve as a national voice for the environment, working with others to inspire the renewal of our communities and the earth, through research, education and advocacy. FOE has grown from a small group of volunteers in 1978 to one of the country's most important voices speaking out on environmental issues. It is the Canadian voice for one of the largest international environmental networks—Friends of the Earth International—with over 70 sister organizations around the world working for healthy environments and environmental justice.

Friends of the Earth, 300 - 260 St. Patrick Street,
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1N 5K5
Phone: 613-241-0085
foe@foecanada.org
www.foecanada.org



FRIENDS OF THE EARTH CANADA
**SUSTAINABLE
WATER PROJECT**



The POLIS Project on Ecological Governance

Created in 2000, the POLIS Project on Ecological Governance is a research-based non-profit organization based at the University of Victoria. “POLIS” takes its name from the ancient Greek word meaning “city state” but to Greek thinkers, the polis was more than just a place; it was seen to embody the highest purpose of our humanness. Researchers who are also community activists work together at POLIS to dismantle the notion of the environment as merely another sector, and to bring it into the mainstream where it belongs—as a core value in all aspects of our society. Among the many research centres investigating and promoting sustainability worldwide, POLIS represents a unique blend of multidisciplinary academic research and community action.



POLIS Project
an
Ecological Governance
University of Victoria

POLIS Project, University of Victoria
PO Box 3060, Victoria, BC, Canada, V8W 3P
Phone: 250-721-6388
polis@uvic.ca
www.waterdsm.org