## **CEP Technical Report: 95**

# HOT SPOT ASSESSMENT DIAGNOSTIC TOOL FOR SIDS GEF IWCAM/CEHI









## Rapid Watershed Hot-Spot Risk Assessment Tool North western Coastal Water Quality Demonstration Project for St. Lucia

### Introduction and Instructions for Use

The purpose of this assessment tool is to capture information on the pollution risk associated with hotspots Hotspots are sites which are likely to be sources of physical, chemical and biological pollutants which can enter drains and rivers, to be ultimately discharged to coastal waters along the northwest coast of the island. The scores from this risk assessment tool will prioritize sites for further detailed investigation and intervention towards better coastal water quality and overall environmental protection.

This is a rapid assessment tool, to capture maximum information within minimum time, and simple enough that the field personnel will not require extensive training on its use. It is also designed to minimize subjectivity, hence is structured on the basis of presence/absence of specific pollution criteria rather than surveyor judgment.

Section 1 is to be completed for all sites, Section 2 only if the site is industrial/commercial, and complete Section 3 for residential, commercial and industrial sites. Section 4 is to be completed for agricultural sites. If there is mixed landuse at the site e.g. both agriculture and housing, all applicable sections must be filled out.

Key variables that relate to pollution potential are weighted and ranked to produce a hotspot assessment score. The higher the likelihood the variable will contribute to freshwater and coastal pollution the higher the weighting. For example soil/land degradation is considered to be a greater water pollution risk factor than solid waste hence the former has a weighting of 9 and the latter only 6. The level of magnitude of each variable in turn is ranked from 1-15, so for example for solid waste pollution if the site has "No trash or very little trash present (i.e. less than one bucketful)" the rank is only **1 but if the site has** "A large amount of trash or debris scattered over a large area" the solid waste ranking is 10. Thus a site with no trash, will have a solid waste risk score of 1X6=6. Weighting, rank and final score columns have already been provided in the table below. This is the field version of the form for manual entry of the scores, there is also a Microsoft Excel version of the form which can be used in the field on a laptop for example or into which the scores can be entered after the field assessment.

Organization name:	Interviewee name:	
Interviewer name:	Date:	_Start time:

SECTION 1: G				WEIGH	Rank	SCORE
1.1 WATERSHED	1.2 MAIN	DISCHARGE PC	DINTS	N/A FOR	R REFEREN	
NAME	(A) LOCATIO COORDINATE	NAL <b>(GPS)</b> S	(B) DESCRIPTION (provide for each discharge outfall)	-		
	# EASTING S	NORTHINGS				
	1					
	2			_		
	3			_		
<b>1.3</b> PHOTO ID (C	amera-Pic <b>1.4</b>	SITE IDENTIFY	I NG CHARACTERISTICS (e.g. address, major landmarks, light pole number)	N/A FOR	REFEREI	NCE ONLY
#3) # РНОТО # D	SCRIPTION					
1						
2						
<b>1.5 MAJOR LANI</b> Residential Natural veget	USE/LAND COV	<b>FR</b> (Adapted from Com Com Com Com Com Com Com Com Com C	om Cooper 1996) Imercial Agricultural Vacant lot/abandoned area/open space	N/A FOR	REFEREN	ICE ONLY
1.6 TOPOGRAPH	Y			WEIGH	RANK	SCORE
Gradient flat	o gentle sloping	(0-10 degrees	) (2)	-TING		
Gradient gen	le to moderate : erate to steeply	sloping (10-20 sloping (20+ d	degrees) (5) legrees) (8)	6		
<b>1.7 PROXIMITY</b> Manmade dr	O WATERCOURS	SES Sen in width) on	property or within 10m of property boundary (5)	WEIGH -TING	RANK	SCORE
Channelized	water course, riv	ver or dry river	bed (>3m in width) on property or within 10m of property boundary (8)	10		
Property on o	oastline, on bea	ch or within 10	m of coastline or beach (8)	10		
Property is a	jacent to multip	le water course	es e.g. both on the coastline and next to a river (15)			

<b>1.8 WATERCOURSE VEGETATION BUFFERS</b> (if edge of property is within 10m of the coastline or within 10m of river, dry riverbed or concrete drain >3m in width)	WEIGH -TING	Rank	SCORE
Adjacent or onsite river or drain has a continuous vegetation strip (trees and/or ground vegetation) >20m wide extending			
Adjacent or onsite river or drain has a continuous or patchy vegetation strip (trees and/or ground vegetation) < 20m wide	6		
extending from bank towards hotspot (5) Adjacent or onsite river or drain does not have a continuous vegetation strip (trees and/or ground vegetation) the bank of			
the watercourse towards hotspot (10)			
<b>1.9</b> SITE ACTIVITIES (if edge of property is within 10m of coastline, beach, river, dry riverbed or concrete drain>3m in width)	WEIGH	RANK	SCORE
Laundry (6)     Recreational e.g. bathing camping hiking (3)	-11NG		
Grazing animals (3) Forestry e.g. logging (2)	10		
Watchield stockpring e.g. for rode works (4)    Warehousing (2)   Treatment and disposal (15)			
OTHER PLEASE SPECIFY:			
<b>1.10</b> EVIDENCE OF SOIL/LAND DEGRADATION (Adapted from Ontario Ministry of Environment 2010)	WEIGH	RANK	SCORE
No evidence of soil degradation (no or little exposed soil) (1)	-TING		
Exposed soil visible, no rills or gullies evident (3)	0		
Exposed soil visible. Rills evident (small erosion channels in the soil running downslope) (7)	9		
L Exposed soll visible with marked signs of erosion that may include guilles, exposed plant roots, exposed bases of fences,			
1.9 EVIDENCE OF SOLID WASTE POLLUTION (Adapted from Kitchell and Schueler 2004)	WEIGH	RANK	SCORE
No trash or very little trash present (i.e. less than one bucketful) (1)	-TING		
Small amount of trash (i.e., less than one pickup truck load) (3)	6		
time but it could be cleaned up in a few days, possibly with a small backhoe (7)	6		
A large amount of trash or debris scattered over a large area (10)			
SECTION 1 SUBTOTAL SCORE (SUM OF SCORES FROM 1.6-1.9):	1	I	

SECTION 2: COMPLETE FOR INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL SITES	WEIGH -TING	RANK	SCORE
2.1 ECONOMIC SECTOR (Adapted from Trinidad and Tobago Standard Industrial Classification)         Construction       Industrial washing/cleaning         Electricity and water       Retail and wholesale trade, hotel and restaurants         Manufacturing       Financing, insurance real estate and business service         Transport, storage and communications       Recreational and cultural services         Agroprocessing       Community, social and personal services         Fish processing       OTHER PLEASE SPECIFY :	N/A FO INFORM	R GENERAL	LY
<ul> <li>2.2 SITE SECURITY</li> <li>Is there a fence or security measures which limits access and therefore reduces the chance of tampering/vandalism that may lead to chemical spillages or other forms of pollution?</li> <li>Yes (1) No (8)</li> </ul>		Rank	SCORE
<b>2.3 CHEMICAL PRODUCTION</b> Are the following substances produced at the site?            Compressed gas cylinders, industrial gases (4)         Petrochemical products (e.g. oils, gasoline (8)         Paint, pigments, inks, glues, resins (2)         Acid, solvents (3)         Agricultural chemicals (pesticides and fertilizers (4)         Soaps, detergents (1)         If other materials manufactured please specify below:	WEIG HING 8	RANK SUMMED RANK OF ALL SUBSTANCES PRODUCED	SCORE

<b>2.4 CHEMICAL STORAGE</b> Are the following substances stored at the site?         Compressed gas cylinders, industrial gases (2)         Paint, pigments, inks, glues, resins (2)         Acid, solvents (3)	Weig hting	RANK SUMMED RANK OF ALL SUBSTANCES	SCORE
Agricultural chemicals (pesticides and fertilizers (4) Soaps, detergents (1)	1	PRODUCED	
If other materials are stored please specify below:			
2.5. SITE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	WEIG	RANK	SCORE
a) Is there a documented Environmental Management System or Plan or policy in place	HTING		
□Yes (0) □No (5)			
2.5. SITE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	WEIG	RANK	SCORE
b)Is there a documented Waste Management System or Plan or Policy in place	HTING		
$\Box$ Yes (0) $\Box$ No (5)	2		
2.5. SITE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	WEIG	RANK	SCORE
c)Are there measures in place to reduce chemical contamination risk or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts e.g.			
special storage arrangements (does not have to be documented)			
□Yes (0) □No (5)			
SECTION 1 SUBTOTAL SCORE (SUM OF SCORES FROM 2.2-2.5):			

SECTION 3 : COMPLETE FOR RESIDENTIAL, INSTITUTIONAL, COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL SITES			
<b>3.1 SEWAGE</b> a) If sewage is generated- please indicate the type of collection or treatment         Package Sewage Treatment Facility or other on-site treatment facility (3)         Connected to municipal sewage treatment facility (4)         Septic Tank (6)       Pit latrine (8)         Open defecation/septage (15)	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
Other please specify:			
3.1 SEWAGE	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
b) Is the facility occupied on a daily basis by) $\square < 50$ persons (4) $\square > 50$ persons (9)	2		
<ul> <li>3.1 SEWAGE</li> <li>c) If there is outfall or discharge to drain or watercourse from the sewage treatment facility please describe the discharge characteristics below:</li> <li>Outfall does not have dry weather discharge; staining; or appearance of causing any erosion problems at the point of discharge (1)</li> </ul>	WEIGHTING	Rank	SCORE
<ul> <li>Relatively small volume discharge; flow mostly clear and odorless. If the discharge has a color and/or odor, the amount of discharge appears small compared to the stream's/drain's baseflow (5)</li> <li>Relatively large volume discharge having a distinct color and/or a strong odor. The amount of discharge is significant compared to the amount of normal flow in receiving stream/drain (9)</li> </ul>	9		
<b>3.2 GREYWATER</b> a) If greywater is generated, please indicate the type of collection or treatment         Package Sewage Treatment Facility or other on-site treatment facility (3)         Connected to municipal sewage treatment facility (4)	WEIGHTING	Rank	SCORE
<ul> <li>Preliminary/partial waste treatment then discharged to drain or water course (6)</li> <li>Waste discharged to drain or watercourse without treatment or disposal (9)</li> <li>Other, please specify</li> </ul>	6		
3.2 GREYWATER	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
b) Is the facility occupied on a daily basis by $\square < 50$ persons (4) $\square > 50$ persons (9)	4		

<b>3.2 GREYWATER</b> c)If the greywater is discharged to drain or watercourse please describe the discharge characteristics below Outfall does not have dry weather discharge; staining; or appearance of causing any erosion problems at the point of discharge (1)		RANK	SCORE
<ul> <li>Relatively small volume discharge; flow mostly clear and odorless. If the discharge has a color and/or odor, the amount of discharge appears small compared to the stream's/drain's baseflow (5)</li> <li>Relatively large volume discharge having a distinct color and/or a strong odor. The amount of discharge is significant compared to the amount of normal flow in receiving stream/drain (9)</li> </ul>	8		
<b>3.3 CHEMICAL WASTEWATER</b> a) If chemical wastewater is generated, please indicate type of collection or treatment            Package Sewage Treatment Facility or other on-site treatment facility (3)             Connected to municipal sewage treatment facility (4)		Rank	SCORE
<ul> <li>Preliminary/partial waste treatment then discharged to drain or water course (6)</li> <li>Waste discharged to drain or watercourse without treatment or disposal (9)</li> <li>Other, please specify</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li><b>3.3 CHEMICAL WASTEWATER</b></li> <li>b)If the chemical wastewater is discharged to drain or watercourse please describe the discharge characteristics below</li> <li>☐ Outfall does not have dry weather discharge; staining; or appearance of causing any erosion problems at the point of discharge (1)</li> </ul>	WEIGHTING	Rank	SCORE
<ul> <li>Relatively small volume discharge; flow mostly clear and odorless. If the discharge has a color and/or odor, the amount of discharge appears small compared to the stream's/drain's baseflow (5)</li> <li>Relatively large volume discharge having a distinct color and/or a strong odor. The amount of discharge is significant compared to the amount of normal flow in receiving stream/drain (9)</li> </ul>	8		
<b>3.3 CHEMICAL WASTEWATER</b> c)Is the chemical wastewater generated          occasionally (4)         daily (9)		RANK	SCORE
<b>3.3 CHEMICAL WASTEWATER</b> d)Is the facility □< 3000 sq ft	WEIGHTING 2	RANK	SCORE
SECTION 3 SUBTOTAL SCORE (SUM OF SCORES FROM 3.1-3.3):			

SECTION 4 : COMPLETE FOR AGRICULTURAL SITES	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
(NOTE: use this section only if there is active agriculture; abandoned estates and fallow land are not applicable)			
4.1 GENERAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	N/A DESCRIPT		Y
a) Type of agriculture			
Livestock Crops Mixed Aquaculture			
Please elaborate below:			
4.1 GENERAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	N/A DESCRIP		LY
<b>b)</b> For sites with crops please indicate the scale of operations			
(Adapted from St. Lucia Ministry of Agriculture Land holding designations)			
Small subsistence <1 acre			
Small commercial < 5 acres Large commercial > 5 acres e.g. plantation/estate			
		DANK	Coope
4.1 GENERAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	VVEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
For investors operations prease describe type below $\Box$ Free range animals (2) $\Box$ Animals in pens/cages (intensive rearing) (10)	5		
	5		
<b>4.2.</b> LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY (WHERE HAVE INTENSIVE REARING: ANIMALS IN PENS/CAGES)	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
a) Pigs: number of sows in unit:	15		
4.2. LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
b) Poultry: number broilers/layers in unit:	0.03		
4.2. LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
c) Rabbits: number animals in unit:	2		
	2		
4.2. LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE

d) Goats: number animals in unit:	3		
4.2. LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
e) Sheep: number animals in unit:	3		
4.2. LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
f) Horses: number animals in stable:	5		
4.2. LIVESTOCK REARING INTENSITY	N/A REFEREN	CE ONLY	
g) Other please specify			
4.3 CHEMICAL USAGE AND DISPOSAL	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
a) Fertilizers/pesticides/animal hormones/antibiotics stored and/or used on site 🗌 No (0) 📋 Yes (9)	4		
	4		
4.3 CHEMICAL USAGE AND DISPOSAL	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
<b>b)</b> Leakage of aforementioned chemicals observed $\square$ No <b>(0)</b> $\square$ Yes <b>(10)</b>			
4.3 CHEMICAL USAGE AND DISPOSAL	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
c) Evidence of dedicated storage vessel/pit for used chemical containers 🗌 No (0) 🗌 Yes (8)	8		
4.4 ANIMAL WASTE MANAGEMENT	WEIGHTING	RANK	SCORE
Waste treated on-site and removed for off-site disposal (2)			
Waste used as fertilizer on site (2)			
Waste composting – unsheltered (note this is better practice (3)	15		
$\square$ Waste treated on-site and then discharged into environment (4)			
Waste washed directly into watercourse or drain (15)			
SECTION 3 SUBTOTAL SCORE (SUM OF SCORES FROM 3.1-3.3):			
TOTAL SCORE SECTIONS 1, 2, 3, 4 =			

#### **Bibliography:**

- Center for Watershed Protection. 2005 A User's Guide to Watershed Planning in Maryland. Annapolis: Maryland Department of Natural Resources <u>http://www.dnr.state.md.us/watersheds/pubs/planninguserguide/UserGuideChapter5.pdf</u> Accessed 01/08/10
- Cooper, A. 1996. ESAs Made Easy: A Checklist Approach to Phase I Environmental Site Assessments. Rockville, MD: Government Institutes
- Howard County, Government of Maryland, Department of Environmental Services. *Centennial and Wilde Lake Watershed Restoration Plan*

http://www.co.ho.md.us/dpw/docs/section2 watershed management approach.pdf Accessed 01/08/10

- Joubert, L. and Lucht, J. 2000. Wickford Harbor Watershed Assessment http://www.uri.edu/ce/wq/NEMO/Publications/PDFs/WA.Wickford.pdf
- Kitchell, A. and Schueler T. 2004. Unified Stream Assessment: A Users. Manual. Center for Watershed Protection. Ellicott City, MD.
- Ontario Ministry of Environment. 2010. A Holistic Approach to Stormwater Management, Ontario Ministry of the Environment. <u>http://www.civil.ryerson.ca/stormwater/menu\_5/index.htm</u> Accessed 01/08/10
- Silano, V. 1984 *Evaluation of Public Health Hazards Associated with Chemical Accidents*, 2nd edition (corrected). Panamerican Centre for Human Ecology and Health, PAHO/WHO, Mexico
- UNDP-GEF Dnipro Basin Environment Programme. 2010 UNDP-GEF Dnipro Basin Environment Programme <u>http://www.dnipro-gef.net/first\_stage/project-reports/other-reports/hot-spot-identification-and-evaluation-ukraine/methodolgy/summary-of-approach</u> Accessed 01/08/10
- UNEP 1992. Hazard Identification and evaluation in a local community. Technical Report no. 12. UNEP.
- Wright, T. Swann, C., Cappiella, K and Schueler, *T.* 2005. Urban Subwatershed Restoration Manual. Center for Watershed Protection.