From: ***PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED***
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 9:56:28 AM
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
CC:***PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED***
Subject: Water Act Modernization: Another Red Herring? WAM comment submission

Rather than separate these messages to 'livingwatersmart' and to my email list, I'm enclosing my own response at the bottom with this suggested response - as today is April 30th, and I've just received it.

WATER ACT MODERNIZATION DEADLINE FRIDAY, APRIL 30TH

Hello Folks,
Please deal with this as soon as you can. Friday is the deadline!!!
RD&B

From:

Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 8:06 PM
Subject: please submit your feedback - Water Act Modernization

Greetings,

We are days away from this deadline. Luckily, I received a note from a friend. If interested, please pass it on to your BC friends and family, then submit a letter to the BC Government...(see sample letter below).

The BC Government is interested in your views on the potential solutions outlined in the Water Act Modernization Discussion Paper <http://www.livingwatersmart.ca/water-act/discussion-paper.html> . Any British Columbian can make a submission. Please send your submission electronically to livingwatersmart@gov.bc.ca. Your submission along with other input will be assessed using the proposed principles and the objectives under each goal area.

http://www.livingwatersmart.ca/water-act/feedback.html

The deadline is April 30, 2010
Water Act Modernization letter writing campaign:

All letters need to be sent NOW! Your response is crucial!!
Please forward to all your contacts so we can create a massive wave of involved citizens

All emails sent to: livingwatersmart@gov.bc.ca
Please include your name and address and write on the subject line, "WAM comment submission"

Here is a SAMPLE LETTER that you can alter, sign and email:

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN,

I am writing to express my input about the proposed Water Act Modernization. The current proposal is clearly NOT a healthy and viable solution to Water Protection. All water-using citizens should be contacted and made aware of such a proposal, brought to Referendum and decisions made with true public interest representation. Below are some points that I believe are important after reviewing the proposal:

>WATER is to be clearly recognized as a BASIC HUMAN RIGHT and part of COMMONS- common public resource HELD IN TRUST by gov't to manage and represent public interest.

>The Water Act would not undermine/devolve uses and protections to other acts (ie:-Section 9 of the Water Act devolved Water protection to various other Ministries' acts (Forestry, Mining, Gas and Oil)

>Watershed Reserves need to be re-established for SOURCE PROTECTION from Forestry and other resource extraction activities

>Allocation decisions need to be made collaboratively using Science, Traditional Knowledge and Local history- PRECAUTIONARY principle functioning as opposed to mitigating damage after it has occurred.

>The CURRENT WATER ACT is kept in place UNCHANGED until a broad scope public input process occurs with full funding and major public consultation.

>FITFIR - First in time, First in Right remains unchanged as a self-regulating system for over-allocation problems. Our farms and domestic water rights are THE MOST IMPORTANT THING.

>DOMESTIC USE licenses should NOT BE CHANGED - We want to maintain our basic legal rights.

>FIRST NATIONS social and cultural practices associated with water are respected and accommodated.

There were inadequate measures taken to inform the public of the proposal and the public input process. This caliber of issue needs major public process and input and accurate representation in Gov't in order to create an amendment or "modernization" to the current Water Act. Do NOT allow this "modernization" to occur without due and right process. This is THE MOST IMPORTANT DECISION OUR PUBLIC AND GOVERNMENT COULD MAKE. Please consider all I have included in this letter and maintain the current Water Act until a healthier model can be made with Public interest- NOT FOR PROFIT AND POWER.

I will be expecting a prompt response, Thank you for your time and consideration.
For the LOVE of WATER,

The undersigned agrees with the above suggested letter and adds:
....

How many pure, pristine lakes have now been labelled 'mine tailings catchment areas?' Excuse me if the wording isn't exactly right - but you know what I mean. For instance Fish Lake in BC Chilcotin.
What sort of mind could conceive of such an alien approach to a clean lake? Worse than a toilet bowl! Why not just throw open all of Canadian and BC fresh water

to sell to the highest bidder (our neighbour to the south apparently).
Here in the Shuswap we had absolutely NO government support from ANY elected or appointed officials or offices to protect our fresh water when our lake was open for any and all developers to spew their sewage. Oh yes, they have booklets, words, labels; no doubt even meetings - but:
When we discovered our precious and fairly clean lake (which is our drinking water) was being thrown open for use by any new developer to spew their sewage at hundreds, even thousands of gallons per day - who was there to help us protect our water? Certainly no GOVERNMENT body. In fact, Health, Environment, Fisheries, Regional Districts all said no, not their problem, not their jurisdiction, we appeared to be a THORN IN THEIR SIDE! It looked very much like they would prefer to keep doing business as usual and accomodate business over health.
Same with our watershed protection efforts. Citizens formed groups to address the problem. NOT GOVERNMENT. Appeared those in positions of authority were there to do the opposite! Make it difficult to protect the water!
Livingwatersmart might start with getting rid of those charged with leading and put in their place some honest PEOPLE WHO CARE!
They can be found in all environmental groups which somehow seem to be an enemy of the government. They can also be found in homes where there are babies and parents being told a different story every week about which water is safe.
Clean Living Water was provided by the creator, like air and land, to be available to sustain life. It is not a commodity.
Clean Living Water is abundant IF YOU LEAVE IT ALONE. It has been cleaning and renewing itself forever. Science and governments will never create water, but they have certainly figured out how to destroy it. Stay away from watersheds, let them heal. Protect water, not profit. Let the experts like Goldman Sachs take care of your money!
P. White
RR 1, S8
Chase, BC Please see enclosed resolution passed at the BC Women's Institute, 2006:

We members of the British Columbia Women's Institute,representing over one thousand BC Women and their families and friends, demand that the BC Ministry

of the Environment and our Premier Gordon Campbell and Cabinet reword the Municipal Waste Management Act, and the Municipal Sewage Regulations; to deny access to any waterway or lake or watershed in all of the Province of British Columbia for the purpose of disposal of any type of WASTEWATER OR sewage treated or untreated, from any source. This includes all present and future

applications under these Acts and Regulations from all domestic, industrial or community sources.

WE ALSO DEMAND THAT OUR PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT

BEGIN A PROCESS OF REVOKING APPROVALS FOR WASTEWATER,

SEWAGE OR TREATED SEWAGE ALREADY IN PLACE. FACILITIES

PRESENTLY DUMPING ANY OF THIS EFFLUENT INTO BC'S

FRESHWATER SOURCES NEED TO RE-DIRECT THEIR EFFLUENT

PIPES AWAY FROM OUR WATER.

Further:

2007 BC Presbytery named clean water as the year’s priority. “This issue must be considered a public health crisis; not a political issue.”

"The fact that pressure exists for the sake of community growth, particularly growth in the form of developments which neither pay their share of local taxes, or vote for representatives to protect local residents concerns for a sustainable future; is not acceptable reasoning to destroy the very reason we have tourism in the North Shuswap at all: clean water.

If the cost of growth is the pollution of Shuswap Lake, then growth must be stopped until those who insist on growth are willing to use one of the many systems available and in use in other areas. It is entirely up to those private developers to research and pay for such systems." (Shuswap Lake Coalition)