From: ***PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED***
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 8:56:49 PM
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Subject: Water act modernization submission

To Ministry of Environment, Water Stewardship Division

RE: WATER ACT MODERNIZATION

Please consider my comments on the Water Act Modernization:

Water is recognized as a human right and part of the commons. Water is owned collectively by all and held in trust by government to manage in the public interest.

It is clear through your proposals that you have failed to consider the public interest. How is it in our interest to lose our comman law riparian rights in exchange for temporary permits. How are farmers and small community landholders to feel secure in developing the land with the possibility of loss of water rights which would then make their land use impossible.

I urge you to include in this discussion of water protection land use (like resource extraction activities) since you can't protect the water without considering the land. Intact forest watersheds are pivital in sustaining good quality, reliable water sources. Why isn't this part of the picture?

It is clear who is influencing these proposed changes..

Water Act should not devolve some uses and protections to other acts (Section 9 of the Water Act devolves water protection to various other Ministries Acts (Forestry, Mining, Gas & Oil))

I ask you to re-established watersheds for source protection from forestry and other resource extraction activities. Watershed reserves would protect our drinking water supplies.

Collaborative science, traditional knowledge and local history should inform all allocation decisions. The precautionary principle should be functioning at all times (no harm proof prior to new uses, not mitigation after damage). First Nations social and cultural practices associated with water must be respected and accommodated.

We need a Governance model: a FULLY FUNDED local government model with local decision-making power. Since there is no funding and the government may never grant local decision making powers, it would be best to go with the STATUS QUO (no change model) until broader scope, full funding and full public consultation is part of the process.

FITFIR (First in time, First in right system) must remain unchanged since it is a self-regulating system for over-allocation problems. Modifying FITFIR could allow government to remove water rights from established farms,water systems, and other uses.

Domestic Use licensed use should NOT be changed to a "permitted" use in order to retain legal rights Public involvement must be enlarged to cover further steps in the process. The government decision making model shows the

workshop/comments as our only chance for input, and this is not enough.

FITFIR and Domestic Use must remain unchanged!

Sincerely,

PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED