

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 6:45 PM

Hello,

Water is life. We need to protect this resource from corporations that are currently making millions. Please do not take forever in getting this bill past, our future depends upon it.

Thanks for your time.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: a water sustainability act for bc
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Cc: Sultan.MLA, Ralph LASS:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 5:19 PM

Anything that can be done to clean up the waters along the coast of British Columbia and the lakes and rivers is most welcome. For a long time i have been an advocate for the abolishment of of open net fish farms and moving them to land enclosed ponds. This would probably do more than anything else to clean up B.C.`s coastal waters. ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
c.c. Ralph Sultan MLA

Subject: water sustainability act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Cc: Gail Shea M.P.; John Weston MP

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 4:58 PM

Ralph Sultan MLA---anything that can be done to clean up our coastal waters and our lakes and streams is most welcome. For a long time i have been an advocate for closing the open net fish farms and moving them into land enclosed ponds. This has proven to be economical on vancouver island and in eastern Canada and USA.

Personal Identifiers Removed

c.c. John Weston MP. Gail MP Shea Minister of Fisheries

Subject: water sustainability act for bc
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Cc: Gail Shea M.P.; John Weston MP
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 3:21 PM

To the provincial Government of B.C.---Anything that can be done to clean the waters along the coast of bc and and in the lakes and rivers is welcome. For a long time I have been an advocate for the abolishment of open net fish farms and moving them to land enclosed ponds.Land enclosed fish farms have been proven to be economical on Vancouver Island and in eastern Canada and U.S. In my view this would do more for the sustainability of wild fish and sea life than anything else . ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
c.c. John Weston
Gail Shea Minister of Fisheries

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 1:24 PM

Hi I am a resident of Gibsons BC. and have been for approx 20 years.
We appreciate our untreated potable water contribution from our aquifer and have attempted to identify its quantifiable discharge/recharge relationship, with the objective of not over drawing its recharge capabilities - both of which are special to us.

What would be of concern to me would be an attempt to create an omnibus bill - of "one size fits all"

Subject: Water Sustainability Act
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 12:35 PM

I request the Water Sustainability Act incorporate Resolution B69 which was adopted at the UBCM Convention on September 18, 2013. The Resolution states:

WHEREAS there are concerns that mining projects can negatively affect surrounding aquifers:

AND WHEREAS many people rely on these aquifers for drinking water:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the provincial government conduct comprehensive mapping and modeling of the aquifers that may be affected by proposed mines before approving mine projects.

Regards,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Ground water costs

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 12:26 PM

Corporate interests should pay as much as I do minimum, \$0.0013/Litre
or \$3.25 per unit. 1 unit = 100 cubic feet or 623 gallons or 2,832 litres

If their business model doesn't work on these prices then the business shouldn't be in BC.

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Mon 2013-10-21 9:28 PM

Please update the act so that companies that pollute water (even saline water) must pay the full cost to clean this water so that it can re-enter the environment.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 1:43 PM

I feel that water is critical and regulating it is important

I feel that proposed user cost ie: Nestle is wrong Private well users should pay a a flat fee approx \$150/year

Commercial users a flat fee based on volume

ie: \$350/million litres They are making large profits

Clarify the costs to administrate the program

Logially Aquifiers will drop as population in the areas where they are

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Mon 2013-10-21 11:43 AM

I am from Shawnigan Lake B.C. and am currently fighting your Permit to S.i.a to dump Victorias contaminated soil above my watershed and Sooke Lake watershed.

You want feedback? Stop poisoning our water and bio remediate on site. Do not remove and truck poison up the Malahat to poison my community for your profit and convenience!

Toxic Dumps leak every single time. It is irresponsible of you to issue a Permit to poison our Watershed.

Reverse the decision and put a moratorium on Toxic dumps on hills above watersheds....that sentence alone is idiocy.

Protect our Watershed like WE TAX PAYERS PAY YOU TO DO!

Overtun South Island Aggregates permit now before we get poisoned

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Mon 2013-10-21 11:07 AM

Hi,

Will you be having any webinars or a Twitter town hall on the Water Sustainability Act before public consultation closes on November 15? I'm keenly interested in this topic.

Thx.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Mon 2013-10-21 10:45 AM

I just happened upon this site today purely by chance, this is the first time I have seen or heard anything referring to the water conservation concerning the public. I could not get very much info to guide me through "all that has taken place so far and what your intentions will be for our water resources" can you give a site with more pertinent info for individuals. I am a beginner on the computer so am not as saavy as I would like to be in following your intended plans. Thank you for any clear info you can give me so I can understand what my part in this procedure could be. Thank you,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 9:15 PM

Thank you for asking for public input.

1. Please ensure that a large water user who will have his water measured and reported is considered large in relation to the available water source. A golf course in a semi arid area on wells supplied from a small watershed should be considered a large water user.
2. Is the definition of Land Improvement changed in the new act from the present definition of drainage. Land improvement is not drainage!!!!
3. At this time a surface water storage licence takes precedence over any water users down stream. The province needs to be very clear about who owns the water.....the BC government. If a storage water licence takes precedence then do not allow any development below the storage area.
4. Please put water under one Ministry and it is not a natural resource to be sold as timber, but is in public trust. from the Lower Nipit Improvement District, a lake stewardship group which has operated under an impossible system while trying to protect the environment and the water.

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 8:05 PM

Our water is one of our most renewable and important resources. It is very important that users pay for water just like I do as a resident of Parksville. More importantly it is important that the guidelines set out protect these rights for the long term. There is no sense in setting guidelines and price structures that are locked in.....this legislation has to have time frames, price increases, usage, and availability. It is very important that if we ever start to see shortages of this water resource that the legislation has the ability to curtail or even put a stop to the taking of this resource. There are many other provinces that charge for water usage.....hopefully the government will take a look at what these provinces are charging and come up with an equitable solution and guideline. Personally I do not think the proposal of one dollar for 1.18 million litres of groundwater is sufficient return to the government for such a precious resource. Given what the average home owner pays by comparison for water that figure is ridiculous....and yes I get our drinking water is filtered and treated even so the cost factors do not compute. When one looks at the example of Nestle's taking 265 million litres of fresh water and paying the proposed amount of \$225 annually to the government I can only shake as I pay almost half that amount for a 3 person household and I don't use a fraction of the water.

I hope the government looks very seriously at this proposal and listens to the people of British Columbia because it is our water you are basically giving away.

Yours truly

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 6:31 PM

Minister,

The proposed Act simply demonstrates your government's total lack of knowledge and concern in this critical area. The measures you are putting forward do not protect our water supply. You recommend that BC residents pay more for domestic water consumption than the Nestle Company which is making millions pumping water out of the Hope aquifer (currently for free) for a proposed annual fee of \$265 with the most minimal benefit to British Columbians. You propose no charge whatsoever to the companies using deep saline water sources for fracking and which then dispose of the discharge poisoning our groundwater.

For goodness sake think it through! This is nuts!

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 6:28 PM

Whatever the outcome, it must be done fairly and reasonably, and consistently.....otherwise you will create a complicated monster and be no farther ahead.

You, as government, are well aware that you do not have the manpower currently to monitor and enforce any and all Laws you do have.

Same goes for Regional Districts.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 4:38 PM

I have just read the article in the province on oct 20/13, and am appalled that the proposed fees are so low. Exclude small agricultural users that produce less than 1/2 million dollars per year net. Increase the proposed fee to 250 times more than those proposed so that instead of Nestle paying \$225.00/year they pay about \$56000.00 for 265 million liters that will retail for \$500 million.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 2:42 PM

Hello My wife and I are seniors,

I think the proposed rates to be charge to companies extracting fresh ground water at the rate of \$.85 per 1000 cubic meters is an absolute joke. To think the companies are charging around \$1.00 for a small bottle of water that's an incredible profit, plus we have all the garbage of disposable plastic water contains that we the consumer then bears the cost. If you profess to be good managers then you had better start looking for new managers ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

Subject: Water Sustainability Act
From: *****Personal Identifiers Removed*****
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 1:57 PM

Why are we selling ourselves 4x short of what Ontario has set the bar at? \$3.71 is the number....nothing less.

At some point Governments need to pull Big Business out of their pockets and start representing the PUBLIC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 11:31 AM

Yes there must be tight regulation of water with a priority for the environment, then individual citizens, then traditional industries and finally "new" industries. For example farming would take precedence over Nestle. Traditional farming should pay a minimal fee where as charging nestle \$0.00000085/ liter of water is ridiculously low. Nestle should pay considerably more, say \$0.01/liter. Water use, based on what is important to the citizens of BC is more important and must be listened to rather than handing over water rights to industry with it's lobbyists and deep pockets. Fracking must also be fully researched as this invasive process greatly impacts on ground water.

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 9:28 AM

In following this issue it appears this much needed revision is vital to all. The issue that stands out to me is that of the extraction of water solely for profit eg. the nestle example , it was reported in the sunday papers that a paltry sum of \$225. would be charged annually.this seems more like an insult than a fee that reflects the profits made from this #1 resource. needless to say this is a multi faceted and complex issue, but the commercial aspect would be a good place to start,

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sun 2013-10-20 2:00 AM

Thank you for this opportunity, as an elder I can simply say that I appreciate this proposal. I am very concerned for my family, grandchildren, and generations to come with regard to the quality, availability, and service of water in their future. As it is now, there are communities in our province where drinking water is contaminated resulting in poor health and hardship, which is a sign of what could be in store for all. Water may have to be rationed in the future, perhaps to one bath or shower per week. If this Water Sustainability Act is not legislated, and enforced by law, and qualified protective agencies. I do feel this Act is well planned and presented with the best of intentions and am somewhat encouraged by it. I pray it will happen.

Respectfully, ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 11:57 AM

Hello,

I have heard today the proposal is to charge 85 cents per million litres of water. This will not even come close to recovering the costs of the bureaucracy that will be created.

Water is a precious non renewal resource just as oil and natural gas is.
This is completely ludicrous to squander our precious resource in this manner.

In addition, we are giving millions of litres of water away for the process of fracking and other industrial processes.

To give away a precious resource without any compensation makes no sense. To the average tax payer it would appear that there must be some kind of campaign contribution scheme in play. What else could explain this type of policy?

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 8:51 PM

I am writing to provide my input as a BC citizen to the Water Sustainability Act.

Water is one of our most precious resources. Without it we cannot survive more than a few days. It is easy to take water for granted in this province, blessed as it is with an apparent abundance of it, but we must not do this or we will wake up and find we have lost control of this precious resource.

I believe BC water should be protected principally for the use of BC citizens. We should avoid treating water as a for-profit commodity. In other words, we should see water as an element of the commons; it should be available to all individuals at minimal cost. Anything we charge individuals for water should be aimed at encouraging prudent usage rather than as a profit-making endeavor. However, by the same token, we should not be commodifying water or allowing it to be exploited by for-profit companies. I have heard stories about homeowners being unable to obtain water in some geographies because the resource is being so heavily exploited by corporations who are simply pumping the water into plastic bottles and selling it for huge profits. I personally refuse to buy bottled water as I feel it is such an unethical product. As a province, BC should be taking steps to protect our water from this kind of exploitation by charging bottling companies top dollar for water they take from our aquifers and strictly limiting the amount they can use.

It is also critical to ensure our water supplies are protected from pollution sources. In particular, I am extremely concerned about the impact of fracking on the quality of our water. Not only are huge quantities of water required in fracking, but the water used is then contaminated and will then in turn contaminate our aquifers. I believe BC needs to ban fracking as a means of extracting shale gas. Force the companies to come up with non-polluting means of tapping this resource, or simply leave the resource in the ground. We would be better off in the long run if we invested in renewable energy rather than continuing to build reliance upon fossil fuels.

Sincerely, ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 8:37 PM

I have recreational property on Hornby Island and approximately 27 years ago I had well drilled on my property. I spend about half the year living at my cabin. Because water is a problem in the gulf islands my wife and I decided not to develop a septied field to flush the water into the ground and instead invest in a composting toilet. It angers me when several companies on the island deliver water to Summer rentals of which there are many. There are many concerns about individuals pumping water out of the ground and over taxing the aquifer must to make a profit. Those individuals should be metered I think.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 6:07 PM

To Whom it May Concern:

I have just finished reading the article in the Huffington Post on the Water Sustainability Act and I am horrified at the size of the fee water corporations will be charged. I have been long upset that corporations could draw from our water to make an enormous profit while providing nothing in return to our province. At a fee of only 85 cents for every 1,000 cubic meters of groundwater used- they continue to be reaping vast rewards from our collective resources. The annual fee should be far far more and if this is not possible, then corporations should be required to provide certain funding to our lowest income and most marginalized BC residents. First Nations peoples, as our province's natural stewards of the land, should be provided something each year that the corporations, such as Nestle, take from BC. It has gone on too long that corporations are disproportionately benefiting from our collective resources. Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 4:27 PM

B.C. Environment Minister Mary Polak released the government's proposal for a new Water Sustainability Act. The following are all 'relative' and don't have any limits or conditionals set upon them:

- *Protect stream health and aquatic environments.*
- *Consider water in land-use decisions.*
- *Improve security, water use efficiency and conservation.*
- *Measure and report large scale water use.*
- *Provide for a range of governance approaches.*

All of the above should be definitely formulated so there is no ambiguity as to what is meant.

- Companies such as Nestle profit enormously from vast usage. Fees should be considerably larger and come out of the profits of Nestle (less return for them) and not passed onto consumers. Perhaps \$.20 for each litre should go back to the government (for the taxpayers) and go into infrastructure for water conservation, NOT into coffers for general use.
- Industry, not the taxpayers, should pay for the disposal of ALL contaminated water.
- Groundwater reserves should be protected from all pollution sources.
- Firms should be monitored and fined heavily for over-water use, or pollution.
- The estimates for water resources should take into account the run-off, the glacial retreat, and the reduced snow packs due to climate change. These estimates should not be conservative, but take into account that the progression is exponentially driven and will happen sooner than later.
- Include the protection of "coastal waters" from industrial damage.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 1:13 PM

The fees proposed for the extraction of groundwater by commercial interests are close to scandalous. According to the Vancouver Sun, Nestle would pay \$245 a year plus an annual fee for the water extracted at Hope. The figure should be a thousand times that, \$245,000.00 per year. Yes, this would increase the cost of bottled water and decrease sales of such, but is that such a bad thing in a part of the world that has fabulous water "on tap"?

Please reconsider this section of the act.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sat 2013-10-19 8:09 AM

I have just read the news article about the proposed charge for BCs' groundwater. While I agree with the concept of collecting revenue for the use of the water for profit, the suggested charge is far too low.

Given the fact that most bottled water is sold for around a dollar per litre, I would suggest a fair price would be .01 per litre - not .85 per million. One cent per litre is a fair charge, that certainly couldn't hurt the companies - raw material at 1% of sales price is still a bargain.

While the companies that profit from our free (or nearly free) water will complain loudly, we should be sending a clear message that our provincial resources should not be abused.

Regards,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Fri 2013-10-18 6:08 PM

Dear Ministry of Environment:

First, I appreciate this opportunity for the public to give feedback on the “legislative proposal” for a new Water Sustainability Act. I also appreciate that all comments will be made public throughout the month-long comment period.

Second, I call on the B.C. government to extend the comment period well beyond November 15, 2013. One month is not enough time to grasp all there is to grasp in the Act. We’ve waited 104 years for a new Water Act. Surely we can have 60 or 90 days to wrap our heads around the legislative proposal released today.

One thing I’ve been able to grasp so far is the fact that water bottlers such as Nestle Canada will now have to pay annual fees of some amount, along with a commodity rate of 85 cents for every 1,000 cubic metres of groundwater used.

The basic premise that government should be selling groundwater, belonging to the commons, to corporations so they can sell it back to us, the owners of the water, in fossil-fuel-dependent non-biodegradable plastic containers is sheer folly. That the bottlers should pay a mere 85 cents for a million litres is breathtakingly inadequate. I’ve read that Nestle Canada’s plant in Hope bottles an estimated 265 million litres of water annually. For a total commodity price of \$225.25, the company will be able to carry on their business as usual. The corporation’s executive members and their shareholders must be rolling on the floor laughing! They should actually be put out of business, and they must know that!

Another piece that I’ve been able to grasp is that the proposed legislation exempts the saline aquifers that lie more than 600 metres below the surface – the water source predominantly used in hydraulic fracking of natural gas. Up to now, saline aquifers have been considered of no benefit to humans. We will not be thinking the same thing if safe large scale carbon sequestration ever becomes feasible.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Fri 2013-10-18 4:33 PM

Hello,

My comments are not many. I do support a Water Sustainability Act that protects our drinking water and the water used in the streams by our fish and other creatures. From what I have read, so far, it seems to do that.

My concerns are as follows:

- I would like to see all costs to be fair and reasonable. After all, our taxes are supposed to cover the needs of our government.
- I would, absolutely, not want to see any changes to Improvement Districts. Ours has always done a wonderful job and has provided high-quality, clean and safe water to our area.
- I would, absolutely, not want any regulation that requires the use of chlorine.

Thank you for considering these in your final review of the Act.

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Fri 2013-10-18 3:48 PM

Please note my comment is personal – not representative of any agency.

I am a rural resident who withdraws groundwater for domestic drinking water purposes. I totally agree that ground water needs to be protected and managed, especially since there may currently be large volumes being withdrawn from aquifers for use in industrial activities. For industrial users, I agree that licensing and measurement of withdrawal is important along with applicable fees.

I am also not opposed to residential domestic water users being required to license their wells, although up to now landowners have not been required to license groundwater withdrawal for domestic purposes. Information from the licensing of wells or springs on private land could provide additional information on BC's aquifers.

I do have a concern that the government will impose fees and requirements for measuring water used for domestic purposes by rural residents. City residents pay a fee for water and this fee covers the equipment and sanitization of their water by the municipality. Rural residents pay for water indirectly by virtue of having to pay for the drilling and maintenance of a well and associated equipment to pump water into their homes, as well as being responsible for ensuring safety of their drinking water.

Any requirement imposed on rural residents for measuring water will require equipment that no doubt comes with a price tag. No direct requirement has been stated in the water sustainability act proposal for domestic users. However, it is vague when regarding rural domestic users stating that it depends on area and depends on water supply. Please do not place an added financial burden on rural groundwater users (for domestic purposes). BC's first priority for use of water should be for the people of BC to have clean, affordable water for domestic use.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Fri 2013-10-18 2:29 PM

Hi. I own and operate an industrial operation on Denman Island. We use water in our operation and get it from a drilled well on our property. As such, I can imagine that we may well be an operator that falls under the new requirements of the proposed water sustainability act. I'm not very happy about this, for the following reasons.

What we do here is make chocolate. Water is not an ingredient in our products (chocolate doesn't play nice with water). Our water use is exclusively for cleaning surfaces and utensils, washing hands and toilet use. As our processes involve neither gardening nor bathing, we use significantly less water than a typical single family residence in our region. And we are very proactive in limiting our water use because we know that we are fully responsible for maintaining an adequate water supply: running out of water in the summer is a common problem on the Gulf Islands and we can't operate our business if this is something that happens to us. In addition, we are required to monitor and provide quarterly samples of our water quality and we operate a modern septic system to process brownwater and greywater.

As an industrially zoned property on Denman Island, we pay extremely high property tax rates, even though the only service we receive from our municipality is garbage pickup, for which there is a per bag fee. As mentioned already, we are responsible for all aspects of water collection and wastewater management. These are, amongst others, challenges which we readily accept as part of operating a business in a rural area. We believe that rural BC, and in particular the Gulf Islands, desperately need an appropriate scaled and sustainable industrial base in order to continue to foster viable communities. If we are required to conform to new regulations for industrial groundwater use, including licensing and monitoring, etc, this will be another impediment to doing business in a place that desperately needs employment. We already deal with ferry issues (and costs), unreliable electrical supply, increased shipping costs (both in and out), difficulties of accessing technical help (machinery repairs), and so on... and on. One more onerous requirement may just be the straw that breaks the camel's back and forces us to move our operations to an easier and cheaper urban setting. I strongly urge the ministry to consider the concerns of small industrial and commercial operators whose water needs are minimal.

Please, we need your help and consideration in this.

Thank you,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Fri 2013-10-18 1:48 PM

One of the most important things you need to do is regulate how large companies like Nestle use BC water. The BC governments lack of foresight has already cost us significantly so any new water act better address this issue appropriately. We've been giving away a precious resource for no compensation so this needs to be addressed immediately.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Fri 2013-10-18 1:25 PM

I applaud the governments move to finally update the century old water act. My main concern is that no one should be taking groundwater for free nor should the fee be so low that it will be an issue. I suggest a question to the public on how much we should charge for our groundwater. Also please put limits on how much can be used and a severe monetary fine if it is misused. Besides a fine make the CEO also criminally responsible as it is our future we are talking about.

Thank You,

Personal Identifiers Removed