

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 2:37 PM

I think that water for fracking should not be fresh.

I think that municipalities should not be allowed to resell bulk water to industry for fracking; the ministry should approve and monitor the large users of water and should not have satellite users or significant resale.

Please, I urge you to stay true to the thrown around name and keep that your vision "water sustainability"

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: water

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 1:48 PM

to whom it may concern ,

my local concern regarding water supply , use and stewardship. At present my local government does not control issues that affect the watershed. They are responsible for the end use (tap water) but do not have jurisdiction over the industrial use of the watershed. At present logging rights supersede drinking water and its protection.

This is not working , erosion and contamination by poor logging practices continue to be a concern now , and in the future should this not change.

Put local water in the hands of local government.

Thanks you

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Sunshine coast regional district

Subject: leave the water in the kettle river

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 12:58 PM

I tried and tried to post a blog first-maybe you will relay this. Water in the Kettle River (valley) needs to be left in the river. Assertions about 'first timer' priorities for ranchers and farmers overlook nature's real first timers, the fish, animals and natural riparian areas that all depend on the limited water remaining in the river. Other plans to take water from the river and from the West Kettle River for commercial purposes ( a golf course!??) should also be stopped. Fishing should also be curtailed at least for awhile as it is on the Slocan River for example.Thanks!- \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act  
From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*  
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX  
Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 11:15 AM

Hello,

I would like to see the government charge much, much higher fees to industry that uses so much of our water. I don't understand why the government practically gives water away for free. If it were timber that was being cut down, the government expects a lot of money from industries that are using this natural resource to make money. However, when it comes to water the government is giving that away. Water is as precious a natural resource as timber, so why are the two treated so differently?

We should have a user-pay system. As more and more municipalities move towards metering the water that goes into a home in order to charge citizens on a user-pay basis, it should be the same for industry. Thank you,

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Proposed Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 8:59 AM

I have reviewed the proposed water sustainability act, and am concerned at the lack of concrete, definitive stormwater quality targets.

Stormwater is one of the largest threats to our streams, lakes, wetlands and rivers, yet in BC very little other than loose 'guidelines' regulate the quality of stormwater that is channeled into these sensitive and vulnerable ecosystems.

[http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wat/wq/nps/NPS\\_Pollution/Stormwater\\_Runoff/sw\\_main.htm](http://www.env.gov.bc.ca/wat/wq/nps/NPS_Pollution/Stormwater_Runoff/sw_main.htm)

BC should look closely at progressive states such as Washington, Oregon and California, or countries in Europe where stormwater discharges are closely monitored and regulated. Currently, it is left up to the local government bodies to regulate stormwater discharges, however in my opinion BC needs a province wide regulation that sets minimum standards for water quality.

Best Regards,

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Tuesday, October 29, 2013 6:43 AM

I have two major concerns relating to the new 'Water Sustainability Act'. The first pertains to the quality of water coming from the tap. From what I understand, it will be just fine for water to be tainted in the wilderness as long as the new 4-3-2-1 regulations can clean it up before human consumption. This interference with nature does nothing to protect wildlife which also relies on fresh clean water. It also does nothing for ground water users who are currently consuming water from barrels because their sources are tainted from fracking, mining or other industrial activities that primarily benefit corporations.

The second concern is that private water companies are allowed to purchase our water so inexpensively. It is nice that you are going to finally start charging them but I don't think that 85 cents per million liters is acceptable. If the government actually charged for what water is worth, it would not be so carelessly wasted, polluted or given away. And with the money that could be made, BC probably would not have a deficit.

This proves that once again, the public will be paying for the government's immediate need for money by allowing companies/corporations to denude, contaminate and rape the British Columbia landscape. Please stop this. All life needs a clean reliable water source.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

People will forget what you said,  
People will forget what you did,  
But people will never forget,  
How you made them feel.

Subject: Emailing: Comments on Water Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 7:35 PM

Madam Minister,

Thank you for including me (and my extended family) in your alert about this legislation.

I and my wife do agree with the need for some revisions to the ACT; and, we do support the proposals made for protecting, managing and enforcing current and planned regulations.

However, we are troubled by the lack of specific reference to growing evidence of abuse of our water resources through its use in industrial endeavours that render the water un-useable for other domestic needs and even threatening toxification of groundwater resources. The action of greatest proven abuse has been fracking. In our view that should be banned by this legislation applicable to this province and then promoted for all of Canada. Other countries have done so; and so must we!

Perhaps there are vague references to such abuse in your legislation, but we failed to identify something that was adequately specific. Why?

There are clear signs that the world is running out of potable water. Our supply may be ample for BC sustainability but not if others covet or demand that it be shared well beyond our borders.

Sincerely,

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Victoria, BC.

Subject: Emailing: Comments on Water Act  
From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*  
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX  
Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 4:15 PM

Comments on Water Act:

From \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Former advisor to RDOS Area C commission and Air Quality Committee

Protecting stream health;

Intrigate land & water usage, Protect stream flows by developing a policy of upper elevation management to let the water down **slowly**, thus protecting aquifer recharge and stream flows over time, allowing resource extraction as a continuing activity.

License ground water industrial and domestic extraction'

Develop priority for water use:

Allowing Agric. Water reserves is only a mitigation of inadequate management.'

Agriculture needs to be given top priority in management.

Second priority is for Domestic use.

Third priority is for fisheries.

The needs of agric.will also take care of flow requirement for fisheries.

Regulate agriculture usage by Dole Valves, not meters, thus encouraging the user to plan for wise use.  
Insure adequate distribution designs for soil capacity and water intervals.

Domestic water should be delivered only in mapped areas for a given license or Letters of patent.

The purveyor of the domestic water should have adequate councilors at the table representative of the total distribution area.

Strip development demands a logistical, impractical management of both land and water.

Major decisions should need approval of the controller of water rights.

Do not allow temporary water use stoppage to disrupt properly run agricultural farms.

Continue to educate purveyor's and other users for wise usage of water.



Insure trans border flows are not impacted by US agreements.

Insure that our waters are regulated, or impounded by BC Authorities.

In future all dams should be developed by the Crown and cared for by the Crown, even if partial financial commitments are shared.

Areas suitable for human settlement should be mapped by all regions taking into account water availability, geological studies, utility distribution grids and road construction. There should be no political interference in Regional Growth Planning.

The number of agencies involved in Water and Land Management needs to be reduced.

Subject: Re: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 11:14 AM

Hi,

I just read that the BC government will be imposing a fee of \$.85 /1000 m3 on commercial ground water customers. This very small cost will not encourage conservation of the resource.

As noted below, I think the Comox Valley Regional District is raising excess revue by collecting \$.64/m3 going to .68m3 in 2014. The CVRD collect as much from their bulk water sales as the entire Province of BC will collect from all Commercial ground water users in BC - about \$5 million dollars /year.

There needs to be a review of water tolls when **residential customers pay 750 times more than commercial customers for the same resource**. Obviously, Commercial customers have be no incentive to conserve and Residential customers are paying too much, with the present bulk water rate structures in the Province.

regards

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Comox

Subject: Water Sustainability Act ~ MOE Water Protection and Sustainability Branch

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Monday, October 28, 2013 6:42 AM

Our wetlands need preservation and restoration to achieve a goal of water protection. Our main geologic wetland, Loftus Lake Fen, here at Shuswap Arm received a un-monitored/un-compacted sewage dam in 1994 that all but destroyed the wetland. Ducks now swim in the toxic sewage lagoon that captured most of our fen's surface and subsurface water flows and spring fresh-net. The loud frog chorus at Loftus Lake has all but disappeared. Disgusting and gradating!!! The fen is basically dried out with trees growing up throughout. Much had been written back in the early 90's on the need to preserve our wetlands. The question is... 'Is the present government now going to act on the residents protests and concerns, seeing the sordid results of the past southern interior wetland plan?'

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Balmoral B.C.

Subject: I believe that domestic water use should also be included in the regulation

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 4:57 PM

While I am aware that there are both logistical and political reasons for not included domestic use in the proposed regulation I believe that they should be included for the following reasons:

1. They are a very significant use of ground water.
2. They have an important effect upon the aquifers.
3. Including them will give a better overall picture of total water usage and can result in better planning.
4. Urban and some rural domestic use is already included and these people are often on metered water.
5. If they are exempted now when a major change is underway, they will be difficult to include in the future.

I would suggest that initially this usage be recognized on the act and future government regulations be the vehicle by which they could be licensed and controlled.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Qualicum Beach, BC

Subject: A Water Sustainability Act for B.C. Legislative Proposal

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 2:34 PM

Good afternoon,

I'm concerned that the hydraulic fracturing parade continues to march on.

I'm concerned that 'fracking' companies are getting a great benefit from the proposed revisions of the B.C. Water Sustainability Act.

Fracking has proved to be harmful. Very harmful to everyone and everything living within the reaches of hydraulic fracturing sites. Watch Gasland and Gasland 2.

Not only is B.C. supporting hydraulic fracturing, they're putting the health of the province at risk again, and again, and again, time after time, from Harper unprotecting Canada's river systems, to the 2010 Olympic Games where hard working Native performers were given degrading, plain lunches consisting of one granny smith apple and a sandwich.

Stop hydraulic fracturing before the Earth implodes on itself.

Sincerely,

Everyone who cares about the Earth

Subject: Sustainable Water

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 3:22 PM

To whom it concerns;

A well is a need of survival use for individuals and families and they should not be required to pay beyond the cost of the well placement and water quality testing itself.

Industry must be charged for their use of water and not some negligible sum.

The use of massive amounts of water above or below ground must be reflected in the cost of infrastructure, resource management, and administrative costs.

The tax payers who own these commons must not be made to pay for the cost of providing this to industry, it is a cost that they must bear as part of their business plans and ongoing operational costs.

The dividing line should be when massive amounts of water is taken for an industrial "for profit" only use.

I would draw a line between a 20 hectare family run farm and an agri-business on many hundreds of hectares for instance.

A graduated rate could be put in place for operations that did not fit easily into one or the other and could be looked at case by case.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 10:45 AM

Having read the summary of the Water Sustainability Act I can say that generally I like what is being proposed. I would like to add weight to a few of the proposals:

In regulating commercial users it states that this would be done through licenses and fees. Hopefully the provisions in Section 4 would also allow for legislation that is robust enough to go as far as reducing and even cutting the supply if necessary.

In section 6 I believe that it should go further and encourage (if not legislate) municipalities to look at smaller users, homeowners and small businesses, and regulate use by charging an extra fee when consumption is over a reasonable amount of use. I believe some municipalities already do this.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Nanaimo, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Sunday, October 27, 2013 10:04 AM

Re Pricing rates for water – FAR TOO LOW.

A company like Nestle should be paying say \$5K to \$10K per year for their license – that would be a reasonable cost of doing business and one that should not affect their business model.

The structure could be to buy an annual water license (for water used above a certain amount) = \$5K minimum (and have it increasing also based on usage) , then so much per usage (\$/litre) above a certain amount – similar to what was announced, but higher rates. This would also address the current criticism with Oil & Gas users for fracking (and again, would not disrupt the economics of their projects).

This would bring in more funding (than currently proposed) to help self-fund regulation, inspections, enforcement, etc

The current rates as proposed – sure, BC needs to be competitive with other jurisdictions, but those same jurisdictions are also far too low, and again, rates proposed above would not damage the economics of any current or future projects.

Please consider this change.



Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 4:22 PM

Although it's encouraging to see that there is draft legislation being considered on this issue, I'm disappointed by both the limited scope and lack of teeth in the proposed Water Sustainability Act. To be blunt, the government of BC still doesn't seem to be taking the issue of protecting our water very seriously. It is currently October 26<sup>th</sup>, and it looks like California outside. In case you haven't noticed, the future has arrived.

As numerous other posters on your website have pointed out, corporations like Nestle should be paying more than a token fee for the water they resell – personally I think a rate of 10 to 15 cents per litre is quite reasonable – and the revenue generated by this fee would be more than enough to pay for enforcement of the regulations. The oil and gas sector should also be paying premium rates for every drop of BC water they consume: it must be obvious that subsidizing big business to make fat profits while they pollute the environment is not a viable long-term plan. There should be an absolute ban on fracking. I'm sure that both corporations and BC citizens will do a much better job of conserving this precious asset if they are adequately motivated to do so – which generally means using both the carrot and the stick.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Squamish

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 9:17 AM

Thank you for the tone of the act

& chance to contribute

to protect environment first.

Please no fracking be allowed.

Is it possible to support more widespread awareness

of water's importance?

The Canadian documentary 'Watermark' by Jennifer Baichwal,

Nick de Pencier and Edward Burtynsky speaks to this most eloquently.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Saturday, October 26, 2013 8:57 AM

The fee structure you plan on creating is a joke. You are stating on one hand how valuable you feel groundwater has become yet charge users a pittance of what it is worth. The first recognized users of water should be fish. Any watershed that does not have enough water of a quality to support fish should not be opened up to industry for their use. A watershed that is fit for fish is fit for people but its use by people should be limited when it impacts fish. Fish health and sustainability should be assured before the taps are turned on for industry.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Parksville, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 4:22 PM

Hi

I am pleased to finally see some action on this important issue. My only comment is the proposed rate to charge corporations for water is way too low! It needs to be much much higher including the Nestly people for bottled water and companies fracking, etc.

--

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, October 25, 2013 9:00 AM

I am concerned about the current costs and future costs for small users with small "environmental footprints". For example, I live in a 600 sq. foot home on 13 acres and I have to pay three different fees for the little water I use. I dug a pond to collect water for use in my home and my garden. I divert some of this water for, for 6-8 months a year, from my pond to the bottom of my property for hydro-power. I pay \$25 for use \$25 for storage and \$100 for power. I use very little water and most of what I use is returned to the water table. I, like many others, am a responsible user and custodian of our water and land yet I pay \$150.00 a year for the rain water that runs through my property to the beach at the bottom of my land. Why can't I pay just one simple fee for minimal use? Why must I pay \$25 for domestic use and \$25 for storage on the same water.

I am concerned about the proposed increase in cost for all users. I believe that small users should get a break. For years I have paid while many large users have had agree ride.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

*Lasqueti Island*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 5:56 PM

Hello

I am a member of a water-users community drawing water from a reservoir fed by a seasonal stream. A stable concrete dam creating the reservoir has provided the community with irrigation water and fire protection water supply for 40 years. Suddenly the Ministry of Forests, Lands and Natural Resource Operations, drawing on Dam Safety Regulations, sees this dam as a possible downstream risk without providing any support, financial or technical to evaluate the condition of the dam, or to make any effort whatsoever to ensure that this and many other dams continue to safely provide water supply and sites for aquatic habitat. Practically speaking, a reservoir is a mitigative structure that buffers storm flows and can prevent flooding during heavy rainfall events and should be valued as such.

How does this policy of the MoFLNRO contribute in any way to the water sustainability proposal for this province? In my opinion, it is a blatant contradiction.

Thank you

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Foursome Lake Water Users Community, Kootenay Bay, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 3:02 PM

Would like to see more water dam sites throughout the Province of B.C.

Mission Creek in Kelowna should have a controlled water dam site constructed East of Kelowna.

There is an existing valley area that could store a large volume of water.

This water could be held back for dryer seasons, and also release a controlled volume of water down

Mission Creek year round.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 2:57 PM

Updating the current legislation is good and required but I also would recommend grandfather all existing wells (Wells registered prior to the new bill being passed) for household consumption or irrigation purposes as exempt from any new fee structure.

regards

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Kelowna, BC



Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 12:57 PM

Hello,

I am concerned with industry (mining, logging) polluting in water shed.

Are there now consequences?

Will there be consequences, ie fines or ceasing work in the new water act?

As a concerned citizen, whom do I approach now to ensure continuation of polluting (heavy metals, nitrates) is stopped?

Will the new water act give me access to water testing to show if polluting continues?

Thank you,

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Van Anda,

Texada Island.

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2013 8:49 AM

Good day,

I support this initiative. Ground water and surface water are equally valuable resources. Protecting water quality and quantity needs to be the priority.

Conservation efforts should be first placed on reducing wasted water, through leaks in infrastructure, public and private- and misuse of the resource.

There is no "one fits all" solution for managing the resource as different regions have different water supplies, but the user pay model should apply to all customers who use water, whether ground or surface. Universal water metering is the only way to determine customer use of the resource. The cost of infrastructure should be part of considering the bulk rates for water-i.e. many well users pay for their own infrastructure.

Conservation goals may be be very different in communities that depend on very limited water supplies. Other areas may be blessed with an "endless "supply of water and the same goals just do not make sense, unless conditions change. When condition change, customers will adapt as they did in the Victoria water drought of 2001..

The water resource should not be used as "cash cow" for local governments. The user fees should cover the cost of the water delivered and the priority should be to extend the service to communities/constituents who have limited water supplies, at a reasonable cost.

I'm concerned about the management of the Comox lake water supply in the Comox Valley, from many perspectives, including protecting the watershed. I think the Province should be more actively involved when local politicians can't agree on such an important issue.

regards

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2013 9:19 PM

the aims and goals appear to be preservation of BC water. That is a good thing. However there are issues that concern us.

First the BC Government proposal to use fracking to obtain natural gas appears to us to go outer to the aims. Fracking has been on the internet frequently of late and pictures of a match being lit and applied to water in a sink resulting in a burst of flame, or a same result with a glass of water are indeed troubling. Reports in the USA of earthquakes and the same in Eastern Canada lower our confidence in this procedure. It needs to be halted.

BC is a province with many pristine lakes and rivers. These fresh water resources are a priceless source of fresh water something it appears that is showing signs of being in short supply thanks to human activities. We know BC's they are threatened by pollution from mining and industrial production. Recent plans for using them for production of electricity by private rather than public means will further deplete them.

Site 2 of the Peace River Dam is already in the works. Site 1 caused a significant change in the weather of the surrounding area. We have not seen any reports in the major media about this. Has the result been beneficial to the people living in the area or has it created problems for them.

Finally the proposed pipelines are a serious threat to fresh water sources. Present pipelines are evidencing problems like rust and leaks that forecast even larger problems. It is untrue that this is a Federal issue, it affects all BC residents. the BC government (it includes government and opposition) can play a forceful role in publicizing information to BC residents and openly stating our opposition.

Our First Nations people are no longer primitive, Fresh water is vital to their existence and must be taken into consideration by your government.

All these points are worthy of serious consideration by the drafting of the Water Sustainability Act. You are to be congratulated for your email

We reserve the right to Cc. \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

Subject: Re: A Water Sustainability Act for BC: Legislative Proposal

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2013 7:04 PM

Thank you, Mary, what a great job you and your staff has done. I'll be back with suggestions. Still, the solutions are "narrowed" to North American applications, but there are many other way to go.

Coming from Switzerland where you can drink water from every of the tenthousands of village and city fountains and no chlorine is in the system since ever, you might be interested in their solutions. I still have some relations with the water authorities of my hometown Zürich. i suggest that you bring one of the engineiers over, might save you billions ... Also we had a guest at our environmentally awarded inn, which you might invite for comments, Alison M. Jones from : <http://nowater-nolife.org/index.html>.

Best regards

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

P.S.: If you ever drive east, you're very welcome at enjoy one of our "geo coaching tuours, where we show our visitors how we give back to Mother Nature what we take from her. Mulvehill Creek won several environmental awards.

Subject: As Requested- **\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*** Feedback 23OCT13 Re: A Water Sustainability Act for BC: Legislative Proposal  
From: **\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\***  
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX; Polak.MLA, Mary LASS:EX  
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2013 6:44 PM

Good Wednesday Evening, Honourable Minister Mrs Polak (Mary),

**Re: As Requested - **\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*** Feedback 23OCT13 Re: A Water Sustainability Act for BC: Legislative Proposal**

Respectfully,

**\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\***

**\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\***

\*\*\*\*\*

On 23/10/2013 6:18 PM, Living Water Smart ENV:EX wrote:

Dear **\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\***

I am pleased to release Government's [A Water Sustainability Act for B.C. Legislative Proposal](#). British Columbia's current *Water Act* was established more than 100 years ago, and although it has evolved over the years, it is no longer adequate to address our growing population, expanding development and changing climate. That is why the provincial government has been working towards bringing in a new *Water Sustainability Act* to help ensure that our water stays healthy and secure for future generations.

Over the past four years, we have heard from citizens, First Nations organizations, local governments, industry and environmental groups -- everyone who has an interest in our water resource. British Columbians sent [thousands of submissions with ideas](#) covering everything from how to protect groundwater and how to ensure our streams and lakes stay healthy, to considering water when we make land-use decisions. We have considered all these ideas and put together a proposal for a new *Water Sustainability Act*, to be introduced in the Legislature in the spring of 2014.

*Now I am inviting you to offer your **feedback** one last time, so we can make sure our new water legislation really does serve your needs, and the needs of future generations of British Columbians. Your **feedback** will not only help us refine our legislative proposals, but will also help guide us as we implement the new Act in the months and years ahead.*

Have a look through the [Legislative Proposal](#), the [Overview](#) and other background materials on the new [Water Sustainability Act website](#), and tell us what's most important to you by [leaving a](#)

[comment on the Blog](#). You can also comment by email fax or post; check the website for details. Comments received by **Friday, November 15, 2013**, will be considered as government prepares a final version of the new legislation.

Thank you for taking the time to help us modernize the rules around our most precious natural resource.

Sincerely,

Mary Polak  
Minister of Environment

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

----- Original Message -----

**Subject:** " A Water Sustainability Act for B.C.: Legislative proposal",  
[http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA\\_leg\\_prop\\_final.pdf](http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA_leg_prop_final.pdf)  
**Date:** Sat, 19 Oct 2013 14:32:11 -0700  
**From:** \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*  
**To:** Dan Fumano <[dfumano@theprovince.com](mailto:dfumano@theprovince.com)>, Sunny Dhillon  
<[sdhillon@globeandmail.com](mailto:sdhillon@globeandmail.com)>  
**CC:** \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*, **Honourable Mary Polak**  
<[ENV.Minister@gov.bc.ca](mailto:ENV.Minister@gov.bc.ca)>

Good Saturday Afternoon, Mr. Fumano (Dan) & Mr. Dhillon (Sunny),

**Re: " A Water Sustainability Act for B.C.: Legislative proposal"**  
[http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA\\_leg\\_prop\\_final.pdf](http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA_leg_prop_final.pdf)

\*\*\*\*\*  
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/british-columbia/bc-water-plan-derided-as-insufficient/article14945646/>

"B.C. water plan derided as insufficient to protect precious resource"  
by Sunny Dhilon VANCOUVER — The Globe and Mail  
Published Friday, Oct. 18 2013, 9:43 PM EDT  
Last updated Friday, Oct. 18 2013, 9:56 PM EDT

<http://www.theprovince.com/news/Lack+water+regulation+really+unbelievable+activist+says/9009143/story.html>

"Lack of B.C. water regulation 'really unbelievable,' activist says"

Environment: Activist says B.C. has the opportunity to create the best legislation across the country

By Dan Fumano, The Province October 7, 2013

" A Water Sustainability Act for B.C.: Legislative proposal" (126 pages)

[http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA\\_leg\\_prop\\_final.pdf](http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA_leg_prop_final.pdf)

"A Water Sustainability Act for B.C.: A technical Briefing" (10 Pages)

[http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA\\_technical\\_briefing\\_final.pdf](http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/WSA_technical_briefing_final.pdf)

*The provincial government is interested in your feedback on A Water Sustainability Act for B.C. Legislative Proposal.*

*Government welcomes your feedback on the Proposal until Friday, November 15, 2013.*

\*\*\*\*\*

Thank you both for your coverage of the "" A Water Sustainability Act for B.C.: Legislative proposal", all 126 pages of it.

I'm certain that in the feedback response time allotted between now and 15NOV13, much more will be said by many other people and groups, about this "long-time-a' coming" legislative proposal.

My view is that of a naive volunteer layperson with an active and abiding interest in fish, fishing & fish habitat...and...is the view of but one of 7 billion plus people in the world.

My concerns and those of other like-minded people and groups, regarding B.C. water legislation, were stated, sometimes in excruciating detail and frequently repeated, during the Water Act Modernization public consultation meetings & process, spearheaded by, then, MLA, John Slater.

Those submissions still stand and should form the practical basis for this latest round of solicited responses by "concerned" citizens.

**"What We've Heard"**

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/what-weve-heard/>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/BC-Wildlife-Federation.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/BC-Wildlife-Federation1.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/BC-Wildlife-Federation-Vancouver-Island.pdf>

[http://livingwatersmart.ca/water-act/docs/wam\\_report-on-engagement.pdf](http://livingwatersmart.ca/water-act/docs/wam_report-on-engagement.pdf)

**OTHER**

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Okanagan-Nation-Alliance.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Ducks-Unlimited-Canada.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Trout-Unlimited.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/West-Coast-Environmental-Law.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Ecojustice.pdf>

<http://www.watershed-watch.org/2011/03/update-on-the-water-act-modernization-process/>

<http://www.watershed-watch.org/issues/water/water-act-modernization/>

<http://www.watershed-watch.org/2011/04/water-act-modernization-ecosystem-vs-economics/>  
<http://groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/okbcwf/conversations/topics/5467> January 5, 2010 5:02 PM

[http://livingwatersmart.ca/watersciencestrategy/docs/BCWaterSymposiumProceedings\\_Feb2011.pdf](http://livingwatersmart.ca/watersciencestrategy/docs/BCWaterSymposiumProceedings_Feb2011.pdf)

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Urban-Systems-Ltd.pdf>

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Okanagan-Basin-Water-Board.pdf>

<http://www.obwb.ca/blog/category/water-act-modernization-2/>

[http://www.obwb.ca/fileadmin/docs/minutes/130702\\_obwb\\_agenda\\_pkg.pdf](http://www.obwb.ca/fileadmin/docs/minutes/130702_obwb_agenda_pkg.pdf)

<http://engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact/files/2013/10/Okanagan-Basin-Water-Board1.pdf>

FWIW.

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*

On 22/10/2013 9:38 AM, \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\* wrote:

Thank You \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*, long time no see or hear, I have to admit I would be surprised if your gov can bring meaningful change because I like & trust you from our experiences I will read & comment.

With Primer talking oil pipeline safety over trains , living in front of low rd expansion for rail, coal & grain with an increasing number of oil tankers with a renewal of military contracts to come living in a dust & sound vacuum with constant sleep disturbance wondering if the Chinese will stop coughing before we send them all this coal, oil, LNG. \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Sultan.MLA, Ralph** <[Ralph.Sultan.MLA@leg.bc.ca](mailto:Ralph.Sultan.MLA@leg.bc.ca)>

Date: 21 October 2013 10:39

Subject: Water Sustainability Act Feedback Requested

To:

On Friday, October 18<sup>th</sup> the government released several documents pertaining to its proposed Water Sustainability Act, intended for introduction to the Legislature this coming Spring. The purpose of distributing these papers is to stimulate further feedback and discussion, prior to final legislative drafting. This work has been under way since December 2009, when the “Living Water Smart” blog was initiated, resulting in 2,250 blog and website submissions. Work on the proposed new Act has been grinding forward in the Environment Ministry since that time. With the release on Friday of Environment Minister Mary Polak’s “A Water Sustainability Act for BC” (a 103-page discussion paper and 22-page legislative overview, and other documentation and news release) comes an opportunity to assess the proposed Act’s impact on stream protection, fish habitat conservation, salmon, and steelhead. Consultation commences on Friday, October 18 – and runs until November 15, 2013. We have less than four weeks to make our views known. Comments can be submitted on the Blog at



[www.engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact](http://www.engage.gov.bc.ca/watersustainabilityact) by email to [livingwatersmart@Wgov.bc.ca](mailto:livingwatersmart@Wgov.bc.ca) by fax at [250-356-1202](tel:250-356-1202) by post to *Water Act Modernization*, Ministry of Environment, Water Protection and Sustainability Branch, PO Box 9362, Stn Prov Govt, Victoria BC V8W 9M2. In a nutshell, these documents reflect the more than 2,000 earlier submissions, plus a great deal of consultation with municipalities, with agriculture interests, with industry, and with others concerned with land use. Ground water issues are covered extensively, as well as governance, measurement and reporting. Aquatic ecosystem health and environmental flow needs are also acknowledged as important. There are many claimants for British Columbia's fresh water. This Act will set the usage template for many years to come. Before rushing to comment, I urge to read and think about what is actually being proposed, based on the extensive documentation now being provided. I am sure the government would benefit from your views. Now is the opportunity to comment thoughtfully on the proposed legislation.

Ralph Sultan

Subject: Comments on WSA Legislative Proposal

From: \*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2013 4:56 PM

In short: for what I pay every year for the water for my home, I fully expect a huge, multi-billion dollar corporation to pay their fair share! I think it is grossly unfair for the general populace to pay for water when someone can just pump it out of the ground for free and market it for huge profit. You talk about conserving water and not wasting it? Why? So Nestle and other water companies can use it to get rich? At least if the government was getting something in return (royalties or taxes), I wouldn't be so offended, but to just give it away!? You want people to save it for someone to make a profit? Not a chance. If that's why I'm paying water bills every year, I'll use and waste as much water as I feel necessary! Nice business to be in, your raw materials are free and you get to charge as much as the market will bear! Last I checked the price of Nestle water was anywhere from \$1.00-\$2.00 in machines and stores, unless you buy cases of 12 or 24. 265 million litres a year is a lot of water and a lot of money NOT coming in to government for the rights to the resources being used. Tidy profit for just pumping it out of the ground, filtering it and bottling it. I know there are costs associated with the process, but I'm sure the equipment is paid for by now and that just leaves maintenance and wages for a few staff.

"Water" you doing with MY water?

Sincerely,

\*\*\*Personal Identifiers Removed\*\*\*