From: nobody@scribe.env.gov.bc.ca
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 4:17:59 PM
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Subject: Water Act Modernization Discussion Paper Feedback

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by
() on 2010 04 30, at 16:17:59

PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED

ContactMethod: Email

Principles_Support: Strongly Disagree

Principles_Comments: This is a ridiculous format for a survey. How can someone possibly state their opinion on multiple criteria listed in each question by clicking one option! The precautionary principle must be used to define sustainability. The fact that this proposal does not in anyway restrcit water used by the oil and gas industry while it attemps to restrict all other stake holders makes this BOGUS legislation. This legislation should involve extensive public input and the finalized version should be made a referendum issue.

Goal1_Support: Neutral

Goal1_Comments: "Consumptive use" needs further clarification.

EnviroFlow: Standards

EnviroFlow_Comments: The standards need to be adapted for each water source depending on water usage by which stakeholders.

WaterAllocationPlan_Conditions: Prioritize water allocation according to stream/aquifer health followed by drinking water and agricultural demand. Oil and gas or run of river projects should be the last to be considered.

DumpingProhibition: Amend

Goal2_Support: Neutral

Goal2_Comments: If water used by the oil and gas industry is not included in this proposal then this is bogus legislation. Shared responsibility for decided water governance is only justifiable if the leaders of the "partner" allow extensive input for all stakeholders to dtermione an agreed upon course of action.

Goal3_Comments: On page 31 it states that "the construction of water source wells associated with oil and gas activities will continue to be regulated under oil and gas legislation. If this water modernization act does not put oil and gas under the same legislation as all other stakeholders then this is BOGUS legislation.

Goal4_Comments: Define "crtical areas"!

FedAndProvLegIntegration: I agree with the following letter:

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

AffectOnCommunity: They have the potential to restrict water use for everyone except oil and gas water use. Since they are the largest users of eater here that is completely unacceptable. Our ground water and limited source water supply is threatened by oil and gas extraction complicated by drought conditions in summer.

Improve_InterestsTakenIntoAccount: Put all water use by oil and gas under the same criteria as all other users to be regulated and manged by the Ministry of Enviroment.

KindsOfCollaborativeProcesses: Every local community should have an elected group of people to act on a water stewardship board to take into account all users and to prioritize usage according to stream health, consuption (drinking) food or crop production. Oil and gas can use treated sewage water as proposed for the Dawson Creek area and not waste fresh groundwater, treated drinking water or trap runoff

just for oil and gas extraction.