From: nobody@scribe.env.gov.bc.ca
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2010 11:24:11 AM
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 27, at 11:24:11

PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED
ContactMethod: Email

Principles_Support: Neutral

Principles_Comments: As a surface water right user (captured from a Spring on private property) and having paid a yearly tax for twenty nine years, I have seen no value other than another Provincial tax. Over the period of time, personal ground water users have paid nothing. Further, I fully support the supply and protection of clean water for all Native reserves in B. C. including their involvement in planning, installing and monitoring systems.

I would give support to the proposal if it excluded residential households in rural areas (ground water - 500 litres/per day) - If it laid the burden (of protection) on too Industry, the Agricultural community and cities/municipalities.
At the present time, (and not knowing all the issue's), I am concerned at the proposal of turning Chilco Lake into a tailing pond. this indicates to me that the big issue needs attention first. INDUSTRIAL/AGRICULTURAL POLLUTION AND DAMAGE MUST BE CONSTRAINED.

Goal1_Support: Neutral

Goal1_Comments: As a layman, and in the Kootenay Lake area of Nelson, the Regional District has legislation in place in protecting riparian area's; the Federal Gov't is also involved. My question is "who is in charge" - is it Federal, Provincial or local Gov't. There was a case last year of lakeside residents in the city of Nelson who applied to the land title office in Cranbrook who issued them a permit to install pilings for a warf - The city of Nelson felt it was their jurisdiction.

EnviroFlow: Guidelines

EnviroFlow_Comments: I selected A for I think flexibility is needed as climate change occurs (and not to offer exceptions for industrial/Agricultural degration).

WaterAllocationPlan: Optional

DecisionMaker: Must Consider

DecisionMaker_Comments: I would go with a Regional Water Manager although I am concerned that these managers come into rural areas, make decisions and than move on to other jurisdictions and are never held accountable for the decisions that they make that were wrong.

WaterAllocationPlan_Conditions: Multiple residential development's and Industrial use including gravel pits, etc. Agricultural including feed lots and grazing animals in water sheds should also have guidelines developed.

DumpingProhibition: Amend

DumpingProhibition_Comments: The Provincial Govt. is responsible for Crown Land. Give the various ministries training and direction to: Report, identify (the dumpers), and issue penalties including clean up.

Goal2_Support: Support

Goal2_Comments: Motherhood statement but I will buy into it. Needs are site specific; need to be local.

Goal2_Options: Delegated

ScaleForWatershedPlanning: Determine by volume; population density and high risk areas (such as the Dry belt areas of the Prov.).

GovernanceFundingSolutions: Well, you can use some of the "water user tax" money that I have paid for the last 29 years as a surface water user. There should be no new tax to set up the system. Once the regulations are in place, budget accordingly but try to use in house services as much as possible.

Accountability: Clean, potable water for humans, other animals and plants. I don't trust all politicians - I would be more likely to trust a judge.

BenefitsOfSharedRoles: Motherhood question, but - involvement of local government (vs local people) should help defuse the contentious areas surrounding water.

Goal3_Support: Support

WaterUseEfficiency_1: Government determines actual needs

WaterUseEfficiency_2: Review rules for transfer and apportionment

WaterUseEfficiency_Comments: Local residence and environmental needs must take p residence over industry and agricultural

AdminEfficiencyOptions_PermittedUse: Permitted use different

AdminEfficiencyOptions_SelfReg: Required self-registration

AdminEfficiencyOptions_WaterUse: Combine admin and efficiency

Flexibility_Support: Neutral

WaterAllocationSystem_Options: FITFIR

WaterScarcityTemporary_Options: Priority date

WaterScarcityPermanent_Options: Through a mandatory Water Management Planning process

WaterScarcityPermanent_Comments: Limit development based on availability of water - We hear of the disaster shortages in parts of the US - No water - No development.

Goal4_Support: Disagree

Goal4_Comments: Only in problem areas such as the gulf islands or in areas where ground water has been polluted by livestock or industry, etc.

FedAndProvLegIntegration: There is only one taxpayer; make it simple and viable

AtRiskWatershedCriteria: Clean water is the backbone of all our communities; that should be the number one criteria.

AffectOnCommunity: Low impact on our water system - no need to raise my licence fee.

Improve_InterestsTakenIntoAccount: Focus on the problem areas. Have Provincial legislation. Don't worry about the non problem areas other than known where they are

KindsOfCollaborativeProcesses: From the Regional District

AdequatelyEquipFutureGenerations: Not if we allow unsustainable growth of our population or allow water export.

WhatHaveWeMissed: We don't really no what climate change is going to due to B. C. Nor do we know the impact of the pollutants in the air and on the ground. A lot of old mining and mill sites (and other industrial areas) scattered throughout B.C. that have not been properly assessed or cleaned up - An effort to create a data bank on the higher risk sites should be a provincial mandate with ground inspections carried out over the next thirty years.

Above fields delimited by |
PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS REMOVED
Email|Neutral|As a surface water right user (captured from a Spring on private property) and having paid a yearly tax for twenty nine years, I have seen no value other than another Provincial tax. Over the period of time, personal ground water users have paid nothing. Further, I fully support the supply and protection of clean water for all Native reserves in B. C. including their involvement in planning, installing and monitoring systems.

I would give support to the proposal if it excluded residential households in rural areas (ground water - 500 litres/per day) - If it laid the burden (of protection) on too Industry, the Agricultural community and cities/municipalities.
At the present time, (and not knowing all the issue's), I am concerned at the proposal of turning Chilco Lake into a tailing pond. this indicates to me that the big issue needs attention first. INDUSTRIAL/AGRICULTURAL POLLUTION AND DAMAGE MUST BE CONSTRAINED.|Neutral|As a layman, and in the Kootenay Lake area of Nelson, the Regional District has legislation in place in protecting riparian area's; the Federal Gov't is also involved. My question is "who is in charge" - is it Federal, Provincial or local Gov't. There was a case last year of lakeside residents in the city of Nelson who applied to the land title office in Cranbrook who issued them a permit to install pilings for a warf - The city of Nelson felt it was their jurisdiction.|Guidelines|I selected A for I think flexibility is needed as climate change occurs (and not to offer exceptions for industrial/Agricultural degration).|Optional|Must Consider|I would go with a Regional Water Manager although I am concerned that th
 ese managers come into rural areas, make decisions and than move on to other jurisdictions and are never held accountable for the decisions that they make that were wrong.|Multiple residential development's and Industrial use including gravel pits, etc. Agricultural including feed lots and grazing animals in water sheds should also have guidelines developed.|Amend|The Provincial Govt. is responsible for Crown Land. Give the various ministries training and direction to: Report, identify (the dumpers), and issue penalties including clean up.|Support|Motherhood statement but I will buy into it. Needs are site specific;

need to be local.|Delegated|Determine by volume; population density and high risk areas (such as the Dry belt areas of the Prov.).|Well, you can use some of the "water user tax" money that I have paid for the last 29 years as a surface water user. There should be no new tax to set up the system. Once the regulations are in place, budget accordingly but try to use
in house services as much as possible.|Clean, potable water!
for hum
ans, other animals and plants. I don't trust all politicians - I would be more likely to trust a judge.|Motherhood question, but - involvement of local government (vs local people) should help defuse the contentious areas surrounding
water.|Support|Government determines actual needs|Review rules for transfer and apportionment|Local residence and environmental needs must take p residence over industry and agricultural |Permitted use different|Required
self-registration|Combine admin and efficiency|Neutral|FITFIR|Priority
date|Through a mandatory Water Management Planning process|Limit development
based on availability of water - We hear of the disaster shortages in parts of the US - No water - No development.|Disagree|Only in problem areas such as the gulf islands or in areas where ground water has been polluted by livestock or industry, etc.|There is only one taxpayer; make it simple and viable|Clean water is the backbone of all our communities; that should be the number one
criteria.|Low impact on our water system - no need to raise my licence fee.|Focus on the problem areas. Have Provincial legislation. Don't worry about the non
problem areas other than known where they are|From the Regional District|Not if we allow unsustainable growth of our population or allow water export.|We don't really no what climate change is going to due to B. C. Nor do we know the impact of the pollutants in the air and on the ground. A lot of old mining and mill sites (and other industrial areas) scattered throughout B.C. that have not been properly assessed or cleaned up - An effort to create a data bank on the higher risk sites should be a provincial mandate with ground inspections carried out over the next thirty
years.|----------