

Subject: BC's Proposed new Water Legislation
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:11 PM

Dear Sirs:

I have serious concerns regarding the proposed new legislation. My main concerns are:

The new proposal has retained the First in Time, First in Right (FITFIR) model of prioritizing water licences. How can a community develop and prioritize water use on a watershed if an industrial user holds a licence with the highest priority? Furthermore, the FITFIR model does not allow for the prioritization of ecological needs and ignores Indigenous use of water, which should be considered "First in Time."

Water is a public trust, which means that water, including groundwater, belongs to communities and cannot be privately owned or controlled.

The beneficial use of water must prioritize the public interest, Indigenous social and cultural use, household use and ecological needs. The public interest should be prioritized in all licensing decisions and economic use should be of lowest priority - meaning only approved when social, cultural, household and ecological needs are not impacted.

A great deal of pressure will be placed on watersheds due to the dramatic increase oil and gas development in the region. While this industry needs far more regulation of its water use, it is questionable to even consider oil & gas development as a beneficial use of water. There must be serious consideration given to whether licences should be issued, particularly for shale gas fracking, which has seen moratoriums imposed in many jurisdictions. Fracking should be halted until it can be done without either endangering our non-renewable ground water supply, or permanently removing precious groundwater from the water cycle.

Offsets are primarily an economic solution to environmental problems in order to allow for continued economic growth. In order to assure the protection of water, users that do damage to a watershed or water system must be held responsible for remediation of that system.

Personal Identifiers Removed
Delta, BC

Subject: Stop Corporate Abuse
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:50 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I am appalled that corporations such as Nestles have have unfettered access to our water supply.

This defies common sense and must be stopped as soon as possible. Water is one of our most important resources and everything should be done to protect it and sustain it.

Personal Identifiers Removed
Vancouver, B.C.

Subject: Clean protected water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 4:11 PM

You cannot ignore the irreparable harm of fracking in the retrieval of gas - you must put profits and politics behind face up to problems - you were elected to make our province a better place - water is a basic need - so can the fracking process and get a grip on what is important to all people - not just the corporate, profit today - tomorrow doesn't matter money - grabbers. Clean water is NOT yours to mess up!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Surrey BC

Subject: BC's New Water Legislation
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:33 PM

Increased population, climate change and industrial use is putting enormous stress on our water supply. Good quality water will very soon become scarce and more precious than any other natural resource in the planet. Good stewardship and preservation of our water is mission critical. We need to increase protection for our water sources from overuse, pollution and depletion with rigorous regulations that preserve our precious water for future generations.

Personal Identifiers Removed
Vancouver, BC

Subject: RE: Protection from the cupidity and stupidity of Multinationals who plunder of our resources.

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:17 PM

RE: Protection from the cupidity and stupidity of Multinationals who plunder of our resources.

Nestlé and its cohort of unethical global corporations of ravaging multinationals have already laid bare the aquifers of other nations. Setting up portable 'factories' like Trojan Horses, which imply long term local employment and healthy development. Then when they have sucked all the water from local aquifers, they pack up their 'tents' and equipment and 'steal away in the night'...it is not right, ethical nor just, IT MUST STOP. We need smart legislation to stop this raping of the planet. We can NOT ALLOW IT TO CONTINUE in CANADA!

Please insure legislation is put in place to stymie this corporate cupidity and the plundering of our natural resources for the pleasure of a wanton corporatocracy and their stockholders.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Nanaimo, BC

Subject: The Health of a Nation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:27 PM

There is nothing more important to the health of a nation than to provide it with water of the highest purity. Without health producing water there can be no healthy life. Absolutely everything must be done to provide the people of Canada with the most pristinely pure water possible. It is by far Canada's most important resource and absolutely must not be sacrificed on the altar of capitalist greed. Giving our precious water away to Nestle or to others for free is nothing less than insanity.

Personal Identifiers Removed

North Vancouver, BC

Subject: Our Water Belongs to Us
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:55 PM

Corporate interests must take second place to public interests when it comes to groundwater. And in this time when potable water is becoming a global issue, we must ensure that our public right to clean, healthy water is NOT on the table for international agreements.

Personal Identifiers Removed
Roberts Creek, BC ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

Subject: Water Legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:55 PM

To Whom It May Concern; I am extremely concerned about water use in the Province. As a government I would hope that you could have a long view on an issue such as our sacred water. It is sacred!! Without it, we cannot live. The public, and of course our First Nations, must come first, before corporations and profits. I expect my government to have more than the bottom line when it deals with these crucial issues. If corporations are using the water of the Province, they must pay for it, and clean it if they dirty it. Please have some vision when you make your policies. Life is more than low taxes!!!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Nelson

Subject: RE: Save our water
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:54 PM

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to express my concern regarding BC's sovereignty over one of our most precious resources - OUR FRESHWATER and water systems. Ironically WATER SUSTAINABILITY in and of itself implies a commitment to maintaining our water systems (OURS no not USA's nor any other province for that matter) and to do so means we need to protect our sovereignty by

- 1) not selling water rights to any one
- 2) maintaining an environmentally sustainable way of keeping our water systems clean so as to sustain the ecology of other important economic components of our system ie. salmon, human sustenance, and the ongoing health of our wildlife and flora.

I would like to add my voice to the wealth of voices that ask for the prevention of companies taking groundwater or other water sources without appropriate fees and levies and increase fines for pollution.

Major companies like Nestle take for granted that people are unaware of the way they abuse our current system. Water is a FINITE resource.

Protect it in the name of the people of British columbia and consult our First Nations people as well prior to allowing mining, deforestation, and other manufacturing industries in our lands.

I am for sustainability, accountability and enforcement of a proactive sustainable water future.

Personal Identifiers Removed
Vancouver, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:51 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts the Environment and public interest ahead of corporate profits and greed. A law that gives our communities and our First Nations the power to effectively steward our precious water. Water is our 2nd most important life sustaining resource! First Nations people know that misuse, overuse and pollution of water will be the end of Life!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Coquitlam, B.C.

Subject: OUR WATER

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:50 PM

Our water should absolutely be managed in the interests of Canadians. Obviously we share this precious resource, but foreign interests should not be swaying our governments ideals for bottom line decisions.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Nelson, BC

Subject: Sustainable H2O

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:46 PM

and accurate information regarding clean date, water waste, frozen sea water, corporate use of water, contaminants in bottled water ,etc.etc. and all cultures from the deserts to the rain forests creatures only survival is water. The importance of sustainable legislation regarding clean water surely is a given and not doing so is the ultimate of crimes.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Salt Spring Island, B.c.

Subject: protecting our water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:35 PM

Dear Sir/ Madame,

Thank you for deciding to update laws regarding our water in BC. I believe it should be protected because all life and good health depends on clean water. I would like to see an end to bottled water companies having more or less free and unlimited access to B.C.'s water. Only if the water can be taken at a sustainable rate should it be even allowed, and if so, then the fee should be high. In B.C. we really don't need bottled water, so these companies are really just creating a lot of waste and pollution for their own profit. Also, I would like to see the practice of fracking banned as it pollutes our ground water and also drains our rivers of fresh water at alarming rates. The whole LNG industry is an environmental disaster, from the pollution from the trucks used to pump and haul water to the removal of water from our rivers and rendering it toxic for who knows how long. I ask if any studies have been done on the amount of water that is being diverted from our rivers a!

and the effects of this on our ecosystems, from salmon being able to spawn to possible impacts on the wetlands of B.C. There should be a moratorium put on the practice of hydraulic fracturing until we learn the full impact it has on our environment and ground water. This type of environmental damage cannot be justified, even if high levies are charged. And finally, the 'run-of -river' hydro projects can also have a negative impact on the environment. Companies are diverting and changing the flow of surface water and I believe they are not being monitored closely enough. Yes, we all need and use electricity, but much more can be done to reduce our wasteful use of this energy source.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I hope you will be guided by principles of sustainability and protection of our fresh water for the present and the future of this grand and beautiful province in which we are all so lucky to live. This natural beauty and abundance of fresh water is the true wealth of our province. We must do all that we can to protect it and ensure it is there for future generations.

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Personal Identifiers Removed

B.C.

Subject: Water is owned by people, not corporations

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:35 PM

Corporations are selling us water that they basically get free and are just making huge profits from it. Now other corporations want to destroy our water by using it to "fack" oil.

The water is ours, not theirs! We should decide on the proper use of OUR water.

Personal Identifiers Removed

North Vancouver

Subject: Re: Re-writing your government's "Updated Water Act"

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:34 PM

Unless the BC government again rewrites the "Water Act" to include the public's right to challenge the oil and gas industries' right to do fracking for natural gas on agricultural lands, First Nation's lands and other parklands, there will be a poisoning of the aquifers in the groundwater from the "cocktail" of poisonous chemicals used in the fracking process. This can only adversely affect future generations of BC citizens.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, BC

Subject: water for the thirsty

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:32 PM

Dear Sir,

Our neighbours south of the border, for whatever reason, are getting thirsty. It behooves us to let them drink.....but on our terms. We should reserve the right to sell water only from government to government, with no commercial providers. We should control the delivery by ship or pipeline with the right of refusal when our supplies are compromised. We should build the ships and the pipelines. We should ask a fair price and not be bullied (Columbia River Treaty).

Personal Identifiers Removed

Powell River. BC

Subject: Water legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:26 PM

Our water for personal, local and agricultural use must be protected from corporations like Nestlé. In fact I'd like to see BC legislate against bottling water in plastic, period. Nestlé and other corporations, commercial companies seek to profit from a basic human, as well as flora, fauna need. This does not fit my idea of what is appropriate, fair, or moral.

Also, our watersheds, and all water needs to be protected from pollution from chemical fertilizers, pesticides, fossil fuels., nuclear waste, all toxins that unbalance ecosystems, cause cancer, and other illnesses, and have effects on procreation of humans, animals and plants.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Courtenay, BC

Subject: Water Legislation changes in BC

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:25 PM

How does the new Act prioritize water licences?

The new proposal has retained the First in Time, First in Right (FITFIR) model of prioritizing water licences. While the proposal justifies retaining the model as something that is convenient, the model severely limits the ability for local planning and stewardship of watersheds. How can a community develop and prioritize water use on a watershed if an industrial user holds a licence with the highest priority?

While the proposal is providing some tools for periods of water scarcity - where household use and environmental needs can be prioritized - it does not allow for community planning in order to proactively avoid periods of water scarcity.

Furthermore, the FITFIR model does not allow for the prioritization of ecological needs and ignores Indigenous use of water, which in all fairness should be considered "First in Time." The Union of BC Indian Chiefs identifies the injustices imposed by the FITFIR model and the inability to reprioritize senior licences. "B.C. has controlled access to surface water through water licences issued on a 'first come, first served' basis. Historically, B.C. refused to record water allocations made to reserve lands, and in many cases, reserve lands have a lower priority than settler interests."

The privileges and biases of practices, licensing and laws established over 100 years ago remain with FITFIR rather than modernizing the allocation system to promote community planning and equity. Retaining FITFIR is a fundamental shortcoming of the current proposal as it prevents any means to prioritize water stewardship, Indigenous use and the public interest over the economic interest of providing certainty to licence holders.

Alarmingly, FITFIR is proposed as the model for groundwater licences, which will be introduced in the new Act. A new area of water regulation will not only inherit the flaws of the old model but will also create a gold rush-style licence grab by industrial users to get the highest priority licences. In modernizing the act, it is unfortunate that the early 1900s model of FITFIR is being retained and likely to promote the resource grab frenzy of those times.

There is no logic in assuming that the most senior licensees would be using water in a beneficial and sustainable manner or in the best interest of the communities that are dependent on the watershed or groundwater. There is also no benefit to sustainability plans or to communities when the more senior licensees have the most secure rights. This really only benefits those licence holders.

Localized governance models established with Indigenous communities should be empowered to establish and adjust the priorities of water use. The proposal document acknowledges that there is interest in a priority of use approach to replace FITFIR.

The justification for keeping FITFIR really seems to be a matter of maintaining the status quo, convenience and pleasing senior licence holders. These should not be the priorities of modernizing the Water Act.

Can treating water as a public trust resolve current limitations of the Act?

Water allocation must be based upon water as a human right, water as a commons and water as a public trust. Water as a human right means that every person has a right to clean and adequate water for drinking, sanitation and basic household use. Water as a commons would mean our watersheds are to be shared, protected, carefully managed and enjoyed by all who live around them. Water as a public trust means that water, including groundwater, belongs to communities and cannot be privately owned or controlled.

The new proposal suggests that because the public trust doctrine is relatively untested in Canada and because it would influence other areas of law, it cannot be considered at this moment. However, a great deal of traditional, legal and academic expertise exists with regards to how the doctrine can be applied and its implications for other areas of law. Furthermore, there are unavoidable and unresolved legal and policy concerns that can be addressed by adopting the public trust doctrine.

The proposal clearly states that Indigenous communities contest crown ownership of water. Furthermore, there was a great deal of concern regarding any commodification of water. Public trust doctrine could be used to designate the provincial government as trustees (stewards) of water as opposed to owners. As a trustee, the government cannot sell or commodify water but can promote a stewardship role to avoid direct conflict with proven and inherent title and rights of Indigenous people.

The Union of BC Indian Chiefs had made clear in their submission that “the Province does not have the ownership and jurisdiction over water where Aboriginal Title exists, and the proposed Water Act amendments continue with the province’s history of denial which is damaging both to Indigenous Peoples and cultures, and also to the waters and all life that depends upon the water.” By declaring water as a public trust, rather than owned exclusively by the crown, a collaborative stewardship model can be promoted through this Act.

Determining “beneficial uses” must prioritize public interests

The Act proposes to continue using a beneficial use determination when issuing water licences. The beneficial use of water must prioritize the public interest, Indigenous social and cultural use, household use and ecological needs. The public interest should be prioritized in all licensing decisions and economic use should be of lowest priority – meaning only approved when social, cultural, household and ecological needs are not impacted.

Not having limits on water uses per licence is a concern

While the proposed transfer of water licences through trading from one use to another has been removed from the current proposal, there is concern that there may be no limit to the uses of a licence. In section 2.3.1 of the proposal it

states that “the limit of three water use purposes per licence would also be removed.” This again, similar to market-based transfers, raises concerns that a licence originally issued for agricultural purposes, for example, can then be used for oil and gas or mining operations. More clarity is needed on what this statement is implying and licences should be issued for specific uses with some related uses being allowed. Having no limit to uses would suggest water licences would be carried with property rights with no regulation on use for those in possession of the licence.

Saline water not included in groundwater regulation

While groundwater regulation is included in the proposal, there are concerns about the exclusion of saline water. The proposal clearly acknowledges that there is an “assumed disconnection” of saline groundwater, shallower groundwater and surface water. Saline water use should not have a licensing exemption based on an assumption.

Does the Ministry of Environment have scientific evidence to prove this disconnection? Will it assess projects for these connections? The impacts of withdrawing saline groundwater from deep formations are unclear, and, although dependant on hydrogeology, a saltwater intrusion of a freshwater aquifer and groundwater drawdown are key concerns.

A study has raised concerns that the injection of CO₂ could cause saltwater intrusion of freshwater sources. The International Water Management Institute warns that “Saltwater intrusion is caused by changes in the natural equilibrium between fresh and saltwater, and could be initiated by increased pumping from a freshwater aquifer.”

This exemption appears to be an attempt to support the fracking industry, which is very water-intensive. Using the precautionary principle, even the possibility of impacts to potable water sources or other environmental impacts should be avoided.

Need for strict environmental flows requirements

Environmental flows are proposed to be considered during licensing. Without mandatory requirements for maintaining specific environmental flows, watersheds remain vulnerable to the decisions of government appointees. Rather than leaving the room for possibility of politically influenced decisions, the environmental flows should be regulated based on strict requirements established by scientific data. This should be required of all new licences and again the FITFIR model should be eliminated in order to make senior licences accountable to flow requirements.

Allowing for discretion in low risk situations requires clarification of the definition of low risk situations. A more precautionary and proactive stewardship model is preferable. All licences should be reviewed periodically for consistency with environmental flow requirements. Reviews after 30 years may not be adequate for all licences or in all regions.

More information on environmental flows is available from West Coast Environmental Law.

Who makes decisions on applications for water licences?

While the new proposal provides flexibility for different forms of governance, the issuing of licences remains with the Comptroller of Water Rights and the Regional Water Manager, which are political appointees of the Minister. The licensing process needs to involve more public engagement.

Decisions on the issuing of licences must involve the most impacted people that are dependent upon the watershed/groundwater sources and Indigenous communities. All applications should be publicly posted so that communities are informed of proposals and can meaningfully engage in decision-making. The Act must assure adequate funding is provided for local and Indigenous communities to fully participate in planning and regulation process.

Regulators and officers must make decisions with local communities, not just in consultation with them. Indigenous Nations must not simply be included as stakeholders. In both the drafting of this Act as well as in proposed governance models, the province must recognize that it cannot claim exclusive title to the land and must recognize Indigenous title.

Full and appropriate participation of Indigenous communities and the public at large must be embedded in the new Water Act as well as in the process of developing it.

New oil & gas use has been introduced

A great deal of pressure will be placed on watersheds due to the dramatic increase oil and gas development in the region. While this industry needs far more regulation of its water use, it is questionable to even consider oil & gas development as a beneficial use of water. There must be serious consideration given to whether licences should be issued, particularly for shale gas fracking, which has seen moratoriums imposed in many jurisdictions.

The Act introduces environmental offsets for remediation

Offsets have been promoted as environmentally responsible solutions to damage caused by everything from logging to CO2 emissions. However offsets do not provide incentive for the protection of ecosystems. In the proposal, environmental offsets are proposed as an option for remediation from dumping and debris. This allows users to essentially declare the areas they've damaged as sacrifice zones, knowing they can remediate another area. There is then no incentive to limit the damage they may cause in one area, knowing they may not be responsible for remediation in that location.

Offsets are primarily an economic solution to environmental problems in order to allow for continued economic growth. In order to assure the protection of water, users that do damage to a watershed or water system must be held responsible for remediation of that system.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria

Subject: B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits.

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:24 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits.

that is all....

Personal Identifiers Removed

pg , bc

Subject: Water sustainability legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:23 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits. A law that gives our communities and our First Nations the power to effectively steward our precious water. I don't think the proposed legislation fits the above criteria.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, B.C.

Subject: Water Act Revision

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 3:10 PM

Where I live, in the Okanagan Valley, there is virtually no protection for water reservoirs from development, right up to the shoreline. They've even taken to relabelling them as "recreation areas" and allowed motorised boats on them. Reservoirs and watersheds, especially in semi arid areas like this, must be protected with a complete moratorium on any and all nearby development (including first nations groups and existing cottages) in perpetuity. Water is taken for granted here, and developers have ultimate power, 2 things that must change before it's too late.

Personal Identifiers Removed

West Kelowna, BC

Subject: Waste of money and effort

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:45 PM

The new Water Sustainability Act is nothing but a boondoggle. It does NOTHING to save and control our water and is thus not worth the paper it is written on, which in all honesty probably cost more than what the province will get for "selling" the water in the first place.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Gold River, B.C. ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

Subject: new water Sustainability act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:47 PM

Please revise your act and not allow corporations such as Nestle to use ground water in our country and hopefully not in other .

Personal Identifiers Removed

lake country, BC

Subject: New water sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:52 PM

I just like to mention that if there are areas that need to be protected to keep a clean water source, that farmers can be forced (for compensation) to keep areas for this purpose. It could also mean that the use of chemical fertilizer and pesticides and fungicides would be prohibited. I'm a farmer myself and hope that we start being stewards of the land that are thinking of the long term benefit and health of our land.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Golden, BC

Subject: New Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:02 PM

Of all the resources that this province has, water is by far the most precious. It is of the utmost importance that we, as a province, as a society, ensure that corporations not only pay for the water they use, but that they use the water in a responsible way. This means every sector, from bottled water to fracking. Clean water is what keeps life going, not corporate profits.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Revelstoke, British Columbia

Subject: Protect our water.

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:34 PM

Hello,

Water is becoming more scares and we need to protect it. In a hurry !!!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Surrey, BC

Subject: New Water Sustainability Act r

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:01 PM

No person, agency, or business/corporation should be allowed to remove water from our aquifer without paying for it, and the more they want, the higher the price. This water belongs to the people of B.C. not to some business that is making a profit from draining our resources. Water is one of our more important assets, and must be carefully cared for. It also must be protected from any pollutant, and anyone who pollutes must pay fully for the damage incurred. Our fish are an important resource also, and must have their waterways protected and cared for, not messed about with. Public interests and accessibility must be protected and cared for - it's our water and our lives depend on it.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Williams Lake B.C.

Subject: Water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:44 PM

I am very concerned about the practise of Fracking in which millions of litres of our precious water resource is being used with each operation , water which is then polluted indefinitely. This practise will destroy our environment in ways we can not yet fully understand or repair and waste billions of litres of fresh water. Corporate profits and the economy are taking a higher priority than ensuring the health of our environment. This is wrong.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Surrey, BC

Subject: Water Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:08 PM

Hello, I have concerns regarding the current Water Act and believe some inquiry is in order.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Revelstoke, BC

Subject: Water sustainability

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:01 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits. A law that gives our communities and our First Nations the power to effectively steward our precious water. We need to protect our water from corporate free-loaders. We should not be using water to frack for Gas.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Qualicum Beach, BC

Subject: Proposed new Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:56 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest AHEAD of corporate profits, and ensures that future generations of British Columbians share the commonwealth of our Province's resources. Please make sure this orientation guides the crafting of the new Water Sustainability Act.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver BC

Subject: BC's Water Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:55 PM

Fresh unpolluted water is a basic necessity that only comes after fresh unpolluted air in the order of what people need to survive. The economy is not a living entity and it's health should not be considered more important than the health of the planet or actual living beings such as humans & animals. We are extremely lucky to live in a Country that is not over populated and if we don't pollute or waste our water and air we have two of the most important necessities to life. Please help save these very wonderful resources and prevent industry, corporations and the government from wasting, polluting or selling them.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Bowen Island, BC

Subject: BC's New Water Legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:50 PM

While the proposed legislation is an improvement over the current law, it's still business as usual when it comes to industrial use. B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits. A law that gives our communities and our First Nations the power to effectively steward our precious water.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:49 PM

You really have to think before letting Nestle just get away with taking our water. They will take and take and take. There must be some legislation to stop this company.

Also the Native population have a poor water problem. Don't they come first?

Water is going to become less and less if we don't manage it in a sustainable and mindful manner now!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria B.C.

Subject: BC WATER

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:47 PM

INDUSTRY NEEDS TO PAY FOR AND BE LIMITED ON THE CONSUMPTION OF OUR VALUABLE
NATURAL RESOURCE.

Personal Identifiers Removed

abbotsford

Subject: Rewrite the Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:47 PM

Greetings,

B.C.'s current laws do not protect our water from corporate freeloaders like Nestlé, who are able to withdraw as much groundwater as they like free of charge.

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits. A law that gives our communities the power to effectively steward our precious water. Without water there is no life.

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, BC

Subject: Water legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:44 PM

I am very concerned about the unlimited use of water by corporations for such things as fracking, settling ponds for the oil and gas industry, and exportation of our water. We need legislation that ensures the people of B C come first: every man, woman, and child in the province should have the right to access clean and safe drinking water. We need to manage our water resources in such a way that our rivers, lakes, and streams are safe for wildlife. Our seas also need to be free of pollution, and safe for salmon, dolphins, whales and all other sea life. Unlimited development is not the way to go. There should be a balanced approach to it, so that we can assure our children and their decedents have the same opportunities we have had. BC is one of the last remaining places on earth that wildlife abound. We need to protect our water in order to safeguard our future. Develop ecotourism rather than continuing to count solely on our natural resources that contribute to !
the destruction of our water resources.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Merritt, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:44 PM

The fees for water use that I have heard proposed are absolutely LAUGHABLE !
The revenues generated would hardly cover the cost of administration, never mind help curtail overuse.

Fees should be on a sliding scale so that the more that is used the higher the per unit cost gets. This might encourage farmers to switch to drip irrigation over spraying.

Exempting Fracking from this Act & regulating it under the Mines Ministry is a MASSIVE mistake. Failure to make that industry pay handsomely for the trillions of gallons of water that they use once & then remove permanently from the Hydrological Cycle externalizes the real cost of such wells. This makes the gas appear cheaper than it really is & delays our conversion to alternate Energy Sources.

A disaster all round as it currently stands I fear.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver BC

Subject: ground water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:37 PM

Get Nestle out.

Bottled water is bad for the environment. Period.

Personal Identifiers Removed

British Columbia

Subject: Re Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:36 PM

I have serious concerns regarding the huge amounts of water that "fracking" requires. This process supposedly renders this water unusable, and in a time when the world's fresh water supply is declining, this issue bears some very careful consideration and study. Has this been done in an unbiased and scientific manner?

I also would like to see limits set on commercial and industrial water licences. There needs to be strict environmental regulations, and follow-up of them.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Little Fort, BC

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:28 PM

Dear Government,

Please design our new Water Sustainability Act in such way that it safeguards our precious water resources from all pollution and guarantees free public access for potable uses for all citizens. Also please ensure that water is price appropriately and reasonable compensation is made for all commercial uses and that access by these users is balanced against other values that we hold dear, including our health and a healthy ecosystem.

BC can be a leader in water management and show the world how to prosper and use its water resources prudently or it can be a laggard, pursuing short-term economic gain at all costs.

Freshwater is life and is increasingly in jeopardy from human exploitation and climate change. We owe it to future citizens and the world to conserve it and to treat it with respect. If we don't do so our health, our economy and ecosystems will suffer.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Richmond, b

Subject: Water Sustainability

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:19 PM

Clean, available water is a human right. No business -- not Nestle, not an oil or gas company -- has the right to take that away or abuse it. The government does not have the right to give it away. Protect our water for the citizens of British Columbia!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, BC

Subject: water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:11 PM

Fresh water is our birthright & Life is not sustainable without it. A lot of people seem to be hard-wired for short-term greed & don't have long-term vision & practicality.

We are not separate from Mother Nature, we ARE part of Mother Nature. As She goes, so go we! I'm reminded of the phrase "Think Globally, Act Locally". I've been an activist all my life & everything I care about has been poisoned - I'm 74 & very discouraged. There's really no one to even vote hopefully for anymore. Money is our God. What about the Goddess?

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, B.C.

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:09 PM

Thanks so much for the opportunity to give input into the new Water Sustainability Act.

I believe that the Precautionary Principle should be used in making all decisions around water, since having clean drinking water is something vital to all of our well-being.

I would also like the public good to come before corporate profits. I also do not believe corporations such as Nestles should be able to help themselves to our groundwater free of charge.

I also feel that the impact of oil and gas extraction and transport activities that could impact the quality of our drinking water should be strictly regulated to avoid all chances of contamination.

As well, I believe that saline water should be protected as well.

Regards,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Nelson, BC

Subject: Water Protection Rights

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:07 PM

In the foreseeable future, certainly within ten years, people in BC will be fighting for water. Just because we receive an abundance of rain on the West coast, doesn't mean that we will have an abundance of drinkable water down the road. We need to act now to protect BC's water. We need to act on behalf of the First Nations and the people of BC. We need to act to withdraw the strong ties with corporations like Nestle. Do something now. Please.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, BC

Subject: water legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:07 PM

Changing BC's Water Act is long overdue and now is the time to protect our water resources in a manner which puts the public interest ahead of corporate profits. This requires a law which gives our communities and our First Nations the power to effectively steward our precious water for the next 100 years. We are in a time where water is the most precious resource of all. It must not be squandered by corporate freeloaders who are currently able to draw use and contaminate as much ground water as they wish.

This is not in the public's (or environment's) best interest and must stop. Also saline water must be protected as well.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Courtenay, BC

Subject: Protect our Water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:07 PM

The access to and use of clean fresh water must be protected. We can longer think of our incredible natural abundance as simply as a resource simply to be marketed.

We must act now for the future.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver

Subject: Need to protect freshwater as untouchable public good, not a commodity
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:34 PM

Clean freshwater is an essential core ingredient to our ability to live on this planet. It must never become a commodity to be bought, traded and sold in any form for profit ventures.

Canada is one of the very few nations in the world with a sustainable share of freshwater. To preserve this public good in perpetuity freshwater must at all cost be exempt from human greed and changing governmental regulations. It is the responsibility of politicians to recognize the ultimate significance of freshwater for human life and therefore all of life on this planet and protect it at all cost.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Kamloops, BC, Canada

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:45 PM

Protect all residential water supplies from every threat. Place the interests of those living in areas of BC over those of corporations with only profits at stake.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver BC

Subject: water protection

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:04 PM

I think we really need to put some stricter rules up for who can use our water and why. Certainly not for reselling as bottled water. It's important and we should start taking it more seriously.

Thank You

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver BC

Subject: B.C.'s new water legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:02 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Spruce Grove, Alberta

Subject: Re-write B.C.s water legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:01 PM

B.C. needs water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits. A law that gives our communities

Personal Identifiers Removed

Surrey BC

Subject: BC's Water Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 2:01 PM

I'm all for the public interest ahead of corporate profits.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Abbotsford, BC

Subject: water in BC

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:33 PM

It's not right that companies like Nestle can take water from us however much they want, whenever they want. It needs to stop.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Lake Country, B.C.

Subject: Future water preservation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:56 PM

As a crucial public resource, the purity of water must be protected from industrial pollution and its use must remain under public control, not available for private corporations to make a profit. This is just common sense. Fracking or any other disruption of the earth is a threat to the sustainability of our water systems and should not even be considered.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver, BC

Subject: BC Water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:55 PM

Stop the give-away

Personal Identifiers Removed

Personal Identifiers Removed

Pitt Meadows, BC

Subject: BC Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:55 PM

Hi there,

you are water we are water. what will we do without water. if we keep going the way we are going giving it away to major corporations and feeding corporate greed you can say goodbye to human life on this planet. don't think it won't happen its just a matter of time as to when it will happen.

We cannot keep going the way we are. Why do we feed Nestle's profit. Why the Frack are we Fracking the Frack out of our pristine ground water. This must stop. its not rocket science folks.

CETA must not happen and why are we trading out water when we won't even have enough for ourselves.

We can make so much more long term income with our tourism industry. Keep feeding the big corporations we won't even have jobs or lives let alone a country to have a tourism industry.

Its time to pull your heads out of your asses and to wake up and smell the roses and stop these acts of terrorism on our water and yes they are acts of terrorism what you are doing to the earth, this moment this lifetime.

Water is the source of all life. We can live without gas and oil but we cannot and i repeat cannot live without healthy nutritious uncontaminated water.

This is what I choose to happen with our new Water Sustainability ActB.C. needs a water legislation that puts public interest ahead of corporate profits. A law that gives our communities and our First Nations the power to effectively steward our precious water. We the people, the majority, not you, the minority.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Pemberton, BC

Subject: Comment on the new Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:54 PM

The new Water Sustainability Act appears to be an improvement on the act from 1909.

One area I didn't see covered well was corporate responsibility to collect and use rainwater rather than relying first on the groundwater and surface-level water that should go first and foremost to households. In BC, we have extended periods without rain followed by torrential rain and then back to droughts; households and smaller local farms often collect rainwater and use it to compensate in dryer times, but I have yet to see larger businesses - from large farms to corporations - implement rainwater collection... and they're not going to unless the government recommends they do. Looking beyond our rivers, lakes and streams and the ocean is a viable option for preserving our water. Rain can do much more than green our grass. Perhaps this ought to be a stronger consideration.

Another area of major concern is the intertwining of water with the oil & gas industry and fracking in particular. I know that water is both a natural and economic resource, but it is first a natural resource and must be protected because it is essential for human, animal and natural life in a way that money is not; we will die without water, and we will die with dirty water. Please do not exchange our future - and it's an immediate future, not a distant one - for the extremely short-term gain of millions of dollars.

Thank you for working to improve the sustainability of our water - without giving corporations more than the households of your citizens.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Victoria, BC

Subject: water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:53 PM

People/individuals not corporations MUST be the priority of all Government agencies. DON'T let corporations spoil/waste our fress water supply NEVER. Protect the rights of our citizens!!!

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver, BC

Subject: Water rights

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:53 PM

No fresh water should be sold to be used in any industry for things such as fracking or any big oil companies. These companies have billions, let them build plants to desalt ocean water at their expense. Lives should always come before business. As for Nestle, this corporate giant is only leading the way in stripping our most precious natural resource. It is unthinkable that our government allows them to take our water, bottle it and sell it back to us. Are we not poisoning the earth enough with plastic bottles? I am tired of the corruption in government and the murder of our country and way of life. Our water should not be for sale at any price. Period. Not to the USA either. They receive but don't pay. It is our fresh water and it needs to go to Canadians first. It is the life and wealth of the country. Continuing to allow the theft of our water will in very short order shut down our fruit, vegetable and grain farming, our raising of cattle, sheep, horses etc., and tumble!

us into a third world way of life. Our trees and natural vegetation will suffer or even die. The water returned by fracking will cause disease and death. The only ones to profit will be the top 1%. From what we have seen of how the majority of these people think, the earth is in for massive destruction. We will soon look like mars. Do they really think their children will thank them for that?

Personal Identifiers Removed

Logan Lake, B.C.

Subject: New Water Legislation

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:40 PM

Please - Our water is SO PRECIOUS. Please, legislators, recognize this and do whatever you can to protect it. It appears that that will take changing the 100 yr. old Act that doesn't "cut it" anymore.

Can you imagine waking up, some morning, and finding that we no longer control what happens with our province's water? NOT a happy thought!

Thanks!

Personal Identifiers Removed

B.C.

Subject: The Water Sustainability Act of BC
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:24 PM

Hello,

I am writing in regards to BC's Water Sustainability Act.

First of all, I would like to thank you for the work that has been done on this legislation. I appreciate all the research, thought, and work that must have gone into creating this comprehensive legislation.

Unfortunately, there are some issues that the Water Act has not addressed appropriately. If these gaps are not dealt with, our future access to drinkable water will be in jeopardy.

First of all, First Nations rights and titles must be respected. The Water Act is woefully inadequate in terms of consultation with First Nations groups. Let's avoid costly misunderstanding and litigation and ensure that First Nations constitutional rights are taken into account.

Another grave concern is that costs to private business for use of public water is absurdly low. It is shocking to learn that a company like Nestle will pay \$265 per year while making millions in profits. For a cash-strapped government, this makes no sense. Payment for use of our water should cover all water management costs at least, and should ideally create revenue that will ensure our water is wisely regulated for many years to come.

As well, it is disturbing that the Water Act may not apply to Oil, Gas, or Forestry industries. Particularly with the practice of fracking, which relies on huge amounts of water to operate, oil and gas companies must be made to pay dearly for water use.

The Water Sustainability Act is important to me because I care about our community's future. Water shortages have become major problems throughout the world, and with global warming now a scientific certainty, we have to do everything we can to protect our water supply. I find it very disturbing that our government may be short-sighted enough to prioritise short-term industry profits over long-term access to water for our entire community. But my main motivation for writing to you comes from my two young children. It is my duty to protect them from harm, and in writing this letter I am hoping that our government will do what is needed to protect future generations from losing our most precious and dwindling resource.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Chilliwack BC

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: water

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 1:11 PM

Hi All

if your are interested ...please charge more to companies using our water for resale. We are trusting all of you in Government to look after our natural world and our general well being. hopefully you have the strength and fortitude to do the right thing and what is right for the future generations.

there is a great interview with Chris Hadfield in the Macleans ,for October 14 2013 ... we should all read it...

--

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

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

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 11:39 AM

I'd like to express support to the Province in modernizing the Water Act. During this period when public input is requested, I'd like to emphasize 3 priorities that I think should be dealt with in detail. They are:

1. Apply the Water Sustainability Act to all fresh water users in the province. The Objectives in the Water Sustainability Act (WSA) must be enforceable and apply to all sectors and industries, with no exemptions for Oil & Gas and Forestry, as is currently implied in the Proposal. The use of freshwater for fracking and the outrageous contamination that results from that process is my greatest concern. Water needs to be valued at its true cost -- the shale gas business is not charged for the extreme environmental degradation it is causing. We are repeating the same mistakes made during the original oil and gas booms by ignoring the actual costs of these activities to the environment.

Ensure the Water Sustainability Act applies to all water users in the province by:

- ☐ Making Water Objectives be “objectives set by government”, meaning that they must be binding on all decision--makers, ministries, and sectors, including the Forestry and Oil and Gas sectors;
- ☐ Including “beneficial use” requirements as an explicit component of the WSA Water Objectives; and,
- ☐ Requiring decision--makers to mandate monitoring and reporting of usage.

2. Protect water for communities and nature.

Our new Water Sustainability Act (WSA) must protect water for the environment. Environmental flows are critical to healthy functioning watersheds and must be clearly prioritized over other non--essential human uses. The WSA must explicitly set aside an ecological reserve that is not available for any use other than the conservation and maintenance of fish habitat and preservation of the natural ecosystem. As well, the definition of “Beneficial use” and how it will be applied is not clearly defined in the Proposal. An improved definition that encompasses a broader set of community, social and environmental benefits (for example, water for fish, drinking water, First Nations purposes, etc.) is required, so that license holders understand they are not gaining a property right, but rather using a public resource that they must steward with care.

The Water Sustainability Act must protect “water for communities and nature”, by:

- ☐ Legally establishing standards (not guidelines) for environmental flow needs and critical environmental flow protections;
- ☐ Applying environmental flow needs to both new licenses and existing surface water licenses where water is insufficient to meet ecological needs;
- ☐ Defining “beneficial use” to include environmental flow needs and requirements so that all new license applicants meet a minimum standard of conservation in order to qualify for a license, regardless of whether the environmental flow needs threshold is being approached;
- ☐ Incorporating environmental flow needs into Water Objectives;

☐ Introducing a modern, flexible water allocation system (i.e. do not rely exclusively on “First in time, first in right”), that embeds water as a Public Trust, in order to ensure that legal protections exist for fresh water across the province for future generations; and,

☐ Ensuring licenses are reviewed within a shorter timeframe than outlined in the Proposal so that they reflect improved understanding of actual stream flows, aquifer levels and/or changing hydrology. A tiered review process should be used: within next 5 years licenses 50 years older or more are reviewed; within the next 10 years licenses 30 years and older are reviewed; and all other existing (and new) licenses are reviewed 20 years from their priority.

3. : Involve the public in decisions that affect local watersheds.

The commitment to shared governance in local watersheds outlined in the Proposal is a positive step toward recognizing the important role that most directly affected communities can play in local decision--making. The Province must continue to play a leadership role in establishing priorities and setting minimum standards that are to be achieved under new watershed governance arrangements.

The Water Sustainability Act must ensure a greater role for public in decision--making by:

☐ Explicitly including local watershed governance arrangements in the list of possible decision--makers under the Act;

☐ Ensuring designation of local watershed governance arrangements, and that approvals of Water Sustainability Plans undertaken through local governance arrangements are done through an independent, non--political process based on clear accountability and representation criteria;

☐ Enabling local watershed governance arrangements to access sufficient resources to execute activities through, for example, a pool of funds from water--use royalties, or a delegated taxing authority;

☐ Supporting provincial pilot projects that can test a range of watershed management approaches and decision--making functions; and,

☐ Including provisions for public notice of applications, and where appropriate public hearings, as well as the right of any resident of BC to object prior to license issuance, and the ability of the public to appeal the granting of a license.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Williams Lake, BC

Subject: Re: My 85 cents on the Water Sustainability Act
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Polak, Mary ENV:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 4:09 PM

Dear Ms Polak,

I honestly could not put it better myself. I whole heartedly agree with what ***Personal Identifiers Removed*** is saying.

And to that I will simply add this - taking a step back is important. To realize that we have but one earth and water is required for life. This is not a matter that should be taken softly.

It makes me think - how can we even price something that is invaluable to our existence? Can we really come up with a price that ultimately means is OK to pollute our precious resource? Where do we draw the line? Should people really be allowed to pay a price to pollute water? Or should this be stopped all together?

I may not have the specific answers but there are a lot of very intelligent people who do and I urge you to talk to the right people.

Let us try to seek answers out side the standard box. We are at a time where we gravely need to be re-considering our interdependence here on earth and moving away from the old story which is one of individualism, and of separation, one of power, greed, and control - it need not be like that, after all - nature does not operate under those conditions and if she did we would not be here. It is about the great web of life we are all connected to, and a part of.

At the end of the day, what we do to others, we do to ourselves, as we are all connected. This, I feel, is a fundamental truth that needs to be remembered as we make these large decisions that will affect us into the future, for years to come.

We already have a lot of the answers to the problems we face - but it's about implementing the tools correctly, and ensuring that they do not have problematic repercussions, and it is certainly about seeing the bigger picture and story of why we are all here, and how we all connect here on this earth.

Thank-you for your time. I truly hope you can feel it inside your heart, and what it means when I say, we are all connected and what we do to anything else, we ultimately do to ourselves and, we can only be as strong as our weakest link.

Let us be mindful that what we are talking about here is water, our live giving, and sustaining, resource.

Thank-you,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Friday, November 8, 2013 10:57 AM

Good to see the Water Act updated at last, tho' some huge holes still need to be plugged:

1. It's all "mist on the river" until the Act requires monitoring/metering and public reporting of actual water withdrawals and discharges from and to surface and *groundwater sources in the oil and gas sector AND the means and funds to effectively monitor and enforce/penalize re. compliance under Water Act/Environment- NOT the OGC.*

2. Groundwater/surface water withdrawals for gas/oil use should all be licensed and LIMITED until we have a much clearer detailed map and understanding of aquifers here in the N.E., and long-term effects of fracing, lost materials, and waste water/fluids, and of water and gas withdrawal on aquifers and strata now and over next fifty years.

(We already have frequent micro tremors as strata crack and settle, and up to 90% loss of sand/water/fracing fluids in some plays.

What will happen as this area is turned into a pin-cushion in pursuit of "2,900 trillion cubic feet" of Montney gas?)

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Dawson Creek

Subject: Watershed protection provisions
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 7:51 PM

Re: Provincial Water Act, BC

Dear sirs/mesdames

I desire to register my concern that the Water Act ensures:

-protection of water quality throughout the water cycle, including groundwater, the smallest streams and catchments, to the sea.

-water diversions and flow controls be minimized.

-provision of potable and fish-sustaining water trumps all other uses.

- 'other uses' be regulated and effectually monitored to enhance rather than diminish the health of natural stream systems.

-anadromous fish rearing streams and lakes be inviolable.

-local governments have significant input and control over the watersheds in their jurisdictions, even to veto power, particularly with respect to the above concerns.

Thank you.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Personal Identifiers Removed

Halfmoon Bay, BC

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 6:02 PM

I am very concerned that the draft Act has not adequately addressed the costs of industrial use of water in the short, medium and particularly longer run. The public interest in sustainable water resources in the medium and long term have not been given sufficient weight, and the short run interests of Industrial use of water have been over - weighted. Stewardship of water is a critical responsibility of government - no one else can do it.

I am also concerned that there is insufficient attention to the need to leave scope in the Act for the potential impacts of land claims of Aboriginal people. BC has continuing necessity and urgency to address Indigenous Title and Rights to BC natural resources and need to be full partners at present, and have their interests safeguarded appropriately while these claims are being resolved.

I'd appreciate your feedback on these concerns.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Vancouver, BC

Subject: proposed water sustainability act
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 5:52 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I support the principles of:

1. knowing what we have (quantity & quality of water, both surface & below)
2. regulating commercial & industrial extraction of water
3. protecting aquifers from depletion and/or contamination

I am very concerned about the commercial extraction of water from aquifers for bottling without compensating crown for the public resource.

Sincerely,

Personal Identifiers Removed

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

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 12:41 PM

Encouraged after reviewing proposal.

Important points:

1. That the new act will replace the current WATER ACT.
2. While FITFIR seems a fair way to consider in place H2O licenses. Serious application of "Beneficial Use" must be used to support these licenses. Where licenses are in place and water is not used there can be serious damage occur.
3. If as is suggested under `Climate Change` expectations of heavy rainfalls could occur, we must look at opportunities for those who can, to help in dispersing some of the H2O. Co-operation both in excess and drought H2O conditions must be applied.
4. Agriculture must be supported with adequate water opportunities. Agricultural Water Reserves will be difficult in some areas of the province, but must be looked at province wide.
5. Consideration of available H2O in land use decisions should not impair opportunities either to the economy of an area or property owners.
6. Where costs for water use is applied, consideration of the ramifications must be studied. Costs should not be detrimental to economic opportunities or harmful to current water users.

It would appear that there will be significant costs incurred both to government and water users under the new act. It is therefore appropriate that a phase in will be used to ensure that the act can be implemented thoughtfully and thoroughly.

Thank you for considering this input.

Yours truly

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 12:29 PM

I find this a very important topic and I hope the Government actually does the right thing and protects the water the way it should be. I find it beyond belief that British Columbia is so antiquated in the idea it does not have to have stringent rules governing a commodity as important as water.

I live in Langley and am constantly amazed at what is allowed to go in this area.

Here are a few of my ideas:

- 1) The Act needs to be much stronger to protect base flows of streams (i.e. guarantee that sufficient water will be available for fish survival even in dry summer months) especially in areas like the Hopington aquifer where excessive withdrawals have caused the water table to drop a foot a year for over 30 years resulting in danger to the provincially important Salmon River. Withdrawals must be curtailed where they are causing problems.
- 2) Will regs follow in a reasonable time
- 3) More money will have to be raised from the users (higher rate for water) either initially or soon (I can see the rationale for a lower introductory rate with escalation over a reasonable period to time to allow users to adjust their operations) in order to pay for enforcement and rehab efforts
- 4) Will there be the will to enforce the act and the personnel in the field (as opposed to a lot of management and publicity but no one to do the work and a reluctance to take users to task legally and in other ways---the sort of neglect we have seen increasingly by DFO where no prosecutions happen anymore making the Fisheries Act a toothless tiger)?
- 5) Will the act have any traction vis a vis the Right to Farm Act since farming including manure and irrigation are a big part of the quality and quantity problems
- 6) Will the government reassure us that they are not going to download responsibility for planning and action to local stakeholder groups? If the advisory groups they talk about are going to assist in tailoring the act to local conditions that is fine but there is a real risk that any downloading by the province of responsibility will end up with users dominating the local groups and obstructing any progress.

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 12:16 PM

Unless the new rules under the Water Sustainability Act are strictly ENFORCED, there will be no teeth in this new Act and we will be back to the very outdated ways of protecting water.

Sincerely

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: sustainable water supplies

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 10:59 AM

Please consider my responses to a new Water Act that places the uses of both fresh and ground water on a more responsible basis.

1. Potable water by communities and Regional Districts that are not in control of their watersheds. Many of these communities and Regional Districts are the purveyors of water making them responsible for potable water, but have little control over the watersheds, or source water protection. Many industrial, farming, ranching and recreational activities are allowed into these watershed that place the water supply in jeopardy. This results in an unfair down loading of the problems to local government that must spend millions to provide water treatment. Clearly, source water protection managed by local and provincial agencies would follow the precautionary principle.

2. Related to the above, but even more broadly, would be the development of water sustainability plans (on a watershed basis) whereby First Nations, local populations, stakeholders and the provincial government follow a set of guidelines where source water protection is the highest priority.

3. It is a contradiction to have the Oil and Gas Commission influence the use of fresh and ground water supplies. The fracking industry must be encouraged (by increased rates on fresh water supplies) to use recycled water. Moreover, the burden of proof for contaminated water supplies from fracking should not lie with local populations affected. Large security bonds should be required of these companies as well as the responsibility to fund independent scientific assessment of water quality and quantities affected. Legal assistance for affected locals should also be the responsibility of the polluter.

Thank you for your consideration,

Personal Identifiers Removed

Personal Identifiers Removed

Roberts Creek, B.C.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Personal Identifiers Removed

Subject: Water Sustainability Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 9:14 AM

Prohibit the use of ground water for hydraulic fracturing.

Subject: Proposed new Water Sustainability Act
From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***
To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX
Sent: Thursday, November 7, 2013 12:04 AM

Personal feedback on the proposed Act

I have just watched Environment Minister Mary Polak's video on the proposed Water Sustainability Act, in which she invites everyone to provide feedback to the proposal.

Doubtless the Minister will hear views on our most important of resources from concerned British Columbians everywhere, so I will limit my comment to what the Province, through the legislation it proposes to put in place, can do to provide a greater degree of security for me, for my family and my fellow residents in the tiny community we live in.

As the Minister knows all too well, Metro Vancouver has for many years been trucking its municipal waste (as much as half a million tonnes per year) to the Cache Creek Landfill. The landfill, as is well known, is located within a kilometre of Cache Creek about for hundred yards upslope of the Bonaparter River, which drains into the Thompson River just a short distance away.

The available evidence strongly suggests that groundwater within and outside the perimeter of the landfill site is significantly contaminated by noxious leachates. The evidence, though less clear, also suggests that at least some of these leachates are entering the Bonaparte. Residents who, like me and many others, live on the banks of this river and draw water from it, have worried for years about the potential adverse effects on us of these contaminants.

The village of Ashcroft, too, has reason to be concerned, since it draws its domestic water from the Thompson River only about two kilometres from the point upstream where the Bonaparte enters the Thompson.

There is as yet no clear evidence that the suspected contaminants have physically affected any of the residents, but the worry remains.

One thing we should be thankful for is that Metro Vancouver is now thinking of discontinuing its practice of sending us its garbage. Indeed, thanks to increased recycling and composting, MV is now sending us only about half the amount of refuse it had been sending us until a couple of years ago; and, we hope, it will stop the practice altogether as soon as its contract with Belcorp ends in 2016 and its waste-to-energy program gets underway.

Needless to say, the Cache Creek landfill will keep leaching chemicals into the ground (as well as venting huge quantities of methane and other landfill gases) for years to come, but our hope, at least, is that things will not become worse than they are.

Things, of course, could become significantly worse if the Ministry decides to give Belcorp the OK to go ahead with what is known as the Extension, essentially another huge landfill that would enable dumping at Cache Creek indefinitely. If that ever happens, our worries about water contamination (among others) would increase accordingly.

I therefore urge the Minister and the legislators not to forget us, and our needs and worries, as the new Act is given its final touches.

Personal Identifiers Removed

Ashcroft

Subject: Water Act

From: ***Personal Identifiers Removed***

To: Living Water Smart ENV:EX

Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2013 8:54 PM

ABSOLUTELY NO NO NO to fracking in BC!!!!!! Period!

Sent from my iPhone