

De : Tina Regehr <address removed>
Envoyé : 21 octobre 2008 16:17
À : comments@suffieldreview.ca
Objet : EnCana's proposal to drill 1275 wells in Suffield NWA

To the Joint Review Panel,

As a retired petroleum geologist who worked in Canada for 21 years, I observed the recent public hearing on EnCana's proposed Shallow Gas Infill Development Project with interest. I am strongly opposed to EnCana's proposal to drill 1275 more wells in the Suffield National Wildlife Area at this time. My objections to this project going forward are threefold:

1. EnCana may make more profit by producing the existing wells for as long as they are profitable. By then they will know more precisely how far out each well has recovered gas and therefore also know how much is left to be recovered by infill drilling. (Most likely fewer infill wells would be needed.) Drilling for that gas later should also make more profit, as the price should be much higher due to increased demand and decreasing supply. Additionally, recovery techniques may improve in the future such that the existing wells could be worked over to recover most of the remaining gas. Price increase will also allow EnCana to produce existing wells longer at ever lower recovery rates and they may eventually reach out far enough to recover most remaining gas without the need for additional wells.
2. Depletion of non-renewable hydrocarbons needs to be delayed as long as possible to allow time for development of all renewable energy sources to take the place of the non-renewables. Exploiting Suffield at a slower rate with the existing wells is consistent with this necessary concept. It seems EnCana's urgency is more about the time-value of money than ensuring the recovery of the remaining gas.
3. The Suffield National Wildlife Area has been set aside to preserve native vegetation and wildlife and therefore should be left as pristine as possible for the benefit of all citizens. The preservation of this habitat should be assured and not altered for the benefit of one company, especially if that alteration may not even be necessary in the long run as I have suggested above.

Although EnCana promises to be a good steward of the environment, I have concerns that government oversight is necessary to ensure that EnCana follows through on their promises. It was pointed out in the hearing that the ERCB would be responsible for ensuring that proper environmental standards are followed by EnCana. Recent examples of U.S. companies being left to self-regulate has caused a worldwide financial collapse. Thus I feel that environmental protection of the NWA will fall short unless there are ERCB representatives on the ground monitoring EnCana's activities on a regular basis.

Sincerely,
Don Hagen,
U.S.A. <address removed>