

De : Martha Munz Gue <address removed>

Envoyé : 17 octobre 2008 23:24

À : comments@suffieldreview.ca

Objet : Suffield National Wildlife Area

To the Suffield Review Panel and our MLA,

This is to register my opposition to further industrial development .i.e. petroleum activity, happening on the National Wildlife Area at Suffield. Some reasons that this area should be left as is:

1. The area hugs the major river in SE Alberta. All areas that are adjacent to major rivers and their tributaries ought to be treated with a great deal of respect. The natural vegetation there helps to preserve the stream banks, clean the run off from snow and rain before it enters the river, and provides shelter and food for a high proportion of the animal species that exist in Alberta. It is estimated that 80 percent of Alberta's wildlife live within easy reach of the rivers and lakes of Alberta. Any activity that compromises the land and vegetation in that area, also compromises the animal species.
 2. There are already hundreds (over a thousand?) of gas wells in that area from which the company is getting at the natural resource under the ground. Already there are spaces in the National Wildlife Area that have been compromised. Vehicular trails criss cross the area and where they are on hills and repeatedly used, the resulting erosion has stripped the land of its vegetation. The one area that has been reseeded and fenced off is not an example of exemplary reclamation. IN fact invasive species overtake the prairie species. Adjacent the service trucks have cut new trails, which in turn are eroding. The matter of service trucks scaring the prairie permanently is a serious one.
 3. I understand that the proposed gas wells would get the gas out faster. But the existing wells are getting it out anyway but at a slower pace. What is the rush??
 4. If all the money used for the proposed wells, and for this panel, were used for implementing **conservation** in the institutions and industries of Canada and US, there would be no need to increase the supply of fuel. Energy need can be reduced enormously through changed **routines and lifestyles** in our homes, schools, government, businesses and industries.
 5. Need for energy can be further reduced by using more **efficient** vehicles and equipment in our homes, schools, governments, and businesses and industry.

I am concerned that all the attention is on the National Wildlife Area, and in the mean time similar increase in numbers of wells in occurring on all the townships adjacent to Suffield (and on the rest of Suffield?) without any scrutiny from those who would slow down the greed for gas and oil. I am also concerned that the larger questions are not being asked as Alberta attempts to extract and export its rich resources as fast as possible. It won't go bad if left in the ground. We need to proceed at a much slower pace and focus on conservation lifestyles and fuel-efficient technology. Our families and communities will be healthier for it.

I am also concerned that the panel may be not in a position to be able to explore all the many aspects of the industry.

It would provide better balance if a second panel were appointed with representations from such organization as the Council of Canadians, the David Suzuki Foundation, Nature Canada, and the Canadian Wildlife Federation. If both panels presented their findings in the presence of one another, greater understanding would result.

Martha

<contact information removed>

Please consider the environment before printing this message.