

De : Tina Regehr
Envoyé : 14 octobre 2008 13:58
À : comments@suffieldreview.ca
Objet : EnCana's request to drill more wells in Suffield NWA

To: Suffield Review Panel

I request that EnCana is denied its request to drill any more wells in the Suffield National Wildlife Area. Why should Canadians pay so that EnCana can break its promise? The Suffield National Wildlife Area was created for a purpose, and when it was created, EnCana agreed not to drill any more wells there. EnCana wanting to break its promise not to drill any more wells in the National Wildlife Area, indicates to me that the company wants it all, leaving nothing for Alberta's wildlife and the people who value it.

It appears that the "public interest" is going to lose at Suffield in more ways than one while EnCana only gains. It has been estimated that the panel's proposed royalties for natural gas will actually result in an economic loss of \$1 billion at current prices and not a gain.

How much more repetitive drilling can the National Wildlife Area, indeed Alberta, our groundwater, listed species, sensitive and rare native grasslands, and citizens take?

Repetitive drilling's cumulative affects have not been appropriately assessed anywhere, never mind in a National Wildlife Area and refuge for listed species! There needs to be a proper Federal Environmental Assessment done, without the bias of the ERCB involved!

I strongly disagree with the fact that the Joint Review Panel chose EnCana over the public interest by granting the company its secrecy request in 7 days, before consulting with interested parties and the public.

I request that the ERCB member is taken off the Joint Review Panel to remove apprehension of bias and unfair proceeding. Certainly, having an ERCB employee on the Panel is in conflict, when dealing with submissions that question the ERCB involvement in this Federal issue! I request instead that a publicly agreed upon representative from an Alberta NGO is put on the panel instead (and paid the same as the ERCB member is now being paid). Then, we might begin a "fair" process.

Sincerely,

Tina Regehr

<address/email removed>