

De : Nigel & Sue Teucher

Envoyé : 9 octobre 2008 18:01

À : comments@suffieldreview.ca

Cc : pm@pm.gc.ca; Baird, John [NCR]

Objet : *****SPAM***** Proposed gas wells for Encana at Suffield

To Whom it May Concern

It has come to my attention that Encana is proposing to drill 1275 shallow gas wells in the Suffield National Wildlife Area. I am aware that Encana already has a number of wells in this protected area and as a result there has been enough degradation of the area to be able to anticipate what a further 1275 wells would do to the habitat. The mixed grass prairie is one of the few remaining prairie areas left, and the sand dune ecology is particularly fragile and vulnerable to compaction by vehicular traffic and the creation of roads and drill sites.

I have no doubt you have been given many arguments against the proposal based on scientific evidence.

My argument is that this area's name, the Suffield National Wildlife Area, implies protection by the Federal, and I would presume, also the Provincial Government. To allow further development by a powerful oil and gas company makes mockery of the laws surrounding creation of a protected area and the protection of the species within that area. The Species at Risk Act requires effective protection of the habitats that support those species listed under that act. However, without maintaining the integrity of the Wildlife Area, our ability to protect federally listed species that occur there is greatly reduced. The Ord's Kangaroo Rat and the Western Harvest Mouse are just two of the species in this area whose continued viability is dependent on enforcement of that act as well as that of the Canada Wildlife Act, which governs the management of National Wildlife Areas such as Suffield, and should prevent activities that will harm the species and ecosystems that occur within them.

I believe it is critical for the proposed drilling to be turned down to ensure continued belief in the ability of our preservation laws to do just that, preserve.

Please take whatever steps can be taken to protect this supposedly already protected area. It would be a shameful legacy to be the government that allows the precedence of granting a development permit leading to destruction of habitat inside a nationally protected area.

Yours truly,

Sue Teucher

<removed>