

February Email Submissions

Subject	Fracking review
To	HFReview; Karen Casey
Sent	Friday, February 28, 2014 8:48 AM

The prospect of opening up Nova Scotia--or any state or province--to fracking has so many downsides, it's hard to know where to begin. But in my mind, there's one issue that makes all the others moot points: There's no question that the era of oil and gas is on its way out, and all our efforts to keep it going are like beating a dead dinosaur. It may be true that natural gas is a cleaner form of energy than coal or oil, but the fact is, the fracking process itself, like the extraction and processing of tar sands oil, requires an enormous amount of fossil fuel. Instead of living in the past, encouraging the development of finite resources--ones that contribute to climate change and environmental pollution--we should be leading the way into the new era of renewable energy. The dinosaurs died out because they couldn't adapt; surely we're smarter than that.

Subject	Sober Second Thought
To	HFReview
Sent	Thursday, February 27, 2014 10:55 PM

I realise this will most likely never be read, or if it is, no one will care, but I feel that inaction is worse than no action. My name is Stephen and I personally believe that fracking, while regulated like all big industry, does pose just too much of a threat to local environmental systems and populations in general.

Lets break this down a little. First, unlike mining or pumping, fracking has an impact that goes beyond the initial site of ground break. It requires water, a lot of it, that must be removed from the local water table to power the process. Yes it is returned, eventually. Yes it is treated, when they are done with it. But what about the local table in the mean time?

Secondly, potential chemical contamination of said water. Yes some chemicals need to be added, yes some come from the process and the earth it's self, but what is the cost? The water is filtered and purified to a standered, but who sets that standered? Our Federal Conservitive Goverment has cut soo much funding to the sicences, who is there to make the proper, researched and informed decisions on how pureified the waste water must be?

Third, As a supporter of green energy I find it laughable the amount of stink and red tape a few people who do not want a windfarm can create, yet when a large percentage of a community comes together and declares they do not want fracking in thier area, you go ahead while barely listening? If a solid and noticable complaint can be made because one or two windmills are going to lower the quality of life for a couple of households, then I cannot even begin to comphreand how much power an entire community should be able to leverage against an invasive procedure like fracking.

And Lastly, from me myself, as a Canadian, and Nova Scotian and a resident of the North Shore of this province, I ask, does my opinion not matter in the least? Your statement asks us to site reassessed materials and published documents against a field that has many long term and unknown effects on the surrounding areas. There is not large amount of data from anywhere for this. All we have to go on is that almost everywhere in North America that has fracking, has issues with it. How can we open our arms to something like that? How can we, as citizens who live and breath and die here, welcome a procedure that does not have happy stories?

If you have read this I thank you. I love my community and my province and I do not wish to see this place (or any other) turn into nothing more than a way to make quotas and fill pockets, life is about more.

"May the light of Good Fortune shine ever on your face, so that the shadow of Bad Luck be every behind you."

Stephen Byers
Tatamagouche NS

Subject	Fracking , as a small business owner , real-estate owner and developer , I am totally opposed to cracking on the north shore of Nova Scotia
To	HFReview
Sent	Tuesday, February 25, 2014 3:10 PM

to fracking on the north shore of N.S. The destruction of the infrastructure and water supply is a major concern . Rural N.S. does not need this short term gain resulting in long term losses . Reg Forbes Pres. Forbes Bros Ltd.
Sent from my iPad

Subject	To register as a Stakeholder for the Review of Fracking in N.S.
To	HFReview
Cc	Mark Tipperman; marke slipp; keith@irvingmla.ca; johnlohrm@gmail.com; chuck@chuckporter.ca; Stephen McNeilLibLeaderNS; energyminister@gov.ns.ca; min_env@gov.ns.ca
Sent	Sunday, February 23, 2014 10:49 AM

Dear Margo MacGregor -

Please register me as a Stakeholder on your correspondence list. I am an Interested Citizen who lives in Wolfville, NS.

I have attended a number of meetings in our area about the Fracking proposition, and from everything I have heard, I am very much opposed to this process being allowed to take place anywhere near our area, or indeed, anywhere in Nova Scotia.

I know that at present there is a Moratorium on exploration, and on Fracking itself, but this is likely to expire in just a few months. I think there really needs to be a legislated permanent Moratorium on all Fracking activities in our province.

Everything I have heard indicates that the Fracking procedure uses up a great deal of water, causes problems about how to deal with the contaminated waste water when it returns to the surface, pumps toxic chemicals into the earth, can endanger underground water tables and hence affects the safe drinking water of both human and non-human animals.

The vaunted economic rewards which we are told could result from this activity are not really likely to occur, either. At a recent presentation by Acadia Professor Dr. Edith Callaghan to the Kings County Council, we learned that most of the 'jobs' that might be created by going ahead with this activity are at best temporary, not very well-paid jobs, like driving trucks full of materials to carry out the Fracking procedures. These heavily-loaded trucks would also have a destructive effect on our already-challenged roads, too. Professional, permanent, well-paid jobs would not in fact go to local people, but would rather be filled by trained, experienced professionals from other areas, likely in the U.S.

The deleterious effects of Fracking on our landscape, local agriculture, tourism, and other aspects of our local lifestyle which are highly valued by local residents, are simply not tolerable to most, simply to generate short-term profits for the fossil fuel industry. We should be assiduously searching for ways to encourage everyone to cut back on their use of planet-destroying fossil fuels like shale gas, and others, rather than ripping up what is left of our relatively pristine Nova Scotia environment to access a little more of what we should be trying to wean ourselves off of!

Please recommend to the Provincial Government that a permanent Moratorium on shale gas fracturing is what is very much needed in this province, and that most Nova Scotia residents who are aware of this issue would most strongly agree.

Respectfully,

-Michaele Kustudic 6-21 King Street Wolfville, Nova Scotia B4P1K4 (902)542-3462

Subject	Letter to the Wheeler Commission on Hydraulic Fracturing
To	HFReview
Sent	Saturday, February 22, 2014 12:28 PM

Dear Dr. Wheeler,

I support a long-term moratorium on hydraulic fracturing.

Rob Assels
821 Hwy 6
Marshville, NS
B0K 1N0

902-351-1476

Subject	Comments for the fracking review panel
To	HFReview
Sent	Wednesday, February 19, 2014 10:21 AM

I am a chemist, retired from the National Research Council of Canada where I led a group concerned with improving the reliability of chemical analyses of environmental samples. I also led an international group sponsored by UNESCO and the UN Environment Program that worked to enhance the accuracy of chemical analyses of marine samples. In retirement I also volunteered with the Canadian Analytical Laboratories Association for about ten years as an assessor of analytical laboratory quality assurance systems and worked in this way with laboratories in seven Canadian provinces.

From these experiences I seek to advise the Fracking Review Panel that it is of the utmost importance that those permitted to undertake hydraulic fracking operations be required to completely disclose the chemicals and other substances they will be injecting.

In my experience, efficient and accurate monitoring of potentially affected groundwaters and other environmental samples before, during and after fracking operations will only be possible if the relevant analytical laboratories can develop and apply specific methods that can be assured to be acceptably sensitive and accurate.

It is also very important that chemical analyses be done only by commercial or government laboratories that have quality assurance systems accredited by The Canadian Analytical Laboratories Association.

With best wishes for success in the Panel's work,

Sincerely,

Dr. W. David Jamieson

W. D. Jamieson, PhD, P.Chem, FCIC
Scotia Chemical Technology
1074 Wellington St.,#604
Halifax, NS, B3H 2Z8

Tel: (902) 477-3720

Cell: (902) 471-3427

Internet: david.jamieson@ns.sympatico.ca

Subject	Stakeholder submission
To	HFReview
Cc	Barb Reynoldson
Sent	Saturday, February 15, 2014 9:45 AM

I would like to take this opportunity to both register as a stakeholder, as an interested citizen and as a resident of Nova Scotia, in the review of hydraulic fracturing (HF) that is ongoing as well as provide this written submission.

I have a number of concerns with the issue and process of hydraulic fracturing. Furthermore, I do speak with some technical knowledge as in my career as a research scientist at Environment Canada I worked with a number of hydro-geologists. My main concerns are:

1. Groundwater is a major resource in many rural areas, including Nova Scotia, both as a source of potable water and a water supply for agriculture, this is particularly true in my area of the Annapolis Valley (Rivard et al 2007) .
2. Groundwater geology is extremely complex and site specific. Therefore little or no general regulations can be used to minimize environmental effects, and particularly groundwater contamination.
3. While I do not know the specific proportion of sites where groundwater contamination has occurred, once it has taken place there are little or no mitigative measures that can be taken.
4. Do cost benefit analyses include the worst case scenario of contaminated ground water and the need to provide an alternate source of potable water, and the loss of agricultural production because of groundwater contamination.

So given these two points, first, the importance, complexity and basic lack of knowledge of and on groundwater resources, and second, the risk of the permanent loss of that groundwater resource should result in extreme caution in making a decision on approving hydraulic fracturing.

As a subsidiary comment it would seem to me that at the strategic level the increasing popularity of HF simply postpones the societal switch to renewable energy sources. As we know based on a host of other examples the more one delays investing in new technologies the greater the cost. Furthermore, the reducing window of opportunity in making that switch will increase the likelihood of poor selections.

Yours sincerely

Dr Trefor B Reynoldson

Trefor B Reynoldson

199 Wall St.,
Canada Creek,
Nova Scotia BOP 1V0

Tel 902 538 3389
Cell 902 670 9294

Subject	Lmitations of the Fracking Panel
To	HFRReview
Sent	Friday, February 14, 2014 11:11 AM

Please forward this message to professor Wheeler as I do not see his contact information on the Hydraulic Fracking Commission website:

Dear Dr. Wheeler,

I'm writing to you on behalf of the Canadian Federation of University Women-Halifax.

We are disappointed that only one of the nine panelists named to the hydraulic fracking panel is female.

While we understand that the representation of women in the fields required to study the technology and science of fracking is lower than that of men, there are certainly women in these fields.

Moreover, as some

members of your panel have identified (see Chronical Herald February 14), the issues involved are not simply technological. Even a pro-fracking commentator (Richard Gagnon) in the Chronical Herald on Wednesday February 12, said "I think that these issues [social issues that emerge from a boom industry], rather than the technical or environmental ones, are the more complicated and difficult ones that we should be addressing...".

Surely there is more than one woman out there who could not only address the geological and technical issue, but the important social/ecological issues that are likely to emerge?

Moreover, the geography and size of Nova Scotia means that fracking is likely to occur near habitation.

As a geologist friend of mine noted in response to a question I posed, "As far as I know, fracking technology was developed in the open landscape areas of western North America. Out there, companies have a lot of freedom for operation, and communities are typically small and scattered.

That is not the case in areas along the eastern seaboard...." Fracking, therefore, is a very different story in environments such as Nova Scotia than it is say, in North Dakota.

I and many others believe that consideration of the impacts on communities and community involvement in the panel are crucial. The Commission should be holding hearings.

Your sincerely,
Stella Lord

--

Stella Lord, Ph.D
e-mail: lords@eastlink.ca
phone: 902 477 0094

Subject	
To	HFRReview
Sent	Monday, February 03, 2014 3:52 AM

I understand that the Nova Scotia government is conducting a review of hydraulic fracturing and that the review is independent of government and is chaired by Dr. David Wheeler of Cape Breton University.

The current evidence surrounding fracturing is negative. Fracturing has polluted many private properties water supplies and forced people from their very homes. It has destroyed the natural environment where the equipment is set up. It has far reaching effects on fresh water supplies, due to the heavy use of water used during the process. This water has to be trucked in if not available locally. Fresh water is something we should not polluting to produce energy. Fracturing wells have a high rate of deterioration/cracking that then causes the leaking of natural gas into the surrounding water table. This makes the surrounding wells unusable to human or animal consumption. This pollution runs off into surrounding rivers and waterways.

Seeing the fracturing process underway from an aerial view shows the devastation to the landscape. Wildlife are already being pushed farther away due to habitat destruction caused by human encroachment. This is producing pockets of wilderness areas which separates groups of animals from each other and thereby weakens the species. The fracturing equipment dots the landscape like a cancer and spreads it's deadly pollution into the waterways and air. All these fracturing wells will need roadways. This cuts up and pollutes more of the environment.

Nova Scotia is fortunate to have an environment that promotes eco-tourism and fracturing will have a negative effect on the very things that bring people here. Our many lakes and waterways and the wildlife that inhabit them need to be protected for future generations. The government must act on behalf of not only the people living in the province now, but for all generations that follow. Short term energy development that pollutes is not a way forward. We are very fortunate to live in such a beautiful province that has all the natural resources we need to survive. We should be protecting and promoting those. We have had enough with dirty energy it is time for clean energy projects.

Our province could be a leader in organic food production and we should be building on our buy local programs. We cannot take chances with our clean water and soil for something short term. For once the natural gas is depleted so will be our water, wildlife and our very way of life.

Sincerely,
Joan Massey
19 Dorothea Drive
Dartmouth, NS
B2W 5X2