



Conservation Council of New Brunswick
Conseil de conservation *du* Nouveau-Brunswick

Have your say on fracking in New Brunswick

*Conservation Council of New Brunswick
Public response guide | October 2026*

Context

The Government of New Brunswick is asking the public for input on the future of “natural: (fracked) gas development through an online survey.

The survey is available at <https://survey.alchemer-ca.com/s3/50640257/Natural-Gas-Development> and is open until October 23, 2026.

The survey falls short of providing a balanced opportunity for public input. It focuses heavily on respondents’ backgrounds and knowledge, emphasizes potential economic benefits over risks, and gives limited space for people to explain their concerns. It also does not directly ask whether the fracking moratorium should remain.

Below is a detailed review of the survey and recommendations for responding constructively and making your opposition to fracking clear.

Our review of the survey

The survey provides an opportunity to oppose future gas development in question 12 and explain concerns in questions 14 and 16. However, several features deserve attention.

- **Too much emphasis on profiling respondents and framing development favourably.** Much of the survey asks who respondents are, what they already know, and which review topics they prioritize. Its introduction emphasizes potential economic benefits, while question 10 connects natural-resource revenues with health care, education and infrastructure. Together, these features risk steering people toward a favourable view of development. The survey gives comparatively

limited space to understanding people's concerns, why they support or oppose fracking, and what they want government to do.

- **Demographic questions could be used to give some voices more weight than others.** Information about respondents' backgrounds, knowledge and affiliations can help government understand who participated. However, it could also be used to discount or undervalue certain responses. Everyone's concerns deserve equal consideration, regardless of their occupation, education or organizational connections. Government should explain how this information will be used and ensure it does not diminish anyone's voice. Question 5 is particularly concerning because labels such as environmental organization member or industry representative could encourage assumptions about people's views rather than consideration of what they actually say.
- **The term "natural gas" can make a fossil fuel sound harmless.** Although this is its conventional name, "natural" does not mean safe, clean or environmentally friendly. The survey should clearly identify it as a fossil fuel made mostly of methane and specify when development would involve fracking. People deserve clear language about what is being proposed and its risks.
- **Question 10 connects resource revenues with valued public services.** It asks about natural resources generally, rather than the benefits and costs of fracked gas specifically. Supporting health care, education or resource revenues does not mean supporting fracking.
- **Question 11 should give benefits and risks equal attention.** Although it includes environmental protection, public health, climate impacts and long-term economic risks, several choices explicitly emphasize benefits, including jobs, government revenues, community benefits and energy security. Risks are less clearly stated. A balanced question would also identify potential water contamination, health impacts, risks to local communities, subsidies, health care costs, environmental damage, cleanup liabilities and impacts on other local industries.
- **The survey does not directly ask whether the hydraulic fracturing moratorium should remain.** Question 12 asks about future fracked gas development broadly. Use the written responses to make your position on fracking and the moratorium explicit.
- **Question 13 should explicitly ask about both benefits and risks.** It includes environmental, health and community impacts, but its economic option focuses only on potential jobs, investment and government revenues. It should also identify financial risks, including the use of tax dollars for subsidies, infrastructure, regulation, cleanup and costs related to health impacts and environmental damage. Risks to local communities and other industries also deserve clear attention. Climate impacts should have a separate option.
- **Indigenous and treaty rights are missing from key choices.** Neither question 11 nor question 13 offers a specific choice for these rights, although the introduction identifies First Nations rights as a review priority.
- **Selection limits restrict what people can communicate.** Choosing only three review priorities or four information priorities does not mean the remaining issues are unimportant.
- **A survey alone is not enough evidence to make this decision.** An open online consultation gathers participants' views. Without a representative sampling method, its results should not be presented as a statistically representative measure of all New Brunswickers' opinions. Decisions also require independent scientific, health, environmental and economic evidence. More meaningful public consultation and direct engagement with communities and First Nations are needed, with opportunities to examine the evidence, ask questions and discuss concerns.

These concerns are reasons to explain your views fully, including by email.

Suggested approaches

These recommendations are for people who oppose fracked gas development. Choose answers that reflect your own views and adapt the sample comments in your own words.

Choose the responses that best reflect your views and experience. “Unsure” and “Prefer not to say” are acceptable options wherever offered. You do not need technical expertise or a settled opinion on every issue to participate or express opposition to fracking.

Question	Suggested approach
1–4 About you	Answer accurately. Use “Prefer not to say” where offered if you wish. Avoid identifying personal information in open-text comments, which the survey warns may be made public.
5 Respondent affiliations	If you live in New Brunswick, select “Resident of New Brunswick.” Leave the other choices unselected as disclosing additional affiliations could be used to discount or give less weight to your response. Your concerns should be considered on their merits.
6–7 Familiarity with gas development and the moratorium	Answer based on what you knew before today. Following the issue, attending meetings or participating in earlier opposition may inform your answer. Choose “Unsure” if appropriate.
8–9 Awareness of the review and existing Sussex production	Answer according to what you knew before today. “Unsure” is acceptable. Knowing about existing production does not imply support for expansion.
10 Resource revenues and public services	Answer according to your actual view. Choose “Unsure” if you do not know how important these revenues are in funding public services. You can consider them important and still oppose fracking. In question 14, explain that your answer should not be interpreted as support for fracked gas development.
11 Factors to examine Select up to five	Suggested choices: Protection of water and the environment; Public health and safety; Climate impacts; Strength of regulations and enforcement; Long term economic opportunities and risks. Alternatively, replace one with Other and identify Indigenous and treaty rights, risks to local communities, or risks to public finances, including subsidies, health care costs and environmental damage and cleanup costs.
12 Opinion on future development	Choose Strongly oppose if that reflects your position. Clarify your opposition to fracking and support for maintaining the moratorium in the written responses.

Question	Suggested approach
13 Review priorities Select up to three	Suggested choices: Water and environmental impacts; Public health and safety; Other. Under Other, write: “Climate impacts, Indigenous and treaty rights, risks to local communities, risks to nature, and tax dollars for subsidies, cleanup, health impacts and environmental damage.”
14 Missing issues	Use the short sample response below.
15 Information to share Select up to four	Suggested choices: Participation of independent experts; Publication of the evidence used in the review; Consideration of environmental impacts; Other. Use the sample below for Other.
16 Most important question	Use the sample below to request independent evidence, a transparent review and more meaningful consultation.

Sample survey responses

Sample response to question 14

I oppose fracking and want the moratorium maintained. The review must consider risks to water, air quality, nature, health and climate, respect Indigenous and treaty rights, and examine costs to taxpayers and future generations. It must assess both the claimed benefits and the risks. My answer to question 10 does not mean I support fracking.

Sample Other response to question 15

All the listed information should be publicly available. Selecting four priorities should not be interpreted as accepting less disclosure.

Sample response to question 16

What independent evidence justifies changing the moratorium? Independent experts must lead the review and publish all evidence and findings, including potential health care costs and costs from environmental damage. The government’s decision to reopen this issue, combined with the survey’s emphasis on benefits, raises concerns about bias. A survey alone is not enough evidence to base this decision on. More meaningful public consultation and direct engagement with First Nations are needed.

Send an email as well

A separate email lets you explain your concerns without the survey’s selection limits. State your position early and describe what matters to your household or community.

Send your comments to naturalgas-gaznaturel@gnb.ca. You can also copy Susan.Holt@gnb.ca, John.Herron@gnb.ca, and your MLA so they hear your concerns directly.

Suggested email

Subject: Maintain New Brunswick's hydraulic fracturing moratorium

I oppose fracked gas development in New Brunswick and urge the government to maintain the hydraulic fracturing moratorium.

Protecting drinking water, air quality, public health, nature and our climate should guide the province's decisions. I am concerned about water contamination, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and the long-term costs that development could leave to communities, taxpayers and future generations.

The review must be led by independent experts and assess both claimed benefits and risks. Publish all evidence, uncertainties and findings, including potential subsidies, infrastructure and regulatory costs, cleanup liabilities, health care costs and costs from environmental damage. Claims about jobs, revenues or lower energy costs must be supported by evidence.

The survey's emphasis on benefits raises concerns about whether the review will be balanced. A survey alone is not a sufficient basis for deciding whether to change the moratorium. Government must provide more meaningful opportunities for public consultation, including time to review evidence, ask questions and discuss concerns.

The review must respect Indigenous and treaty rights. Public survey responses cannot substitute for direct engagement with First Nations.

Please include this email in the review and explain how public concerns and opposition will affect the final decision.

New Brunswick needs lasting economic opportunities that protect the water, health and communities we depend on.