U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Karen Strange
[redacted]
Sauquoit, NY 13456

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Joan Maliniak
[redacted]
Thornwood, NY 10594

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Toby Stover
[redacted]
High Falls, NY 12440

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

carole resnick
[redacted]
syracuse, NY 13210

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Joanne Maloney
[redacted]
Callicoon, NY 12723

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Mazie Dardar
[redacted]
Montegut, LA 70377

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Ron Rattner
[redacted]
San Francisco, CA 94109

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Joan Conca
[redacted]
white plains, NY 10605

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Joels Wilkinson
[redacted]
Glen Spey, NH 12737

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Royce
[redacted]
High Falls, NY 12440

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,
Rebecca Liddell

Rebecca Liddell
[redacted]
Downsville, NY 13755

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Ann Pilcher
[redacted]
jamesville, NY 13078

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Haas
[redacted]
Phila., PA 19152

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Heather DaSilva
[redacted]
White Plains, NY 10603

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Brenda Lahm
[redacted]
Ceresco, NE 68017

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

john leaman
[redacted]
NY, NY 10014

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Steven Mason
[redacted]
Delhi, NY 13753

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Pragati Harde
[redacted]
Nagpur, ot 440022

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

John Hahn
[redacted]
Shohola, PA 18458

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

linda schwab edmundson
[redacted]
shokan, NY 12481

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

KRISTIN WALSH
[redacted]
Nyack, NY 10960

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

James Kinsey
[redacted]
Port Washington, NY 11050

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jill Maynard
[redacted]
syracuse, NY 13224

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Erica Hart
[redacted]
Hankins, NY 12741

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

judith dumitru
[redacted]
williamsville, NY 14221

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

David Barlup
[redacted]
New cumberland, PA 17070

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Silas Jackson
[redacted]
New York, NY 10025

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce Ferguson
[redacted]
[redacted]
callICOON CENTER, NY 12724

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Elaine Sperbeck
[redacted]
Little Falls , NY 13365

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Laurie McFadden
[redacted]
Cochecton, NY 12726

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Angelika Engels
[redacted]
Frankfurt, ot 60435

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Franz Sugarman
[redacted]
Trumansburg, NY 14886

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Eileen McCorry
[redacted]
New York, NY 10024

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Johanna Cummings
[redacted]
Rochester, NY 14620

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Allen Abrahams
[redacted]
Ithaca, NY 14850

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Danny Bowers
[redacted]
Long Eddy, NY 12760

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jed Schwartz
[redacted]
Woodstock, NY 12498

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL GRINNELL
[redacted]
SOUTH BOSTON, NY 14850

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Wilinsky
[redacted]
Callicoon Center, NY 12724

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

John Burke
[redacted]
Sea Cliff, NY 11579

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Megan Dunn
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11217

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Doris Kelly
[redacted]
Hyde Park, NY 12538

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Scott Gaeckle
[redacted]
Southampton, NY 11968

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Peter Herb
[redacted]
New York, NY 10002

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

G B
[redacted]
ny, NY 10012

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

glenna herz
[redacted]
fleischmanns, NY 12430

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Shirley Schue
[redacted]
Cherry Valley
NY, NY 13320

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Amy Harlib
[redacted]
New York, NY 10011

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Duke
[redacted]
Roscoe, NY 12776

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Carol Dobson
[redacted]
New York, NY 10023

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Janet Cavallo
[redacted]
Secane, PA 19018

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

jill wiener
[redacted]
[redacted]
callicoon center, NY 12724

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Reid Larimore
[redacted]
Cheyenne, WY 82001

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

George Koury
[redacted]
Olivebridge, NY 12461

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

RICHARD HORRIDGE
[redacted]
Callicoon Center, NY 12724

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jake Rubinsky
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11235

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Hartz
[redacted]
[redacted]
Fremont Center, NY 12736

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Schrier
[redacted]
Waverly, NY 14892

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Brad Walrod
[redacted]
Kenoza Lake, NY 12750

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

a.l. steiner
[redacted]
cornwallville, NY 12418

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Barbara Heywood
[redacted]
Barton, NY 13734

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Marion Kaselle
[redacted]
North Branch, NY 12766

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Giddings
[redacted]
Highland Lake, NY 12743

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Steakley
[redacted]
Dallas, TX 75206

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Eric schickendantz
[redacted]
akron, OH 44313

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

jill Amey leighty
[redacted]
pond Eddy, NY 12770

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Robert Fontanella
[redacted]
White Lake, NY 12786

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

terese schmidt
[redacted]
kauneonga lake, NY 12749

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Roger Norris
[redacted]
Highland , NY 12528

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Roger Jones
[redacted]
Sharon Springs, NY 13459

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Maria Asteinza
[redacted]
Forest Hills, NY 11375

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,
Joanne Corey

Joanne Corey
[redacted]
Vestal, NY 13850

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Donna Romo
[redacted]
New York, NY 10023

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

John Kastner
[redacted]
Rochester ny, NY 14609

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Anne & Robert Persico
[redacted]
Mount Vernon, NY 10552

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Harold T. Hodes
[redacted]
Ithaca, NY 14850

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Linda Reik
[redacted]
Youngsville, NY 12791

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to [illegible]

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Joel L. Bromberg
Narrowsburg, New York

Joel Bromberg
[redacted]
Narrowsburg, NY 12764

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

camille amadio
[redacted]
Callicoon Center, NY 12724

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jon Nedbor
[redacted]
High Falls, NY 12440

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Luis F. Sanchez
[redacted]
Bay Shore, NY 11706

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Sarah Mumford
[redacted]
Balloch, ot G83 8LB

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Dennis Schaef
[redacted]
Meadville, PA 16335

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Marion Stein
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11231

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Rabl-McRoberts
[redacted]
Windham, NY 12496

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Topar
[redacted]
Westfield, NJ 07090

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Keith Said
[redacted]
New York, NY 10025

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Veronica Steinheimer
[redacted]
Walden, NY 12586

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Charles Brainard
[redacted]
New York, NY 10011

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Natalie Hanson
[redacted]
Lansing, MI 48917

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless.

Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Kim Rasmussen
[redacted]
New York, NY 10025

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Kristina Fedorov
[redacted]
Maryland, NY 12116

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Adam Loomis
[redacted]
Locke, NY 13092

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Clark Pierson
[redacted]
Treadwell, NY 13846

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Larry Yoder
[redacted]
Wayland, NY 14572

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Gail Musante
[redacted]
Deposit, NY 13754

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

sandra conway
[redacted]
mongaup valley, NY 12762

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Catherine White
[redacted]
Brockport, NY 14420

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions

in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Fred White
[redacted]
Horseheads, NY 14845

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Reina Lichtman
[redacted]
[redacted], NY 10977

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

James Bochenek
[redacted]
Delmar, NY 12054

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Tony McCarson
[redacted]
Durham, NC 27703

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Joan Clements
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11215/2224

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Thomas Clements
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11215/2224

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Judy Rhee
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11249

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

len mackey
[redacted]
rochester, NY 14609

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Edward Norton
[redacted]
New York, NY 11375

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,
Briana Clements

Briana Clements
[redacted]
Brooklyn, NY 11215

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

manuel rodriguez
[redacted]
delhi, NY 13753

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jessica Paxton
[redacted]
Putnam Valley, NY 10579

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Beverly Harris
[redacted]
Lake Hill, NY 12448

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Helen Sacco
[redacted]
Germantown, NY 12526

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Art Hanson
[redacted]
Lansing, MI 48917

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Lenchner
[redacted]
santa rosa, CA 95403

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

A Hemenway
[redacted]
Woodstock, NY 12498

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Betty Vignes
[redacted]
Fairfax, VA 22032

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Bruce Gardner
[redacted]
Latham, NY 12110

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Erica Johanson
[redacted]
Hopewell, NJ 08525

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

John Nelson
[redacted]
Livingston Manor, NY 12758

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Steve Froehlich
[redacted]
Livingston Manor, NY 12758

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Marainne Wallin
[redacted]
Tillson, NY 12486

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of "natural gas." A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

FRACKING the American heartland, PIPING METHANE to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, & SHIPPING IT around the world IS NOT RESPONSIBLE CLIMATE POLICY. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Nancy Brothers
[redacted]
Callicoon Center, NY 12724

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Katerina Kreymer
[redacted]
Rochester, NY 14625

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Michael Kreymer
[redacted]
Rochester, NY 14625

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Irina Stepanova
[redacted]
Rochester, NY 14625

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Lidia Pidsosny
[redacted]
Accord, NY 12404

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Sandy McComb
[redacted]
South Haven, MI 49090

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Laura Tyler
[redacted]
Pawling, NY 12564

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Mary Thorpe
[redacted]
Van Etten, NY 14889

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Melissa Bishop
[redacted]
Deposit, NY 13754

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Amy Stoller
[redacted]
New York, NY 10024

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

William Henry
[redacted]
Clinton, PA 15026

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Ann Santarelle
[redacted]
Rochester, NY 14618

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Steven Swenson
[redacted]
Richmondville , NY 12149

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

anna wright
[redacted]
harpursville, NY 13787

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Ms. Stana Weisburd
[redacted]
New Paltz, NY 12561

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

John Petty
[redacted]
New Windsor, MD 21776

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

BOTTOM LINE: USING METHANE, AND FRACKING FOR METHANE, CONTRIBUTE TO CLIMATE CHANGE.
Sincerely,

Nancy Brothers
[redacted]
Callicoon Center, NY 12724

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Diane MacInnes
[redacted]
Deposit, NY 13754

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

David Klass
[redacted]
New York, NY 10011

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jerry Rivers
[redacted]
Roosevelt, NY 11575

[redacted]

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

debra kline
[redacted]
bradford, PA 16701

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

robert sand
[redacted]
jersey city, NJ 07306

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

m pappert
[redacted]
new york, NY 10014

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Arlene Lane
[redacted]
Statesville, NC 28677

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Rose
[redacted]
Cochecton, NY 12726

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Rich
[redacted]
Danville, CA 94526

U.S. Department of Energy (FE-34), Office of Oil & Gas Global Security

P.O. Box 44375
Washington, DC 20026-4375
US

Dear Sir or Madam:

The Department of Energy's report on life-cycle greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG is seriously flawed and unsuitable as a credible information source for decision-making.

On its face, the report is entirely inadequate, because it provides an incomplete and arbitrary set of alternatives for how Europe and Asia could meet their energy needs. Crude comparisons of regional coal, imported LNG, and natural gas by pipeline from Russia are meaningless. Obvious sources of energy that the report ignores include regional production of natural gas within Europe or Asia that would eliminate the need for shipping LNG around the world, the transport of LNG from Yamal (which is currently being pursued by Russia), nuclear power, and renewables like wind and solar—the 21st century choice that all nations of the world, including the United States, should be aggressively pursuing instead of creating a greater dependence on fossil fuel.

In addition, while the report claims to be a "full-cycle" analysis, estimates and assumptions in the report gloss over numerous real-world impacts:

• The report grossly underestimates methane emissions associated with the production, processing, and transport of natural gas. A growing body of research (Howarth, Ingraffea, Brandt, Miller) shows that actual emissions from natural gas systems could be more than 5 percent of total production, far exceeding EPA estimates. This discrepancy (particularly over the 20-year timeframe) undercuts any supposed benefit to LNG.

• The report discounts transmission losses by assuming that power plants are always located at LNG import terminals. Similarly, the report ignores all other industrial, commercial, and residential users of natural gas located far from LNG import terminals, which therefore contribute to transmission and distribution losses.

• The report relies on a limited set of references (largely related to coal mining) and does not clearly identify its source of data for estimates of loss related to LNG production, shipping, and regasification, as well as the basis for estimates of pipeline losses from Russia--much of which appear questionable.

• The report fails to consider the interaction between exports of gas and other energy markets—for example, the extent to which higher prices in the United States and a reduced supply of domestic gas will perpetuate the use of coal.

• The report acknowledges significant uncertainty in its models and overlap among the limited number of alternatives considered to erroneously conclude "no significant increase or decrease is anticipated in net climate impact." Poor modeling is not a reason to dismiss impacts.

Fracking the American heartland, piping gas to power-hungry export terminals for liquefaction, and shipping it around the world is not responsible climate policy. The Department of Energy needs to perform a much more comprehensive assessment of the greenhouse gas impacts of exporting LNG before embarking upon the rapid depletion of U.S. natural gas reserves.

Sincerely,

alina dollat
[redacted]
gouvieux france, ot 60270