

From: [Jean Public](#)
To: [Moore, Larine](#)
Subject: Fwpublic comment on federal register : lng should stay all in the usa you have destroyed the usa for htis gas - keep it in the usa
Date: Saturday, August 06, 2016 5:44:04 PM

no national lands owned by all teh citiziens of the usa shoudl be exported for the nations of the world to use our gas. keep our gas for americans. letting profiteers rent this land for \$1.50 an adre and destroy it is a horror. stop this export. jean publee jeanpublic1@yahoo.com

--- On Fri, 8/5/16, Jean Public <jeanpublic1@yahoo.com> wrote:

> From: Jean Public <jeanpublic1@yahoo.com>
> Subject: lng should stay all in the usa you have destroyed the usa for htis gas - keep it in the usa
> To: jeanpublic1@yahoo.com
> Date: Friday, August 5, 2016, 4:29 PM
> [Federal Register Volume 81, Number
> 151 (Friday, August 5, 2016)]
> [Notices]
> [Pages 51870-51872]
> From the Federal Register Online via the Government
> Publishing Office [www.gpo.gov]
> [FR Doc No: 2016-18652]
>
>
> -----
>
> DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
>
>
> Record of Decision and Floodplain Statement of Findings for
> the
> Lake Charles Exports, LLC Application To Export Liquefied
> Natural Gas
> to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries
>
> AGENCY: Office of Fossil Energy, Department of Energy.
>
> ACTION: Record of decision.
>
>
> -----
>
> SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) announces its
> decision in
> Lake Charles Exports, LLC (LCE), DOE/FE Docket No.
> 11-59-LNG, to issue
> DOE/FE Order No. 3324-A, granting final long-term, multi
> contract
> authorization for LCE to engage in the export of
> domestically produced

> liquefied natural gas (LNG) from the Lake Charles Terminal
> located in
> Lake Charles, Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana (Terminal), in a
> volume
> equivalent to 730 Bcf/yr of natural gas for a term of 20
> years. LCE is
> seeking to export LNG from the Terminal to countries with
> which the
> United States has not entered into a free trade agreement
> (FTA) that
> requires national treatment for trade in natural gas, and
> with which
> trade is not prohibited by U.S. law or policy (non-FTA
> countries).
> Order No. 3324-A is issued under section 3 of the Natural
> Gas Act (NGA)
> \1\ and 10 CFR part 590 of DOE's regulations.\2\ DOE
> participated as a
> cooperating agency with the Federal Energy Regulatory
> Commission (FERC)
> in preparing an environmental impact statement (EIS) \3\
> analyzing the
> potential environmental impacts resulting from modification
> of the
> existing facilities at the Terminal.

> -----
>

> \1\ The authority to regulate the imports and
> exports of natural
> gas, including liquefied natural gas, under section 3 of the
> NGA (15
> U.S.C. 717b) has been delegated to the Assistant Secretary
> for FE in
> Redelegation Order No. 00-006.02 issued on November 17,
> 2014.
> \2\ 10 CFR part 590 (2012).
> \3\ Federal Energy Regulatory Commission,
> Final Environmental
> Impact Statement for the Lake Charles Liquefaction Project,
> Docket
> Nos. CP14-119-000, CP14-120-000, and CP14-122-000 (Aug.
> 2015).

>
> ADDRESSES: The EIS and this Record of Decision (ROD) are
> available on
> DOE's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Web site at:
> <http://energy.gov/nepa/nepa-documents>.
> Order No. 3324-A is available on DOE/
> FE's Web site at:
> http://www.fossil.energy.gov/programs/gasregulation/authorizations/2011_applications/lake_charles_exports.html.
> For
> additional information about the docket in these
> proceedings, contact
> Larine Moore, U.S. Department of Energy, Office of
> Regulation and
> International Engagement, Office of Oil and Natural Gas,
> Office of

> Fossil Energy, Room 3E-042, 1000 Independence Avenue SW.,
> Washington,
> -----
> DC 20585.
>
> FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: To obtain additional
> information about
> the EIS or the ROD, contact Mr. Kyle W. Moorman, U.S.
> Department of
> Energy (FE-34), Office of Regulation and International
> Engagement,
> Office of Oil and Natural Gas, Office of Fossil Energy, Room
> 3E-042,
> 1000 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202)
> 586-5600, or
> Mr. Edward Le Duc, U.S. Department of Energy (GC-51), Office
> of the
> Assistant General Counsel for Environment, 1000 Independence
> Avenue
> SW., Washington, DC 20585.
>
> SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: DOE prepared this ROD and
> Floodplain
> Statement of Findings pursuant to the National Environmental
> Policy Act
> of 1969 (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] 4321, et seq.), and
> in
> compliance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)
> implementing
> regulations for NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR]
> parts 1500
> through 1508), DOE's implementing procedures for NEPA (10
> CFR part
> 1021), and DOE's "Compliance with Floodplain and Wetland
> Environmental
> Review Requirements" (10 CFR part 1022).
>
> Background
>
> LCE is a Delaware limited liability company
> with its principal
> place of business in Houston, Texas. In a Notice of Change
> in Control
> recently submitted to DOE/FE,⁴ LCE states that, on
> February 15, 2016,
> Royal Dutch Shell, plc (Shell) acquired all of the share
> capital of BG
> Group plc (BG). Prior to the transaction, LCE was owned by
> subsidiaries
> of BG and Energy Transfer Equity, L.P. (ETE), and LCE's
> affiliate, BG
> LNG Services, LLC (BGLS), was an indirect subsidiary of BG.
> As a result
> of the transaction, LCE is now owned by subsidiaries of
> Shell and ETE
> ⁵ and BGLS is now an indirect wholly-owned subsidiary of
> Shell.

> According to LCE, LCE will remain the authorization holder
> for its
> existing DOE/FE authorizations and/or the applicant in its
> pending DOE/
> FE proceedings.

> -----

>

> \4\ See Lake Charles Exports, LLC, Notice of
> Change in Control
> (Feb. 17, 2016) and DOE/FE letter responding to Notice (July
> 26,
> 2016) in DOE/FE Docket No. 11-59-LNG.
> \5\ DOE/FE takes administrative notice that
> Shell is a public
> limited company incorporated in the United Kingdom and
> headquartered
> in the Netherlands. ETE is a Delaware master limited
> partnership
> with its principal place of business in Dallas, Texas.

> -----

>

> On May 6, 2011, LCE filed the application
> (Application) with DOE/FE
> seeking authorization to export domestically produced LNG
> from proposed
> liquefaction facilities (Liquefaction Project) to be located
> at the
> existing Terminal in Lake Charles, Louisiana. LCE proposes
> to export
> this LNG to non-FTA countries in a total volume equivalent
> to 730
> billion cubic feet per year (Bcf/yr) of natural gas.
> The Terminal is owned and operated by Lake
> Charles LNG Company, LLC
> (Lake Charles LNG, formerly Trunkline LNG Company, LLC), a
> corporate
> affiliate of LCE.\6\ The Liquefaction Project will be owned
> by Lake
> Charles LNG Export Company, LLC (formerly Trunkline LNG
> Export, LLC),
> another corporate affiliate of LCE which is separately
> pursuing an
> authorization to

>

> [[Page 51871]]

>

> export the same volume of LNG to non-FTA countries in DOE/FE
> Docket No.
> 13-04-LNG.\7\ Lake Charles LNG and Lake Charles LNG Export
> Company are
> both owned by Energy Transfer Equity, L.P. and Energy
> Transfer
> Partners, L.P.

> -----

>

> \6\ In September 2014, Trunkline LNG Company,
> LLC changed its

> name to Lake Charles LNG Company, LLC. See, Lake Charles LNG
> Export
> Co. LLC, DOE/FE Order No. 3252-A, FE Docket No. 13-04-LNG,
> Order
> Granting Request to Amend DOE/FE Order No. 3252 and Pending
>
> Application to Reflect Corporate Name Change (Mar. 18,
> 2015).
> \7\ On Oct. 10, 2014, Trunkline LNG Export,
> LLC filed a request
> in DOE/FE Dkt. No. 13-04-LNG to change its corporate name to
> Lake
> Charles Export Company, LLC. Order 3252-A granted the name
> change.

> -----
>
> On August 7, 2013, DOE/FE issued Order No.
> 3324 (Conditional Order)
> to LCE, conditionally granting the portion of LCE's
> Application that
> requested long-term, multi-contract authority to export
> domestically
> produced LNG to non-FTA countries. Under the terms of that
> Conditional
> Order, LCE is conditionally authorized to export up to 15
> mtpa, which
> LCE states is equivalent to approximately 730 billion Bcf/yr
> of natural
> gas (2.0 Bcf/d), by vessel from the Terminal for a term of
> 20 years.
> The Conditional Order reviewed the record evidence and
> entered findings
> on all non-environmental issues considered under NGA section
> 3(a),
> including the economic impacts, international impacts, and
> security of
> natural gas supply associated with LCE's proposed exports.
> Because DOE
> must also consider environmental issues, DOE/FE conditioned
> the order
> on: (i) FERC's satisfactory completion of the NEPA
> environmental review
> process, and (ii) DOE/FE's own issuance of a finding of No
> Significant
> Impact (FONSI) or a Record of Decision (ROD) under NEPA.\8\
>

> -----
>
> \8\ LCE Conditional Order, DOE/FE No. 3324, at
> 133-34 (Term and
> Condition Para. H).
>

> -----
>
> LCE states that FERC certificated the Terminal
> in 1977 and the
> original construction was completed in 1981.\9\ LCE states
> that Lake
> Charles LNG has expanded and enhanced the Terminal through

> the
> construction of additional storage capacity, additional
> gas-fired
> vaporization capacity, an additional marine berth, ambient
> air
> vaporization equipment, and natural gas liquids extraction
> capability.

> -----
>
> \9\ Trunkline LNG Co., et al., 58 FPC 726
> (Opinion No. 796),
> order on reh'g 58 FPC 2935 (1977) (Opinion No. 796-A).

> -----
>
> According to LCE, the Terminal currently has a
> firm sustained
> sendout capacity of 1.8 Bcf/d and a peak sendout capacity of
> 2.1 Bcf/
> day. The Terminal has four LNG storage tanks with a combined
> capacity
> of approximately 425,000 cubic meters of LNG, or
> approximately 9.0 Bcf
> of natural gas. The Terminal's natural gas liquids
> processing
> facilities allow the extraction of ethane and other heavier
>
> hydrocarbons from the LNG stream.

>
> Project Description
>
> Among other features, the Liquefaction Project
> will include a new
> liquefaction facility consisting of three liquefaction
> trains,
> modifications and upgrades at the existing Terminal, and
> approximately
> 0.5 miles of 48-inch diameter feed gas line in Calcasieu
> Parish,
> Louisiana, to supply natural gas to the liquefaction
> facility from
> existing gas transmission pipelines.\10\

> -----
>
> \10\ See Trunkline LNG Company, LLC et al.,
> Supplemental Notice
> of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for
> the
> Planned Lake Charles Liquefaction Project and Request for
> Comments
> on Environmental Issues, FERC Docket No. PF12-8-000, at 2
> (Mar. 21,
> 2013), available at
> <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/EIS-0491-FERC-SNOI-2013.pdf>.

> -----
>
> LCE states that, following completion of the
> Liquefaction Project,

> the Terminal will be bi-directional, meaning it will be
> capable of
> importing or exporting LNG, and its peak and sustained
> sendout
> capabilities will not be affected.
>
> EIS Process
>
> FERC was the lead federal agency and initiated
> the NEPA process by
> publishing a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the
> Federal
> Register (FR) on September 20, 2012 (77 FR 58373); DOE was a
>
> cooperating agency. FERC issued the draft EIS for the
> Liquefaction
> Project on April 10, 2015 (80 FR 20489), and the final EIS
> on August
> 20, 2015 (80 FR 50622). The final EIS addresses comments
> received on
> the draft EIS. Among other resource areas, the final EIS
> addresses
> geology, soils, water, wetlands, wildlife, air quality and
> noise,
> cumulative impacts and alternatives.\11\
> -----
>

> \11\ See Final EIS at 1-10, Table 1.3-1 Key
> Environmental
> Concerns Identified During the Scoping Process for the Lake
> Charles
> Liquefaction Project.
> -----
>

> The final EIS recommended that FERC subject
> any approval of LCE's
> proposed Liquefaction Project to 96 conditions to reduce the
>
> environmental impacts that would otherwise result from the
> construction
> and operation of the project. On December 17, 2015, FERC
> issued an
> Order Granting Section 3 and Section 7 Authorizations and
> Approving
> Abandonment (FERC Order),\12\ which authorized Lake Charles
> LNG to
> site, construct, and operate the Lake Charles Liquefaction
> Project,
> subject to 95 of the 96 environmental conditions in Appendix
> B of that
> Order.
> -----
>

> \12\ Trunkline Gas Co., LLC, et al., Order
> Granting Section 3
> and Section 7 Authorizations and Approving Abandonment, 153
> FERC]

> 61,300 (Dec. 17, 2015).

> -----

>

> In accordance with 40 CFR 1506.3, after an
> independent review of
> FERC's final EIS, DOE/FE adopted FERC's final EIS for the
> Lake Charles
> Liquefaction Project (DOE/EIS-0491), and the U.S.
> Environmental
> Protection Agency published a notice of the adoption on July
> 15, 2016
> (81 FR 46077).

>

> Addendum to Environmental Review Documents Concerning
> Exports of
> Natural Gas From the United States (Addendum)

>

> On June 4, 2014, DOE/FE published the Draft
> Addendum to
> Environmental Review Documents Concerning Exports of Natural
> Gas From
> the United States (Draft Addendum) for public comment (79 FR
> 32258).

> The purpose of this review was to provide additional
> information to the
> public concerning the potential environmental impacts of
> unconventional
> natural gas exploration and production activities, including
> hydraulic
> fracturing. Although not required by NEPA, DOE/FE prepared
> the Addendum
> in an effort to be responsive to the public and to provide
> the best
> information available on a subject that had been raised by
> commenters
> in this and other LNG export proceedings.

> The 45-day comment period on the Draft
> Addendum closed on July 21,
> 2014. DOE/FE received 40,745 comments in 18 separate
> submissions, and
> considered those comments in issuing the Final Addendum on
> August 15,
> 2014. DOE provided a summary of the comments received and
> responses to
> substantive comments in Appendix B of the Addendum. DOE/FE
> has
> incorporated the Draft Addendum, comments, and Final
> Addendum into the
> record in this proceeding.

>

> Alternatives

>

> The EIS assessed alternatives that could
> achieve the Liquefaction
> Project objectives. The range of alternatives analyzed
> included the No-
> Action Alternative, system alternatives, pipeline system

> alternatives,
> alternative liquefaction facility sites, alternative
> terminal
> configurations, alternative aboveground facility sites for
> pipeline
> expansion, and alternative power sources. Alternatives were
> evaluated
> and compared to the Lake Charles Liquefaction Project to
> determine if
> the alternatives were environmentally preferable.
> Under the No-Action Alternative, the
> Liquefaction Project would not
> be developed. Additionally, the potential adverse and
> beneficial
> environmental impacts discussed within the EIS would not
> occur.
> Furthermore, this alternative could also require that
> potential end-
> users make different arrangements to obtain natural gas
> services, use
> other fossil fuel energy sources (e.g. coal or
>
> [[Page 51872]]
>
> fuel oil), or possibly use traditional long-term energy
> sources (e.g.
> nuclear power) and/or renewable energy sources to compensate
> for lack
> of natural gas that would otherwise come from the supplies
> produced by
> the Liquefaction Project.
> The EIS evaluated system alternatives for the
> Liquefaction Project,
> including six operating LNG import terminals in the Gulf of
> Mexico
> area, and several proposed or planned export projects along
> the Gulf
> Coast. All of the system alternatives were eliminated from
> further
> consideration for reasons that include the need for
> substantial
> construction beyond that currently proposed, production
> volume
> limitations, in-service dates scheduled significantly beyond
> LCE's
> commitments to its customers, and potential environmental
> impacts that
> were considered comparable to or greater than those of the
> Liquefaction
> Project.
> The EIS evaluated three pipeline system
> alternatives for the
> Liquefaction Project. In order to be a viable pipeline
> system
> alternative, the alternative system would have to transport
> all or a
> part of the volume of natural gas required for liquefaction

> at the
> proposed new facility and cause significantly less impact on
> the
> environment. Additionally, a legitimate pipeline alternative
> must
> either connect directly to the proposed facility or to the
> existing
> pipeline system. Each of the three alternatives pipeline
> systems
> considered would require significant expansions in their
> looping and
> compression capabilities to achieve the necessary delivery
> capacity and
> require the construction of new segments to connect directly
> with the
> liquefaction facility. The construction associated with the
>
> alternatives, including significantly increasing pipeline
> looping
> capability or expansion, would result in environmental
> impacts equal to
> or greater than the proposed pipeline system. As a result,
> none of the
> three proposed pipeline alternatives would provide a
> significant
> environmental advantage over the existing and proposed
> pipeline system.
> The EIS evaluated five Liquefaction Project
> sites (including the
> current proposed site), all within relative close proximity
> to the
> existing Terminal. Construction of the Terminal at each of
> the
> alternative sites would have greater environmental impacts
> when
> compared to the proposed Terminal site; therefore, none of
> the four
> other sites evaluated were determined to be environmentally
> preferred.
> For the Liquefaction Project configuration
> (e.g. siting for
> components such as liquefaction trains, pretreatment units
> and pipeline
> connections), the EIS considered the use, design, and
> configuration
> subject to the requirements of 49 CFR 193 and other industry
> or
> engineering standards. The EIS evaluated factors such as
> locations of
> interconnecting LNG transfer piping, operational noise,
> vapor
> dispersion requirements, and site evaluation associated with
> impacts on
> surrounding wetlands. Regulatory requirements associated
> with thermal
> exclusion and vapor dispersion zones would require
> additional fill

> material to increase elevation at the site that will likely
> cause
> further wetland losses on the site. As a result, the
> proposed
> configuration was determined to be environmentally
> preferred.
> The EIS evaluated several alternative sites
> for the proposed above-
> ground facilities (e.g. one new compressor (Compressor
> Station 203-A)
> station and five new metering stations) for pipeline
> expansion. In each
> of the alternative sites analyzed for the facilities, the
> environmental
> impacts from construction and operational activities (e.g.,
> increased
> noise and air emissions) would not be environmentally
> preferred to the
> proposed sites.
>
> Environmentally Preferred Alternative
>
> When compared against the other action
> alternatives assessed in the
> EIS, as discussed above, the Lake Charles Liquefaction
> Project is the
> environmentally preferred alternative. While the No-Action
> Alternative
> would avoid the environmental impacts identified in the EIS,
> adoption
> of this alternative would not meet the Liquefaction Project
> objectives.
>
> Decision
>
> DOE has decided to issue Order No. 3324-A
> authorizing LCE to export
> domestically produced LNG by vessel from the Terminal
> located in Lake
> Charles, Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana, in a volume up to the
> equivalent
> to 730 Bcf/yr of natural gas for a term of 20 years to
> commence on the
> earlier of the date of first export or seven years from the
> date that
> the Order is issued.
> Concurrently with this Record of Decision, DOE
> is issuing Order No.
> 3324-A in which it finds that the requested authorization
> has not been
> shown to be inconsistent with the public interest, and the
> Application
> should be granted subject to compliance with the terms and
> conditions
> set forth in the Order, including the environmental
> conditions
> recommended in the EIS and adopted in the FERC Order at

- > Appendix B.
- > Additionally, this authorization is conditioned on LCE's
- > compliance
- > with any other preventative and mitigative measures imposed
- > by other
- > Federal or state agencies.
- >
- > Basis of Decision
- >
- > DOE's decision is based upon the analysis of
- > potential
- > environmental impacts presented in the EIS, and DOE's
- > determination in
- > Order No. 3324-A that the opponents of LCE's Application
- > have failed to
- > overcome the statutory presumption that the proposed export
- >
- > authorization is not inconsistent with the public interest.
- > Although
- > not required by NEPA, DOE/FE also considered the Addendum,
- > which
- > summarizes available information on potential upstream
- > impacts
- > associated with unconventional natural gas activities, such
- > as
- > hydraulic fracturing.
- >
- > Mitigation
- >
- > As a condition of its decision to issue Order
- > No. 3324-A
- > authorizing LCE to export LNG to non-FTA countries, DOE is
- > imposing
- > requirements that will avoid or minimize the environmental
- > impacts of
- > the project. These conditions include the environmental
- > conditions
- > recommended in the EIS and adopted in the FERC Order at
- > Appendix B.
- > Mitigation measures beyond those included in Order No.
- > 3324-A that are
- > enforceable by other Federal and state agencies are
- > additional
- > conditions of Order No. 3324-A. With these conditions,
- > DOE/FE has
- > determined that all practicable means to avoid or minimize
- > environmental harm from the Liquefaction Project have been
- > adopted.
- >
- > Floodplain Statement of Findings
- >
- > DOE prepared this Floodplain Statement of
- > Findings in accordance
- > with DOE's regulations, entitled "Compliance with
- > Floodplain and
- > Wetland Environmental Review Requirements" (10 CFR part
- > 1022). The

> required floodplain assessment was conducted during
> development and
> preparation of the EIS (see Sections 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 4.1.3.4,
> and
> 4.13.2.1 of the EIS). DOE determined that the placement of
> some project
> components within floodplains would be unavoidable. However,
> the
> current design for the Lake Charles Liquefaction Project
> minimizes
> floodplain impacts to the extent practicable.
>
> Issued in Washington, DC, on July 29, 2016.
> Christopher A. Smith,
> Assistant Secretary, Office of Fossil Energy.
> [FR Doc. 2016-18652 Filed 8-4-16; 8:45 am]
> BILLING CODE 6450-01-P
>
>
>