

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 7/11/14 6:41 PM
Received: June 26, 2014
Status: Pending_Post
Tracking No.: 1jy-8cvt-pwo3
Comments Due: June 26, 2014
Submission Type: Web

Docket: DOE-HQ-2014-0008

Applications To Import and Export Natural Gas, etc.: Venture Global LNG, LLC

Comment On: DOE-HQ-2014-0008-0001

Applications To Import and Export Natural Gas, etc.: Venture Global LNG, LLC

Document: DOE-HQ-2014-0008-DRAFT-0001

Comment on FR Doc # 2014-12210

Submitter Information

Name: Bryar Douglas

Address:

[REDACTED]
Cape Girardeau, MO, 63701

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone: [REDACTED]

General Comment

I vote no, primarily for two reasons:

1). A 25 year contract for natural gas export, in a time where our own gas prices here at home are skyrocketing, seems a little excessive and comes across as Venture Global just wanting to secure it's revenue for 25 years to come. A lot of things change in 25 years. If this was a short-term contract, it would be another story, but 25 years is too long of a contract regarding something as uncertain as gas. Propose a 3 - 5 year contract and it has a much better chance of being widely accepted or tolerated. Or include a safety net in the contract making the contract null and void if any accidents happen. If all goes well and is profitable, then the contract remains in play. Or hold them 100% accountable for any accidents, and any damages that may come to the property of tax payers will be repaid to them, in full, as reimbursement, along with any clean-up fees. I haven't laid eyes on this particular contract so I'm unsure if something like that is already included or not.

2). Louisiana and our water supplies abroad have suffered a lot due to fossil fuel accidents. I don't feel comfortable approving anything with that much risk involved. I understand this is business, but they need to find another way. It's all nice and profitable when everyone's making money. But when an accident happens, the poor and the middle class are forced to live with it, while the financially better-off group has a variety of better opportunities. For that reason, I say no. The juice is not worth the squeeze. I'm inclined to say no to things that don't promote renewable energy research anyways, but I understand that it's a slow process. Nonetheless, I vote NO to this motion.

Thank you.