

LNGStudy

From: Mevrian Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 4:53 PM
To: LNGStudy
Subject: LNG Export Study and Request for Comments

Re: LNG Export Study and Request for Comments

There are serious concerns with the DOE study recently issued on the economic aspects of LNG export. For starters, the consultants employed, NERA, have close ties to the oil and gas industry, calling into question the credibility of the entire study. These consultants have in fact acknowledged that the economic benefits of LNG export would be only for the gas industry, or for those who have investments in gas, or gas leases. For the vast majority of other Americans, there would be no economic benefits, and wages for some individuals in the manufacturing sector could actually decrease. Meanwhile, we would still be subjected to the truly horrendous health and environmental consequences that would result from this practice.

The overly simplistic study also left out the economic cost of all the cumulative damages caused by the expansion of hydrofracking which LNG export would encourage – damages to air, water, public health, farms, forests, communities and climate. It left out the health and safety impacts to humans and animals. All of these harms have economic consequences. For example, Jannette M. Barth of the Pepecton Institute points out that there will be costs associated with the adverse health impacts and increased need for local services likely to arise from a drive for more natural gas extraction. These would include "increased demand for police, fire, first responders, and hospitals", "road damage due to heavy truck traffic", and "water and air contamination, and public health costs." These factors were not addressed by the DOE's study.

Costs associated with these harms are inevitably borne by the local municipalities, not by the gas industry, which is another reason why hydrofracking and LNG export will actually be economically disadvantageous to the majority of Americans, not beneficial. Further, it has been documented that extractive industries tend to create a local "boom or bust" economy, destroying existing agricultural and recreation jobs, and leading to economic downfall for the areas affected.

Beyond the economic standpoint, however, we must also answer the question – are we choosing to sacrifice Americans' health and destroy our land, our air, our water, our natural resources, just so that a few corporations and their investors can make a profit – at the expense of all the rest of us?

The expansion of methane usage anticipated will also derail the move that we need to be making towards truly renewable and sustainable energy – solar, wind, and geothermal power; and we urgently need to switch to these power sources if we want to prevent climate change from accelerating any further. NASA Climate Scientist James Hansen has said that if we have any chance of avoiding the civilization threatening effects of climate change that are heading our way, the fossil fuels that are still in the ground **must** stay there. We should not be using fossil fuels, and that includes methane gas.

For all of these reasons, the DOE's study of economic impacts is flawed, and permits for LNG export should not be approved.

Edith Kantrowitz

[REDACTED]