

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,” such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Meryle A. Korn

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Leslie Burpo

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Camille Gullickson

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Sean Corrigan

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas

drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Jean Reiher

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,¹ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

josiane de angelis

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Christopher Pond

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Benton Elliott

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us

will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,” such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Natalie Van Leekwijck

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Dulce Havill

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Victoria Folker

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,” such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Cindy Biles

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

The lying and misinformation by fuel companies should never be used as truthful information. Exporting gas to other countries while charging the US citizens more for it is totally rude and bad business ethics. Business is not the ruler of the rest of us all. They are only a part of the world, and do not need to make profit to the detriment of the rest of our planet. Big business needs good ethics.

Sincerely,

Vivianne Mosca-Clark

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Richard Knablin

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Ashley Trigg

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,” such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

A. Todd

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

J Beverly

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Sahnou

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

marguery lee zucker

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will

have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Douglas Vernon

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of

families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Ann Watters

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Emma Young

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Arjen Hoekstra

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Melania Padilla

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,¹ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Chantal Buslot

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas

drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Andrea Sreiber

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Yasiu Kruszynski

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Paul Kuck

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will

have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

dianna sarto

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Christine Williams

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to

inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

claudia pesso

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Julie Jones

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Carla Hervert

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to

inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Nicole Weber

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Ellaine Lurie Janicki

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider

the significant domestic demand growth,' such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study "is not an adequate basis upon which to approve" individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

nancy shinn

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Ellen Lovell

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that

up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Jill Guttman

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will

have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Linda Fuller

Dear Department of Energy,

We need to find more sustainable solutions when it comes to our need for heating our homes than the proposed LNG line. This recent proposal is not good for us, in the short, or the long term!

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of

families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

kaseja wilder

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost

of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

karen beesley

Dear Department of Energy,

This study admits that approving LNG export would drive up energy prices for consumers, and not even create any jobs. Hello? Seems pretty clear that the 'benefit' is to a few corporations' profits and not to anyone else. There is not sufficient water available for the processing, nobody wants fracking with its resultant earthquakes, and people don't want to lose their land so that some wealthy corporation can make even more money. Please do the right thing and prevent LNG export.

Sincerely,

--Tree Bressen

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Lauren Poulos

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO₂ equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,¹ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the Jordan Cove proposed export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Gwen Wolfram

Dear Department of Energy,

The study on the impacts of exporting LNG is flawed when it found exporting natural gas would benefit the American economy. While it will benefit a few energy corporations, the study found that most of us will simply have to pay a higher price for natural gas – up to 25% more. The study also found families will have to pay higher electric rates, coal use would increase, and there would be no net increase in jobs. The Department of Energy should consider the economic impacts of export on the Americans who will be harmed by this.

The study failed to consider that exporting natural gas will increase fracking, a controversial natural gas drilling method. Fracking uses millions of gallons of water per well. The study failed to consider the cost of billions of gallons of water from the arid West that would be required to produce natural gas for exporting, especially during a drought and concerns over lowering aquifers. The water and chemicals used for fracking are highly contaminated and must be disposed of safely. The current practice is to inject it back into the earth, but this practice has caused earthquakes. The study failed to consider the costs of these environmental impacts.

Increased drilling for natural gas will increase the rate of global warming and climate change. 2012 was the hottest year on record. The cost of damages from increased storm intensity, flooding, and droughts that are exasperated by global warming, were not considered in the report. A recent study found that up to 9% of the natural gas drilled from wells escapes into the atmosphere. This massive increase in methane, a greenhouse gas 20 times the CO2 equivalent of carbon, was not considered.

Exporting natural gas means new pipelines and LNG terminals need to be built. The DOE study failed to consider the environmental costs of this new infrastructure, and the social cost to the hundreds of families that would have their land condemned by multinational corporations under the pretense that it is in the public good, instead of just for corporate profits.

We agree with Senator Wyden (D-OR), who said the study needed “more realistic market assumptions” than the 2010 market report it was based on. Wyden also found that the DOE study fails to “consider the significant domestic demand growth,’ such as use of natural gas as a transportation fuel used by heavy trucks, public transportation, and the railroad industry.

Senator Wyden concludes the DOE study “is not an adequate basis upon which to approve” individual applications, such as the proposed Jordan Cove export facility or the Pacific Connector Pipeline in Oregon.

We ask the Department of Energy to denounce this study as inadequate and make a more realistic study of the true costs of exporting our domestic fuels.

Sincerely,

Eliz Matteson