

From: [REDACTED]
To: [LNGStudy](#)
Subject: Comment on LNG export
Date: Thursday, January 24, 2013 1:21:50 PM

My name is Dinah Dewald, and I'm a citizen of Pennsylvania. I'm writing to say that on scientific, human health as well as economic reasons, I believe that the DOE should not allow LNG exports in the 19 terminals that are currently permitted only for imports.

The consulting firm that conducted the "cumulative impacts" study have strong ties to the industry, which seriously damages their credibility. Their analysis was narrow, without considering any of the external costs of LNG exports. The exporting of LNG would intensify the pace of shale gas extraction and processing, leading to damage of roads, higher accident rates, noise pollution, air, water and soil pollution, and to correct these damages, the money will have to come straight out of the pocket of taxpayers. The current pace of unwelcome, unexpected extraction is already more than the people - who are unfortunate enough to find themselves living above gas infused shale - can bear.

High volume slickwater hydraulic fracturing (HVSWHF), colloquially known as 'fracking' - the process that has made retrieval of shale gas possible - is different from other industrial processes, which are concentrated in areas set aside for that purpose and zoned industrial. HVSWHF takes place in communities - near homes, schools, hospitals - in farms, parks, forests and ecologically sensitive areas. External costs are thus imposed upon the community - such as property devaluation, infrastructure damage, community cohesion de solution, skyrocketing rental costs, and corruption of the political process by the money and power of the industry. Public health impacts are wide spread and well known, yet under reported and unstudied.

Currently, there have been no scientific studies to show whether the natural environment is able to maintain its integrity amidst the current extensive extraction processes, let alone an increased, unmitigated further rush. HVSWHF is extremely complex, inherently risky, and inadequately studied for its environmental impacts. It is poorly regulated - at both the state and federal level - and the regulations are often not enforced. Monitoring is sorely lacking, and often based entirely on whether the gas industry allows environmental agencies to monitor--not something they are likely to do if there is any possibility of having permits removed. It is also a gargantuan task to try to monitor even if there was easy access to wells and compressor stations, since

there are thousands everywhere, in various stages of development.

Water withdrawals impact streams, aquatic life, wetlands and riparian areas. Water wells, ground water, ponds and the land itself have been contaminated. Forests may never recover from their fragmentation, loss of large trees (and their carbon sequestration), loss of animal habitat, the introduction of invasive species and the loss of biodiversity.

Air quality is negatively affected not only by the actual drilling but by the many processing stations. The diesel pollution from thousands of trucks is both a public health risk and a global warming contributor. The sand used in the process is a silicosis risk for the communities where it is mined and processed and for the workers.

The negative long-term economic effects of a boom - bust cycle on communities by extractive industries is well documented throughout history. Ultimately the community ends up less healthy and wealthy after the resource is depleted and the industry leaves.

The negative impacts on other industries such as agriculture, tourism, outdoor recreation, etc. must be taken into consideration in an economic analysis.

The pipelines that were built to take the gas from the current IMPORT terminals to the end users in the U.S. were built where ever the gas companies wanted them irrespective of property rights - with the use of eminent domain. Eminent domain is only granted for the purpose of the public good - not for the financial benefit of private industry. Therefore, it should be illegal to use those pipelines to transmit gas from the fields to the terminal for EXPORT - which benefits only the industry.

Liquifying, transporting, regassifying and then transporting gas to end users in other countries is an energy intensive process that makes no sense whatsoever in a world that needs to address climate change as soon as possible.

NASA Climate Scientist James Hansen has said that if we have any chance of avoiding the civilization threatening effects of climate change that are heading our way, the fossil fuels that are still in the ground must stay there. We should be encouraging the development of renewable energy, not the use of every last drop of fossil fuel.

-Dinah DeWald