

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FERGAS](#); [LNGStudy](#)
Subject: Please deny permits for LNG infrastructure
Date: Sunday, January 27, 2013 10:15:55 AM

Dear DOE,

Please do not permit any infrastructure permits for the export of LNG. The gains for the companies are not shared by your average citizen. We are left to pay for the contamination, health impacts and diminished property value that result from the fracking process. The DOE should be focused on real long-term energy independence for the US, which means creating an environment that discourages the expansion of fossil fuels and promotes investment and development of sustainable sources of energy. Gas is a terribly dangerous fuel that is vulnerable to attack by hostile forces and leaves us less able to sustain quality lives in the US by contaminating our air, soil and water.

Exporting gas means that the price is set by the highest bidders on the world market and does nothing to insure that it is reserved for American consumption.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Arnold

*I would also like to reiterate the flaws in the study's approach as outlined by someone else:

All proposals to build in LNG export infrastructure should be denied, for both economic and environmental reasons. Such infrastructure is tied to the fate of fracking in Pennsylvania and the Marcellus shale region, which is rending apart communities and changing the rural character of much of the region. While there may be something of a boom right now, fossil fuel extraction repeats and perpetuates the boom/bust cycle that has been devastating for much of Appalachia and other areas.

You direct comments to be "limited to the results and conclusions of these independent analyses on the factors evaluated." The studies focused on economics, but took a remarkably blinkered approach to economic impacts, equating total dollars now with the welfare of Americans. The NERA report notably stated "This study addresses only the net economic effects of natural gas price changes and improved export revenues, not their distribution." The studies' economic analyses should have included analysis of the actual impact on the ground to both the economics and actual welfare (well being) of the people living with fracking in their backyards, and those downstream from them. The absence of such analysis gives a skewed and incomplete perspective on the benefits and drawbacks of building LNG export infrastructure.

Another failure in the economic analyses was the omission of the opportunity cost of investing in energy infrastructure that will last far beyond the lifetime of this

transitory fossil fuel boom–renewable energy infrastructure.

The reports also fail in their economic analyses in refusing to discuss the economic externalities, largely falling on citizens of the United States, from the fracking industry's devastation of the natural landscape (which has a huge economic value, unmeasured here), health impacts (injuries, illnesses, and death), destabilization of shale country communities, and future abandonment of those same communities, which will then need taxpayer support as other poor areas do.

I have omitted discussion of the health and environmental harms because of the narrow scope of your request for comments, but it suffices to say that natural gas extraction, and fracking in particular, have a well-documented history of causing extreme environmental dangers, through greenhouse gas emissions, air, water, and land pollution, earthquakes, and more. Understanding of the macroeconomics of LNG exports alone is not enough to evaluate whether something like this should be built; but even on their own terms, the analyses are incomplete and fail to inform the Department of Energy.