

[REDACTED]

From: Mike Ahern OAM [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 2:50 AM
To: FERGAS
Subject: permit requests for exporting Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from 19 terminals that are currently permitted for import only

I understand and support the following BLOG. I am not concerned that the US Economy receives benefit. In fact I do not see that issue a positive for Australia in the sense that the benefit for the USA will harm the Australian environment :-

“The Department of Energy (DOE) has *permit requests for exporting Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from 19 terminals* that are *currently permitted for import only*. DOE authorized a LNG Study that was recently completed and put out for public comment. The consultants who did the study indicated positive economic benefits to the U.S. economy, the U.S. trade balance, the industry and the natural gas leaseholders, if the export permits were approved.

TALKING POINTS

We do not want the permits for export of LNG to be approved.

The **consultants who did the study have strong industry ties** that puts their credibility into question. Their analysis was narrow and simplistic, without considering the external costs. The exporting of LNG would **intensify the pace of shale gas extraction and processing**. 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.

We do not have the 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**, since there are thousands of wells 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 YESTERDAY.

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.

[Gloria Forouzan's blog](#)"

From: Mike Ahern OAM [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 2:52 AM
To: LNGStudy
Subject: Fw: permit requests for exporting Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from 19 terminals that are currently permitted for import only

From: [Mike Ahern OAM](#)
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 6:50 PM
To: fergas@hq.doe.gov
Subject: permit requests for exporting Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from 19 terminals that are currently permitted for import only

I understand and support the following BLOG. I am not concerned that the US Economy receives benefit. In fact I do not see that issue a positive for Australia in the sense that the benefit for the USA will harm the Australian environment :-

“The Department of Energy (DOE) has *permit requests for exporting Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) from 19 terminals* that are *currently permitted for import only*. DOE authorized a LNG Study that was recently completed and put out for public comment. The consultants who did the study indicated positive economic benefits to the U.S. economy, the U.S. trade balance, the industry and the natural gas leaseholders, if the export permits were approved.

TALKING POINTS

We do not want the permits for export of LNG to be approved.

The **consultants who did the study have strong industry ties** that puts their credibility into question. Their analysis was narrow and simplistic, without considering the external costs. The exporting of LNG would **intensify the pace of shale gas extraction and processing**. 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.

We do not have the 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**, since there are thousands of wells 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 YESTERDAY.

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.

[Gloria Forouzan's blog](#)"