

LNGStudy

From: Hope Punnett [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 4:35 PM
To: LNGStudy
Subject: LNG Permits

To whom it may concern:

As a private citizen, I am writing to oppose the granting of permits for the export of LNG to be approved. I question the credibility of the consultants who did the study. Their strong industry ties put that credibility into question. The analysis was narrow and did not consider the external costs. The exporting of LNG would intensify the pace of shale gas extraction and processing. The current pace of 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.

The scientific studies have not yet been published that would show whether the natural environment is able to maintain its integrity amidst the current extensive extraction processes. 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.

We need to encourage development of renewable energy. Fossil fuels in the ground should stay there.

