

LNGStudy

From: Jennifer Davis [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 1:40 AM
To: LNGStudy; FERGAS
Subject: Liquified Natural Gas Export Terminal Permit Request

Categories: Blue Category

Respectfully submitted to the Department of Energy
Regarding: permits to allow liquified natural gas (LNG) exports from 19 terminals currently permitted for import only.

Please DO NOT APPROVE these permits, which will necessitate and expedite the expansion of high volume slick water hydraulic fracturing (HVSWHF or "fracking"). Despite industry claims, this process has only been in use since 2005 and its effects on the surrounding environment are proving to be increasingly devastating.

These permits are pending based on a study authorized by your Department. The study found positive economic benefits to the U.S economy and trade balance, the natural gas industry and natural gas leaseholders, if 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.

HVSWHF takes place, not in sanctioned industrial areas, but 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 disintegration, skyrocketing rental costs, increased criminal activity, and corruption of the political process by industry influence. Public health impacts are wide spread and well known, yet under reported and unstudied.

We do not have the scientific studies to prove the natural environment is able to maintain its integrity amidst the current extensive extraction processes, let alone an increased, unmitigated further rush.

HVSWHF is poorly regulated - at both the state and federal level - and the regulations are often not enforced. Monitoring is sorely lacking.

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 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 immediately.

We should be encouraging the development of renewable energy, not the use of every last drop of fossil fuel for corporate profit at the expense of our water, land and public health.