

[REDACTED]

From: Diane MacInnes [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2013 6:35 AM
To: LNGStudy; FERGAS
Subject: Liquefied Natural Gas Export Terminal Permit Request

To whom it may concern:

It is against the long term economic, environmental, and social interests of this country to permit this export terminal request. It would lead to increased high volume hydraulic fracturing which will put our air and water resources at risk and undermine the long term economic health of our communities. Using 3-9 million of gallons per well, permitting one well pad every square mile with 8-16 wells per pad, contaminating that water with 500 toxic chemicals, and having no viable plan for disposal of waste water is not a responsible use of our resources. And that's not the only problem. A network of pipelines taking property by eminent domain would require compressor stations releasing methane and volatile organics into the atmosphere, destroying our air quality. Methane is a major contributor to global climate change. The threat of gas drilling in our area has already begun to depress property values on our recreational lakes. The small towns depend on the tax revenue from these properties to support the schools. We simply cannot afford the long term economic, environmental, and social costs of this boom and bust industry with a notorious reputation for taking risks and shortcuts for the sake of profit.

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.

According to NERA's own figures, export would also lower wages for ordinary Americans, especially those in manufacturing jobs. It is because of these threats that some major American corporations are opposing indiscriminate exporting of natural gas. NERA nonetheless concluded that gas exports would benefit the country.

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**.

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.

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.

For the sake of long term economic, environmental, and social interests of this country this export terminal request must be denied.

Sincerely,
Diane MacInnes

[REDACTED]
Deposit, NY [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]