

[REDACTED]

From: Stanley Tobin [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 1:16 PM
To: LNGStudy
Subject: Re: LNG Export Study and Request for Comment

Re: LNG Export Study and Request for Comment

The economic impacts and energy policy ramifications of LNG export far exceed the limited scope of consideration presented in the Department of Energy's ("DOE") report: "Effect of Increased Natural Gas Exports on Domestic Energy Markets".

Any authorizations to export LNG will directly and dramatically affect the level of shale gas development in this country, including development of supporting industries and infrastructure. Therefore any credible LNG economic study, particularly one purporting to be a "cumulative impacts study," must include analysis of the wealth of harms associated directly and indirectly with the increasing shale gas development that will be supported and incited by LNG exports.

Shale gas development presents an unparalleled level of harm to drinking water, air quality, food supplies, and public health that equate to high economic burdens for the United States economy and taxpayers. These are economic burdens that any accurate assessment of the impacts of LNG exports must fully explore and consider.

Shale gas development and its infrastructure induces or contributes to deforestation, land compaction, wetlands destruction, and increased earthquake potential, as well as creates increased potential for flooding and erosion of public and private lands that must be responded to and addressed by homeowners, communities and local, state and federal governments. To the extent that LNG will support, induce and encourage more shale gas development it will be increasing these harms and the associated costs; as such these costs must be considered in any credible analysis of the economic ramifications of LNG.

The most recent estimates of economically recoverable shale gas reserves estimate approximately 20-40 years of supply at current domestic consumption. Increasing LNG exports will reduce the timeline of this supply. As a result all of the hundreds of billions invested in transforming this country's energy infrastructure into one dependent on shale gas will quickly be lost as the quickly dwindling shale gas supply will necessitate the need for a new energy infrastructure. Upon depleting its shale gas reserves in just a matter of decades, America will be faced with an abrupt and expensive shift to new energy sources and corresponding infrastructure. This 20-40 year timeline becomes further abbreviated if LNG exports occur.

Investing in increasing shale gas development including exports brings with it high opportunity costs for this country also ignored by the DOE report. Investment in LNG and shale gas development means there is not investment in truly sustainable energy development, in corresponding quality infrastructure for sustainable energy, in the technological advancements necessary to ensure U.S. leadership in renewable energy sources, and in the use of taxpayer dollars for achieving other high priority job creation and economic advancement goals. These tangible costs were ignored by DOE's study.

Furthermore, scientific research and data increasingly support the proposition that shale gas development – when combined with LNG export – is a net greenhouse gas polluter as potent as coal, and likely worse. To the extent that authorizing LNG export will induce and encourage more shale gas development - and therefore more methane and CO2 emissions exacerbating climate change - it will be increasing the costs associated with

responding to, and rebuilding from, the extreme weather events that will inevitably result. Examination of these foreseeable costs were likewise absent in DOE's study.

The 2012 LNG Export Study's failure to examine the aforementioned and other relevant costs in its analyses renders the report a superficial and stunted picture of LNG's economic ramifications. DOE's study simply fails to provide decisionmakers the complete, accurate knowledge necessary to render an informed decision.

It is incumbent upon DOE to consider these ignored economic and environmental costs in determining whether LNG export to non-free trade agreement nations fulfills the public interest standard set forth under the Natural Gas Act.

In a further personal note, it is not fair to foster onto the public the disincentives that come from the spoiling of the environment. Surely solar energy is a far better than this.

Respectfully,

Stanley Tobin

[REDACTED]
Philadelphia PA [REDACTED]