

**From:** [Ellen Osuna](#)  
**To:** [LNGStudy](#)  
**Subject:** 2012 LNG Export Study  
**Date:** Thursday, January 24, 2013 4:32:12 PM  
**Attachments:** [LNG comments.doc](#)

---

~~

. . .And, by the way, **solutions** ---

<http://www.cleanenergyvictorybonds.org/>

[http://www.upi.com/Science\\_News/Technology/2012/12/10/Study-Renewable-energy-can-meet-demand/UPI-64521355175623/](http://www.upi.com/Science_News/Technology/2012/12/10/Study-Renewable-energy-can-meet-demand/UPI-64521355175623/)

<http://www.desmogblog.com/2012/09/14/no-breakthroughs-necessary-95-percent-renewable-energy-possible-2050>

<http://www.ieer.org/carbonfree/summary.pdf>

<http://www.linycoffshorewind.com/about.html>

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/02/idUS261941+02-Aug-2012+PRN20120802>

--

First of all, the DOE's decision regarding LNG exports appears to be based on a "study" by National Economic Research Associates Economic Consulting. This organization has used their studies to push for deregulation of coal, nuclear, oil, and gas. They have also worked for the tobacco industry. Yet the DOE speaks of "Public interest determinations". As it should – Besides obvious ethics, the DOE has obligations under the National Environmental Policy Act to deeply look at the environmental implications of exporting Liquefied Natural Gas through an Environmental Impact Statement, which must include impacts not adequately addressed in the NERA Study. The entire life cycle of extracting shale gas has tremendous health and environmental impacts, including inevitable well casing / well bore leakage, migration into groundwater via natural faults in the earth, and methane release (see recent NOAA and University of Colorado at Boulder study showing there is even more methane released than previously thought). This has implications not only for the climate, but also points, yet again, to falsehoods in industry rhetoric.

The NERA Study is based on a new, "proprietary" economic model less than a year old, with no tests of forecasting accuracy. It neglects countless effects of shale gas fracking, health, environmental, and economic. Environmental effects ARE health effects. And health / environmental effects ARE economic effects. These all need to be deeply looked at, in a way the NERA study ignores.

These comments are not off topic for an economic issue. Health problems cost – in terms of health care, lost productive work time, industries dependent on clean water and air, and more. Well casings leak, inevitably, and some leak immediately. Through natural faults in earth, Karst topography, and underground migration pathways exacerbated by the fracturing itself, contaminants and NORMS leak into groundwater. This has been proven many times, however the industry still claims there has not been one case of contamination due to "fracking". This is technically true, and an example of how they distort the truth at the expense of human life, which the public is becoming more and more aware of. As long as they define "fracking" as the exact second the shale is blasted, and ignore all the related effects in the definition of "fracking", they can continue to say this. Similar to the obviously deceptive line that the act of smoking does not kill anyone, also technically true, and ignoring the deadly affects related to smoking, ( One would wonder if both industries have used similar consulting and public relations firms with similar strategies . . . and in fact, yes, they have. )

There is also considerable air pollution from hydrofracking, and significant methane releases. ( See recent NOAA + University of Colorado at Boulder study ) Water and air pollution will harm businesses like agriculture, wine, beer, tourism. Road upgrades and repairs will fall upon the taxpayers. And the job creation models, possibly including stippers and prostitutes in their projections, are flawed and biased toward what the industry wants to predict. And as Senator Ron Wyden points out, the NERA study does not fully assess impacts of rising gas prices on homeowners and businesses.

In closing I oppose permits for LNG exports. I support investment in various renewable energy technologies and conservation.

Respectfully,  
Ellen Osuna

