

[REDACTED]

From: jquinn [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 21, 2013 2:46 PM
To: LNGStudy
Subject: 2012 LNG EXPORT STUDY

Dear DOE:

The simplistic conclusion of DOE's study of LNG exports, that the net result of such export would be an overall benefit is simply wrong. At least, it is an incomplete and biased view.

Yes, there would be a huge, relatively short term, financial benefit to the gas industry, its adjunct pipeline owners, LNG processing facilities, shipping line owners, etc. However, in the long term (and in the short run, as well) the effect of greatly increased competition for this gas would, most certainly, put extreme upward pressure on domestic supplies and prices. Domestic manufacturers and businesses of all kinds, in addition to residential customers would, doubtless, experience significant rate increases. This, to the almost exclusive benefit of the "few" and to the detriment of the "many."

Further, increased demand from shale oil deposits obtained by the controversial "fracking" method is, in itself, troubling. If the narrowly perceived ends, identified as a national benefit by the 2012 study, are considered with the potential and long term hazards of such extraction in mind, the "fracked" gas, converted to LNG and shipped overseas to the benefit of foreign industry and interests will be seen as a net loss. This is not to mention the damaging effects imposed by the direct expenditure of energy in constructing pipelines through difficult and already threatened watersheds in the Oregon Coast Range.

Please, in this case, consider long term as well as short return energy benefits and likely harm. What use to, as usual, enrich a few at the expense of the many?

Sincerely,

Joseph Patrick Quinn
Camas Valley, OR
Conservation Chair Umpqua Watersheds, Inc.
Member Executive Council of the Coquille Watershed Assoc.