

RECEIVED

DOE/FE by Email: 02/09/15 8:15 pm (Late)

From: [Maria Szmauz](#)
To: [FERGAS](#)
Subject: FW: FE Docket No. 14-179-LNG
Date: Monday, February 09, 2015 8:15:48 PM

From: [REDACTED]
To: feras@hq.doe.gov
Subject: FE Docket No. 14-179-LNG
Date: Mon, 9 Feb 2015 15:39:38 -0500

To whom it may concern, and incidentally, that is everyone in continental USA and Canada :

We are writing to object to approval of the Pieridae LNG Export Permit. We object for many reasons which We will enumerate below.

We object to export of LNG from North America to clients overseas. The existing natural gas pipeline infrastructure in the United States, and major expansion of same, required to make this happen is far too dangerous and has far too many serious adverse implications to health of all people residing near pipelines and compressor stations, not to mention the unethical, unjustifiable taking of massive amounts of property by eminent domain in the process. If you have done your homework, you surely have research showing how many compressor stations have literally blown up in the last few years. The safety record is so bad that the National Transportation Safety Board has scolded and given about 28 new guidelines to PHMSA, the organization which is supposed to be monitoring safety of the US pipeline industry, because it is doing such a poor job.

Also, the taking of property by eminent domain in the US is illegal if solely for corporate profit, which would be the primary goal of export of natural gas. (I don't think Kinder Morgan or it's competitors would be taking on these projects for altruistic purposes, if major profit was not expected) It is one thing when all of these negatives are considered in the debate over the need for natural gas as a regional energy source in the country it is produced in, but simply for profit consideration of it would be nothing short of criminal.

The negative aspects mentioned above do not even take into account the devastation of landscape involved in pipeline expansion, or the imminent terrorist threat created by huge compressor stations at crucial locations that control the entire natural gas supply for a large region, such as New England. This does not take into account the transition for sleepy little (happy) towns that find themselves changed overnight with the installations of miles of pipeline, and compressor stations, and these same towns with volunteer Fire Departments and Emergency Management Systems that must change drastically to accommodate implications of this change. We feel also, that this huge pipeline expansion is going against

The Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative adopted by many US states, in that new studies (one by Harvard U. in Mass) that leakage from stations around valves etc, and from pipelines in general is more like 2.1 to 3.3% not the previously thought 1.1%, and methane is 86 time more potent as a greenhouse gas than Carbon dioxide.(Cornell Univ. says leakage of unburned gas is 3.6 to 7.9 percent inf pipeline infrastructure before reaching end user.) Also, 1 blowdown at one large station can release 15MCF of methane and 46.2 tons of Nitrous oxide are generally emitted (also a greenhouse gas) yearly.

I also object for personal reasons. The NED project being initiated by Kinder Morgan will take property of mine in NH by eminent domain, and will be situated behind my home in a totally rural forested area, with existing conservation restrictions on all the land (not only mine) it will touch or take in a several mile area. The "co location" of the pipe along Public Service of NH's existing power lines (almost all of its NH route) in this project has huge implications for safety, and it is well known that despite measures to reduce it, corrosion of pipe near high voltage lines hastens corrosion of pipe considerably, causing more safety and health problems. The project has pipeline being routed through neighborhood common lands for housing clusters of 60 plus homes, directly on the land where children play, and will likely necessitate one of the largest compressor stations anywhere around, the closest one of it's size being in Louisiana and in the western US. (that information provided by Kinder Morgan directly)

Until all these negative aspects of piping natural gas are considered, dealt with, and resolved satisfactorily, it would be unethical and morally wrong to allow transportation of natural gas for export, (for profit) and when it will not be to serve domestic need.

References can be furnished for any statistics used above, but I believe all information used above is considered general knowledge, and if FERAS does not have this data already, they (you) have clearly not done sufficient research to make an educated, informed, conscientious decision in this matter, or are making the decision strictly considering monetary gain and nothing else.

Maria T Szmauz
Richard L Szmauz

New Ipswich, NH 03071