

# Downeast LNG Newsletter

Volume 1, No. 2

October 2005



## PROJECT STATUS and FACTS

Downeast LNG is providing this Newsletter to ensure that the residents and property owners of Robbinston continue to be fully informed of the status of our project development and the facts related to LNG.

### ◆ STATUS

We continue to advance our engineering and environmental studies for the site area and project plans. Various scientists have been visiting the site and waters of Mill Cove to investigate:

- wildlife and wetlands,
- geology and seismicity,
- bathymetry and currents,
- visual resources and area socioeconomics.

We will soon start archaeology, traffic and aquatic biology studies. Project engineers are continuing to prepare design documents and investigate a number of alternatives relative to pier design, pipeline routing and plant layout. LNG shipping analyses, including transit planning and security/safety are nearing first phase completion. We have also begun preparation of the first set of permitting documents that will officially initiate the public and government project review process.

In September, we had innumerable meetings with public policy and environmental government officials in both the U.S. and in Canada. We also talked with numerous local entities including the Robbinston Fire Department and the Maine Department of Transportation. For October, the following UPCOMING EVENTS are planned:

- **October 18<sup>th</sup> – LNG Safety and Operations Seminar**

The first in our series of community seminars for Robbinston residents and property owners will be held from 6–9 PM at the Robbinston Grade School. This series of seminars is meant to be informal and after brief presentations regarding the Topic of Interest, an open question and answer period will be held.

- **Late October / Early November – Cove Point LNG Terminal Visit**

Downeast LNG has arranged for six to eight community members consisting of the Fire Department Chief, the Firemen's Association President and select members of the Robbinston Advisory Committee to travel to Chesapeake Bay, Maryland to visit the Cove Point LNG terminal, community leaders, and the adjacent sailing community of Solomons Island.

### ◆ FACTS ABOUT OUR PROJECT

As part of our development program, we believe that it's critical for people to understand the project's true plans and the facts about LNG. Thus, we are disappointed by the volume of misleading and inaccurate information that has been circulated by certain LNG opponents, especially the organization called "Save Passamaquoddy Bay" (SPB).



## *Downeast LNG Newsletter*

*October 2005*

We know that many of you recently received a letter from SPB at your homes about our project, mainly because many of you simply could not believe the statements that were being made by SPB...and wanted to hear from us whether they were indeed false statements. For this Newsletter, we have decided to review and comment on SPB's statements. We've done so in a straightforward manner...and we ask **you** to be the judge of their credibility.

When we first met with you, the community of Robbinston, you asked us to keep our commitment to you to be HONEST and OPEN throughout the process of project review and approval. We promised that we would be, and we believe that establishing our credibility with you is one of the most important aspects of our relationship with you – now and for the future.

Best regards,

Dean Girdis



## **THE FACTS: A Response to Save Passamaquoddy Bay**

### **LNG and Operations Issues**

**SPB:** *“LNG is natural gas that has been super cooled... and compressed to 1/600<sup>th</sup> its original volume to form a liquid.....Propane...can be safely stored, transported and delivered to home and businesses by truck.”*

**FALSE.** LNG is not compressed. Its volume is reduced to 1/600<sup>th</sup> simply by cooling the gas, much like steam condenses to water when cooled. Propane is both pressurized and explosive, and is transported by trucks adding to the risk. These risks are managed by propane vendors and the public has accepted these risks and is accustomed to handling propane in a safe manner despite its hazards.

**SPB:** *“There are no known plans by any gas company to supply gas service to Washington county residents”... implying that natural gas will not be made available to residents.*

**MISLEADING.** Downeast’s LNG will be regasified at the site and fed into a pipeline that will connect in Baileyville to a main intrastate pipeline. At any point along the pipeline route to Baileyville, natural gas could be readily made available to Robbinston and nearby communities. Gas distribution companies are interested in the market opportunity just as they are currently developing a distribution system in St. Stephens. It is simply too early in the project development process for a gas distribution company to develop a plan for our gas, and its extremely misleading to imply that therefore no such service will be available to residents.

**SPB:** *“Gas terminals are noisy...their lights and turbine engines running round the clock”....*

**FALSE.** LNG terminals are extremely quiet. “During normal operations, they pose no unique noise concerns” (California Energy Commission, Report 700-03-005, July 2003). With the tree and vegetation buffers at our site, as well as equipment noise reduction measures, our plant is expected to propagate sounds much less than 60 decibels and basically be imperceptible at the property boundary. The lights from the LNG plant and pier will be minimal – far less than the lights visible from the Marine Research Station in St. Andrews (or even St. Andrews itself for that matter). The control of noise and lighting will be legally committed to in our permits.

**SPB:** *“Since the initial splash of news...not much has been heard about progress in bringing these projects to reality.”*

**FALSE.** Downeast LNG has had numerous public meetings to describe what we are proposing and the lengthy (2 year) site assessment and permitting process that is underway. Newspaper articles have appeared almost weekly relaying the current status of our project as well as others. Unfortunately, after our first meeting with SPB leadership in July (which Downeast LNG initiated), they have refused to talk to us or meet with us again to learn more about the project.

**SPB:** *“Why are these promoters here? ... They haven’t told you that, so far, no other place on the east/ gulf coasts of the US will allow an LNG facility.”*

**FALSE.** Eight other communities along the east coast of the U.S. and Canada and the U.S. Gulf coast have welcomed LNG terminals to their communities and new terminals have been permitted or are under construction, including:

- 5 in Texas (Quintana Island, Corpus Christi [2], Sabine Pass, Port Arthur),
- 1 in Louisiana (Cameron Parish),
- 1 in New Brunswick (St. John), and
- 1 in Nova Scotia (Point Tupper).



See [www.ferc.gov](http://www.ferc.gov) and our own web page. Downeast LNG has specifically told the public why it chose Robbinston and the Mill Cove site over more than 20 other alternative sites and has documented its site selection review criteria in public handouts, presentations, and on its web page.

**SPB:** *“Industrial port facilities do not interest the promoters because they don’t want to pay the high cost for a site...How much are our promoters going to pay for land here?”*

**FALSE.** The Downeast site selection process included many industrial port facilities and did not include any parameter involving the cost for a site purchase. As far as the price of the land here in Robbinston, we are paying a premium price for our site.

**SPB:** *“Once the initial facility is permitted, it is possible that the accompanying cogeneration plant, pipeline, and industrial zone can be forced on us by FERC through eminent domain.”*

**FALSE.** This is completely false. First, we have not proposed, and never will propose, an “accompanying cogeneration plant” or “industrial zone.” And yet, SPB continues to characterize the project as bringing “Newark or Lake Charles” industrial and chemical plants to the community. This repeated falsehood can only be taken as an attempt to frighten the community – despite the facts. What SPB doesn’t want to admit is that this facility is being built to provide clean energy and to serve the existing natural gas demand in Maine and New England – not build a whole new electrical or petrochemical industry in Robbinston or Washington County. While over 60% of Maine’s power comes from natural gas (EIA, Maine State data for 2002), there is not sufficient demand for power in Washington County to financially warrant building a cogeneration facility.

As for new petrochemical plants, they have begun locating overseas closer to the natural gas reserves to save money, and there is no compelling incentive for them to operate in Maine.

Lastly, FERC is a permitting agency. It cannot force the community or the company to expand LNG storage or build an electrical cogeneration plant.

## Community Issues

**SPB:** *“LNG installations are associated with a fall in real estate values, especially for properties in close proximity...Even a mile inland property owners can expect to see a 20% decrease in property value...”*

**FALSE.** This statement is based on a speculative Rhode Island newspaper article and an assessment of the potential impact of a specific LNG terminal proposed in Harpswell, ME. There are many examples of fuel terminals that are not negatively impacting property value. The last LNG terminal fully constructed actually caused local real estate values to rise substantially (EcoElectrica, 1998). In Maine - Searsport and Portland both have very large oil terminals with no apparent negative impact on adjacent properties, much less those a mile away. More recently, Cove Point, Maryland, the location of an LNG facility, has seen annual property appreciation of 30% annually for the past three years.

**SPB:** *“The local municipality would bear the added costs of police and fire protection for the lifetime of the gas terminal (estimated at 30 years), which would result in a heavier tax burden on property owners.”*

**FALSE.** Downeast LNG has repeatedly stated, in public and on its web page, our commitment to cover all additional municipal costs associated with the LNG terminal. This commitment will be executed in a legally binding agreement, the specifics of which are being worked out now by the town and Downeast LNG. Because of this commitment and because of the tax contributions from the project’s operations, property owners will not have a greater tax burden as a result of the facility (in fact, residential and commercial property taxes could practically be eliminated if the town so chose).



**SPB:** “Downeast LNG has offered the town of Robbinston a one-time payment of \$500,000 plus real estate taxes on the facility...”

**FALSE.** Downeast LNG has **not** offered the town any payment beyond its commitment to pay local property taxes. Downeast LNG will create an economic development fund for Washington County and for this trust fund it will commit up to \$500,000 per year of operations. The fund, managed by local business leaders and organizations, could be used however they choose to stimulate economic activity and create additional jobs. In addition to this, we will pay local and state taxes on both property and income, bringing an estimated \$2 million to Washington County and additional income to the state of Maine.

**SPB:** “Downeast LNG proposes a LNG facility...without outlining a comprehensive business plan. Where is the plan?”

**FALSE.** Our plan for the development of the project, including site selection, project design and scope, human resources and economics, as well as our plans for promoting sustainable economic opportunities by the establishment of a development trust for Washington County have been well documented and made available to the public since Day One of our project announcement. We continue to update the public on these plans as they evolve and will continue to do so in the years ahead.

**SPB:** “Following the construction phase, the few jobs that are projected will be highly skilled and competitive. ...implying that there will be no or little opportunity for real employment of Robbinston or other local people???”

**FALSE.** The approximately 300 jobs created by Downeast LNG will, in no way, be just a “few jobs” to the people of Robbinston or Washington County. We will be one of the top private employers in ALL of Washington County. Approximately 32 permanent positions at the terminal will require either a trade certificate, some industrial process experience (e.g. OSB Plant, Domtar), or environmental and safety training. Another 10 positions at the facility will require either a college degree or related industrial experience. Additionally, 14 to 20 tug boat positions will require tug boat experience and/or training. In total, more than 56 permanent positions will be available at various levels of schooling and experience. These positions and the project’s needs, will also support – at a minimum – the growth of more than 240 secondary jobs involving all types of education and experience.

Lastly, Downeast LNG has stated its hiring priority, which includes Robbinston residents first, then Washington County, and then Maine. To further support local residents who desire to work at the facility, Downeast LNG has stated its willingness to provide specialized skills training – and is already in the process of doing just that.

**SPB:** “Many local jobs will be displaced - both in the fishing industry and the growing tourist industry....commercial fishing licenses will be endangered by this project.”

**FALSE.** LNG projects have never been shown to do any such thing. Our intent is to achieve a net zero impact on fishing, and we are accomplishing this by working together with local fishermen to understand their needs and creating a plan that minimizes interference. Some of the most populated fishing spots in the Cove Point Maryland and EcoElectrica Puerto Rico areas are right off the LNG piers!

There is also no reason to assume tourism will be negatively affected by the presence of an LNG ship passing through the channel once per week on average and being at the pier for approximately 14 hours. Both Searsport and Belfast have vibrant tourist industries overlooking the Searsport Oil Terminal and the sight of LNG ships traveling to terminals are tourist attractions in Bilbao, Spain and Puerto Rico.



**SPB:** As a footnote to its page and illustration, SPB states “Facts provided by Save Passamaquoddy Bay & Sandia National Laboratories”.

**MISLEADING.** The Sandia National Laboratory Report did not analyze the Passamaquoddy Bay area or provide any facts about the area in its report.

**SPB:** “Local emergency response facilities would have to be upgraded, schools might have to be moved, local property tax values will be eroded.”

**FALSE.** Downeast LNG has consistently stated that we will assume the costs of upgrading emergency response capabilities – we have already started working on this with the local fire department. We have also consistently stated that building a new school may be possible if that is desired (even though there are no indications that the existing school would be required to be moved at all). The local property tax value will actually rise significantly. Unfortunately, this will cause the town’s state educational subsidies to decline. We learned of this by working with the town and because of this inverse income result for the town, Downeast LNG will compensate Robbinston for any loss of state education subsidies.

## Shipping Issues

**SPB:** “...the Coast Guard may establish an exclusion zone around the ship—typically two miles in front and one mile behind the vessel coming in and leaving the bay. Nothing moves in the exclusion zone.”

**FALSE.** A 2-mile/1-mile exclusion zone is the maximum, not “typical”. A rural LNG terminal in Cove Point, Maryland similar to the proposed Downeast project has an exclusion zone of 500 yards (not 2 miles) while transiting and at dock<sup>1</sup>. Similarly: in Kenai, Alaska (Cook Inlet) the exclusion zone is 1,000 yards both while transiting and at dock<sup>2</sup>, and at EcoElectrica, Puerto Rico (Guayanilla Bay) it is 100 yards while transiting and 150 feet when at dock.<sup>3</sup>

The exclusion zone moves with the ship, so maps such as those on the SPB website showing vast tracts of ocean and bay that will become off limits are completely misleading. It is completely false to state that nothing moves in the exclusion zone – local fishermen and other channel users are frequently allowed to travel along the channel at the same time that an LNG ship is traveling through the channel. This is accomplished with prior authorization from the Captain of the Port, an action that we have always planned on and stated in our meetings and documents.

**SPB:** “Are there problems with shipping LNG?”

**NO.** LNG has been shipped over 40 million nautical miles over a 40 year period with no major accidents. “Since international commercial LNG shipping began in 1959, tankers have carried over 33,000 LNG shipments without a serious accident at sea or in port” Captain David L. Scott, Chief, Office of Operating and Environmental Standards Maritime Standards Directorate United States Coast Guard, before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy, U.S. Senate, 02/15/05. So NO, there aren’t problems shipping LNG – it has one of the most safe transport records in the world.

**SPB:** “LNG tankers are considered to be prime terrorist targets by the Federal Government.”

**MISLEADING.** The Department of Homeland Security has stated that the entire energy infrastructure of the U.S., including small power transformer stations, are potential terrorist targets. The same is true for marine ports, airports, subways, bridges, office buildings, etc. This means that a lot of careful consideration is given to security during the engineering design process, with protective measures built into and continuously inspected at a project like that of Downeast LNG to ensure safety.



## Environmental Issues

**SPB:** *“Passamaquoddy Bay is one of the last pristine places left in the world.”*

**FALSE.** Merriam-Webster online dictionary (2005) defines “pristine” as:

- 1 : belonging to the earliest period or state
- 2 : not spoiled, corrupted, or polluted (as by civilization)

While Mill Cove and much of the Passamaquoddy Bay area are very scenic, both the project site and Passamaquoddy Bay have seen tremendous environmental change and are therefore anything but pristine. According to the Robbinston Comprehensive Plan, many industries have been located in the immediate area of Mill Cove, including a shipyard, brickyard, tidal mill site, shingle mill, and mill site. This, plus the operation of canneries and even a cotton mill, is also true for the Passamaquoddy Bay area (Ecology Action Centre, *Between the Issues*, Vol. 2, No.3). The area has seen many types of industrial and marine development for more than 200 years.

**SPB:** *“[The Bay] supports a fishery with an economic base...Annual income from the bay is currently estimated at \$1 billion” ...implying that LNG ships would destroy this economy?*

**MISLEADING.** Despite an ongoing debate as to the true economic value of the bay, there are no data to indicate that significant fishing or tourist economic losses will result from LNG ships passing through the area. LNG tankers regularly transit important fishery and tourist areas throughout the world, including Chesapeake Bay, Boston Harbor, Savannah and the Gulf of Mexico. Commercial vessels, including ships over 600 feet in length already transit through Head Harbour and Passamaquoddy Bay and have done so for many years.

## Safety Issues

**SPB:** *“LNG is dangerous. In the event of a serious accident, everything and everyone in the immediate area is incinerated. EXAMPLE, August 2005, Nigeria had an explosion and fire of an LNG pipeline that covered 9 square miles.”*

**MISLEADING.** The Nigeria type accident could not occur at the Downeast LNG facility. First, LNG export terminals require different equipment than import terminals, so the Nigeria export facility is not comparable to what we are proposing to build. Second, the serious accident in Nigeria occurred when a two month old minor leak in an underground LNG pipeline went unaddressed. In the US, LNG transfer lines (“pipelines”) are (1) not buried, (2) LNG transfer lines are constructed to prevent leaks from accumulating even if they occurred at all, and (3) are inspected daily to protect against any leaks.

**SPB:** *“On September 20 2004, a fully loaded LNG tanker lost propulsion power off the coast of Norway in heavy weather. The ship’s anchors couldn’t hold it and it nearly ended up on the rocks...”*

**NOT RELEVANT.** First, this was an LPG (liquefied petroleum gas) ship, not an LNG ship. Second, LNG ships arriving to our facility will be escorted by at least three tug boats prior to entering Head Harbour Passage. These large tug boats are fully capable of guiding the LNG ship in any instance of propulsion loss. In Norway, the LPG ship lost engine power and at the time was not being escorted by tug boats (Norway Post, 09/21/04). Finally, LNG ships will only be allowed to enter the transit route under a very specific “window of operations” that is set by regulatory agencies (e.g., the U.S. Coast Guard). The window of operations specifically prohibits the ship from being in transit during rough conditions (e.g., high waves or winds).



**SPB:** *“On 20 January 2004 an explosion at an LNG facility at Skikda, Algeria killed 27 people and injured 74 others.*

**MISLEADING.** Again, such an accident cannot happen at the Downeast LNG regasification facility, because the technology is very different. A plant such as Downeast LNG’s proposed plant simply warms LNG to a vapor and then feeds it into the pipeline. A liquefaction plant, such as the one in Algeria, has many components that are not found in a regasification plant, including a hydrocarbon refrigerant system and boilers (the source of the Algeria accident). Furthermore, no one outside the plant was injured and the LNG storage tanks onsite were not damaged by the explosion. Lastly, it was found that the plant lacked automatic shutdown equipment and hazard detection devices that are mandatory at U.S. plants.<sup>4</sup>

---

**(Footnotes)**

<sup>1</sup> Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, 33 CFR Part 165.500 and 502

<sup>1</sup> Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, 33 CFR Part 165.1709

<sup>2</sup> Department of Transportation, Coast Guard, 33 CFR Part 165.755

<sup>3</sup> CH-IV International, Safety History of LNG Operations, January 2005.

**WE HOPE THAT THIS REVIEW OF THE FACTS ABOUT LNG AND THE  
DOWNEAST PROJECT ARE HELPFUL TO YOU.**

The following is the original text of the letter sent by Save Passamaquoddy Bay to the residents of Robbinston Maine.

September 2005

## **AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RESIDENTS AND PROPERTY OWNERS OF ROBBINSTON**

We are in a position of having at least two LNG facilities in our little town plus possibly a third in Calais. Since the initial "splash" of news about our popularity with LNG promoters, not much has been heard about progress in bringing these projects to reality. What does the advent of LNG terminals mean to you? To the town? To the area?

Some of us have heard some of the facts about LNG. There are many more facts that have yet to be discussed and evaluated publicly. This letter and fixture letters in coming weeks, and the accompanying sheets, are offered to help you become acquainted with all the facts. A few examples of facts we need to be aware of

Why are these promoters here? They will tell you it's because they have found the perfect site for this kind of facility. They haven't told you that, so far, no other place on the east/gulf coasts of the United States will allow an LNG facility. Industrial port facilities do not interest the promoters because they don't want to pay the high cost for a site. Example: the industrial port of Mobile, Alabama was offered \$38 million for a site by Exxon/Mobil (a real energy company) and the city said NO! How much are our promoters going to pay for land here?

Late August 2005 an LNG pipeline facility in Kalakama, Nigeria exploded completely destroying aquatic life in the area (a fishing village) and the resulting inferno devastated approximately 9 square miles of adjacent property. Eleven people are missing in that incident.

On 20 September 2004 a fully loaded LNG tanker lost propulsion power off the coast of Norway in heavy weather. The ship's anchors couldn't hold it and it nearly ended up on the rocks of Fedje island before tugs could get control of the ship. Preparations were made to evacuate the island in the event of an explosion.

On 20 January 2004 an explosion at an LNG facility at Skikda, Algeria killed 27 people and injured 74 others.

We are a group of concerned citizens who feel it is important that everyone be aware of ALL the facts associated with having LNG facilities in our midst. Over the coming weeks we will be sending out other letters providing you with information you need in order to make informed decisions about these projects. We solicit your help and encourage you to send us a donation in any amount you can afford to help defray the costs of keeping you aware of the ramifications of LNG facilities.

Please make your checks payable to: SAVE PASSAMAQUODDY BAY and mail them to:

SAVE PASSAMAQUODDY BAY, ROBBINSTON  
P.O. BOX 5  
ROBBINSTON, ME 04671

## Is LNG Right for Robbinston?

### Economics

#### What is the total economic impact to us?

- Downeast LNG proposes a LNG facility in our community's midst without outlining a comprehensive business plan. Where is the plan?
- Many local jobs will be displaced — both in the fishing industry and the growing tourist industry. The livelihood of our local fishermen is at stake. Up to 813 commercial fishing licenses will be endangered by this project.
- Following the construction phase of the project, the few jobs that are projected will be highly skilled and competitive.
- What happens to the state subsidies that currently reduce the town's tax burden?

#### Local costs are a local problem:

- Downeast LNG has offered the town of Robbinston a one-time payment of \$500,000 plus the real estate taxes on the facility, whatever that is. The town of Harpswell was offered \$8 million per year and after an independent economic study, turned it down because having the facility in their town would cost them more than \$8 million per year. The increase is due to demands on the infrastructure, emergency response services. Local emergency response facilities would have to be upgraded, schools might have to be moved, local property tax values will be eroded.
- Once the initial facility is permitted, it is possible that the accompanying cogeneration plant, pipeline, and industrial zone can be forced upon us by FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) through eminent domain.

# L N G

## WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW

**What is LNG?** LNG is natural gas that has been super cooled to minus 260° & compressed to one 600<sup>th</sup> its original volume to form a liquid<sup>2,3</sup>.

**What is Natural Gas?** Natural gas is a fossil fuel, formed primarily of methane, found beneath the earth's surface. It is a NON-RENEWABLE resource<sup>1</sup>.

**Is LNG same as propane?** NO! Propane is several times heavier than natural gas & can be safely stored, transported and delivered to home & businesses by truck. It does not require metering or having an account with a gas utility company<sup>4</sup>.

**Are there problems with shipping LNG?** LNG tankers are considered to be prime terrorists targets by the Federal Government. Helicopter surveillance often accompanies LNG tankers as they near their destinations. The tankers would affect the schooner fleet, pleasure boaters, lobstering and fishing interests among others<sup>8,9,10,11</sup>.

**Would natural gas benefit me?** A natural gas line runs through Baileyville, ME. There are no known plans by any gas company to supply gas service to Washington County residents.

**What would be the impact of having a LNG terminal on the Maine Coast?** LNG installations are associated with a fall in real estate values, especially for properties in close proximity to the terminal. Even a mile inland, property owners can expect to see a 20% decrease in the value of their land and homes. Those closer than a mile would see a much larger decrease in value. Tourists and retirees would avoid these areas<sup>12,13</sup>.

**Are there consequences to residents if there was a LNG terminal in a coastal Town?** Gas terminals are noisy. The tankers are as high as a 12-story building. Their lights and turbine engines run 'round the clock'. The local municipality would bear the added costs of police and fire protection for the lifetime of the gas terminal (estimated at 30 years) which would result in a heavier tax burden on property owners<sup>14</sup>.

### REFERENCES:

1. <http://www.naturalgas.org/overview/overview.asp>
2. American Gas Association
3. LNG Fact Sheet, CH-iv International, "The LNG Specialists"
4. IBID
5. American Gas Association
6. Ibid
7. Gordon Sheurer, CEO Weaver's Cove Energy, Providence Sunday Journal 1/4/04
8. James A. Fay, MIT Professor Emeritus of Mechanical Engineering 1/23/04
9. Jerry Havens, Professor of Chemical Engineering, University of Arkansas-Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, July-August 2003
10. Code of Federal Regulations 33CFR 165.110 paragraph b
11. Dr. Cyril Widdershoven, Editor GESA, Associate Fellow at the Institute For the Analysis of Global Security, 1/21/04
12. Providence (RI) Journal, 3/10/04
13. Report on the Potential Economic & Fiscal Impacts on the Town of Harpswell, Maine, of the LNG terminal proposed by Trans Canada Pipelines and Conoco Phillips.
14. Ibid

## ENVIRONMENT

Passamaquoddy Bay is one of the last pristine places left in the world. It supports a fishery with an economic base that we have long envisioned. Annual income from the bay is Currently estimated at \$1 billion.

Because of the dangerous nature of the cargo & the possibility of a terrorist attack, the Coast Guard may establish an exclusion zone around the ship -- typically two miles up front and one mile behind the vessel -- coming in and leaving the Bay. Nothing moves in the exclusion zone.

**LNG** is dangerous. In the event of a serious accident, everything and everyone in the immediate area is incinerated. EXAMPLE: August, 2005, Nigeria had an explosion & fire of an LNG pipeline that covered 9 sq miles.

Passarnaquoddy Bay is the nursery for various spieces of aquatic life. It is the home to all sorts of birds and natural plant life and boosts of having the largest known "Whirlpool"

**LNG** is a hazardous liquid. If LNG is exposed to the air, as in an accidental accident or terrorist induced spill, it becomes a highly combustibile gas. This information from the Dec. 2004 Sandia National Lab report for United States Government.

