

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

From: [Laura Jones](#)
To: [Wilson, Aimee](#)
Cc: [David](#); [David Cole](#); [Susan](#); [D Stokes](#)
Subject: Re: Freeport LNG GHG PSD Permit Public Notice Comment Period Notification
Date: Thursday, January 02, 2014 8:11:26 PM

In Reference to Freeport LNG GHG PSD Permit Public Notice Comment Period

The new location, although more aesthetically pleasing for Hide-A-Way on the Gulf and other Save Our Subdivision (SOS) neighborhoods, has brought its own set of concerns, in addition to some of the old concerns that are still looming.

The need for Air Quality Monitoring Systems: The new location of the proposed pretreatment facility, near the intersection of Highway 332 and CR 690, which is very, VERY close to several residential areas, is many, MANY miles away from any of the current air quality monitoring systems – in excess of 5 miles. Also, the prevailing winds will carry the emissions in our (SOS'S) direction, the complete opposite direction of where any of the monitors are and into uncharted areas, off the monitoring grid. So, besides the point of the Brazosport Area lagging far behind (population per monitor) other industrial cities in the count of air monitoring devices, the Brazosport Area monitored areas are FAR removed from our area and the location of the proposed pretreatment facility. Also not taken into account is the HUGE visiting population to our resort/beach location. We have a very large influx of people at all times of the year – families, teens, sportsmen and sportswomen, boaters, birders and Winter Texans. Our population SWELLS beyond the census-driven population count, therefore we are even MORE lacking in the number of monitors for our area. Now, as for the proposed location of the plant, it will be positioned adjacent to and in the pathway of all these visitors who make their way to the beach – they have to pass directly in front of this proposed location. No monitoring devices in more than 5 miles and in the opposite direction of prevailing winds – REALLY???

Our neighborhoods are comprised of mostly retired or soon to be retired individuals. With that population in mind, there are usually more respiratory issues within the population. All the emissions listed within both the EPA and the TCEQ applications indicate MANY that will either create new or exacerbate respiratory conditions or illnesses in these individuals. Particulates are a MAJOR concern to all of us and our respiratory health. Without proper monitoring at the plant-site and in our neighborhoods, we will be exposed to many "knowns" and "unknowns" without the awareness we need to protect ourselves and our loved ones. We are also cognizant to the fact that the chemical modeling/theorizing cannot accurately predict or consider the Toxic Chemical Cocktails these emissions will create. We need monitors and we need them NOW, before construction begins, so we can get baseline measurements for the record. It could truly be a life or death decision you, the EPA, are making for those of us who will suffer the day in/day out toxic fall-out from these emissions.

I have yet to mention the impact these emissions will have on our wildlife – the birds, fish, animals of all kinds and the vegetation and water they depend upon. With a deposition rate of 38% (as established in the Great Waters study) of all air pollutants migrating into our waters, this will be devastating to our environment. We fear for our Bays, Oceans, Rivers, Creeks, Estuaries and Nurseries/Hatcheries and the wildlife that depend upon a clean environment. And we cannot forget – our GROUND WATER – we are on community wells and our wells will be continually threatened by this proposed plant and its emissions.

Light Pollution: With no one being clear on how this plant will be situated or elevated, I am very concerned about the light necessary to illuminate this plant will spill out and over the levy and into our residential areas, therefore robbing us of our view of star-filled skies and beautiful sunsets and sunrises forever more. The FLNG Metering plant already infringes somewhat on us already. What will a plant exponentially larger create?? And how far above grade will they build, which once again will multiply the effect for those of us near to them. And it is not limited to concerns about our scenic beauty, much of the wildlife needs the dark of night-fall. Whether it is for hunting, sleeping,

mating, or other purposes, they need a time of darkness not a home of perpetual light. They cannot thrive or live in this kind of environment.

Noise pollution: A major concern to me is Noise Pollution. After returning home quickly after Hurricane Ike passed through, we came back to a surreal world of darkness, plywood covered windows, damage and PERPETUAL NOISE. The sound of generators roared through out this neighborhood. It is usually a place of peace and tranquility – a place of where you can hear a neighbor talking 4 houses away, a place you can hear a wrench drop in a driveway 3 blocks away, and barking dogs from the other side of the neighborhood. With no looming trees, open prairie around us, and perpetual winds to carry it, noise travels extreme distances out here. In the winter, it is magnified even more so. Reflecting back on Ike, it is the noise that sticks most in my memory and I can remember the day we got our electricity back on and the beautiful sound of silence once more when everyone turned off their generators. With FLNG building in the proposed location, the direction of the prevailing winds, and the EXTREME possibility of the plant being elevated, the noise will be heard here perpetually - 24/7, 365 days a year, day in/day out for decades to come. We will never know that welcomed sound of silence again. And here again, it is not just us humans affected by this. The wildlife will be driven from their feeding, breeding, nursery, play grounds because of the perpetual noise and vibration. Their senses are more pronounced than ours are and the effect will be exponentially more to them.

Welfare and Safety: It has been well documented – our protest of, not only the pretreatment plant when it was to be built on CR 792, but of the pipeline, possible expansion and the safety of our homes and families in the event of an explosion/release. There is only one way in to our subdivisions, therefore there is only one way out. The pipeline parallels CR792 for some distance, which causes us grave concern. If there is an incident, we will effectively be “cut off” from any chance of rescue or escape. Getting rescue boats in-mass to our location would take hours and hours and we would be a lost cause in the event of a disaster. Because of Home Land Security’s involvement, we cannot see what kind of safe guards are in place, where the cut-offs for the pipelines are , what kind of fail-safes are utilized and whether there are

sufficient amounts used to protect us from such a situation. How will we be informed, how will visitors, be informed, who will train us on evacuations, who will help us?? We have GRAVE concerns about this issue.

Socio-Economic Impact: Many of the Residents now impacted by the new location of the Pretreatment Facility are retired and are on very limited incomes. They are sentenced to live the remainder of their lives in the shadow of this plant because they have no financial means to move or the ability to relocate. What a sad thing – would you want this for your loved ones??

Exporting LNG: Lastly, what is wrong with this picture?? Why must we export our resources that are so desperately needed here? Our vehicles could be retro-fitted to run on this gas. And what about exporting this resource and we are left with the toxic fall out here, in our homes, in our wildlife, in our laps and all the way destroying all we hold dear – our health, our homes, our wildlife , our environment – whilsts China and the likes enjoy the benefit of the toxic fallout left here? Jobs here at home - ??? FLNG has been misleading the community in so many ways – this is just another of their attempts at smoke and mirrors. The vast majority of the jobs they “create” will be temporary, AT BEST. They will only have a handful of on-site operation personnel once they begin processing the gas. The damage to our wildlife, our homes, our health and our welfare will be immeasurable.

Laura Jones

Hide-A-Way on the Gulf Resident

Laura Jones



On Thu, Dec 5, 2013 at 3:01 PM, Wilson, Aimee <Wilson.Aimee@epa.gov> wrote:

| In accordance with the Clean Air Act (CAA), the U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency has proposed a draft PSD permit for Freeport LNG. The draft permit, statement of basis and other key documents relevant to the draft PSD permit are available online at <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r6/Apermit.nsf/AirP>.

Laura,

I will let you know if the comment period is extended.

Thanks,

Aimee Wilson



Aimee Wilson
Air Permits Section (6PD-R)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1445 Ross Avenue
Dallas, Texas 75202
214-665-7596

From: Vpfs@aol.com
To: [Wilson, Aimee](#)
Subject: FLNG Liquification Project
Date: Thursday, January 02, 2014 11:50:37 AM

Ms Wilson,

My name is JAMES T. MAHER and I live at 166 Sand Shoals Rd. in Freeport Texas in the subdivision Hideaway on the Gulf. I am writing you in hopes that the FLNG project that is scheduled for 1500 Lamar St, Quintana, TX 77541 can be located elsewhere. When I retired 2 years ago I invested my life's savings in my property. I have had severe allergies for over 10 years which cause me breathing issues. I must sleep with a CPAP machine and have deterioration of my esophagus. I take medications for this daily and am under a doctor's care. I spent 4 months at MD Anderson and hopefully the cancer that I was treated for will not return. I don't think it unfair to request that this project be relocated so that I can remain in my house.

I have a real concern as according to the permit Flng will be emitting additional greenhouse gases and I quote "Under the provisions of 40 CFR 52.21 (except paragraph (a)(1)), EPA Region 6 implements a greenhouse gas PSD Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) for Texas. See 40 CFR 52.2305. AS THE PROJECT WILL RESULT IN INCREASED GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS FOE THE FACILITY DESCRIBED AT 40 CFR 52.21(b)(49)(v) and this will pose a direct impact on my health. I do not want to be forced from the home that I spent a lifetime saving for and would appreciate any consideration that you may be able to lend to getting this project located elsewhere.

James T. Maher



RECEIVED - 6PDL
AIR PLANNING SEC.

To: Aimee Wilson EP 1A JAN-8 PM 6:08

From: Melanie Oldham

Re: Freeport LNG Development, LP,
Freeport LNG Liquefaction Projects
, Pre-Treatment Plant

I'm a citizen of Freeport, TX,
where the Freeport LNG Pretreatment
has been proposed to be built.

I'm concerned about the proposed
construction of the natural gas pre-
treatment plant, for several reasons:

The Pre-treatment Facility will
be built in Brazoria Co, which has
been a severe non-attainment county
for OZONE for years. (2) Summers
ago TCEQ proposed decreasing ~~LNG's~~
non-attainment status, but in June
2012, we (B.C) had the highest
Ozone ^{to} Readings in the state in
our county - in Manvel, Tx.

I'm very concerned about the
CO₂ and other greenhouse gases
this proposed Pre-treatment Facility
will off gas, affecting my and
other citizens of Freeport, Tx
health and welfare.

We have the accumulative affect
of having numerous companies -
DOW Chemical, BASF, Chevron-Phillips
Shin-Tec, etc., who according to

① Also, numerous LNG ships will be in and out of intercostal canal putting out COC's - has this been looked at?

our EPA TRI (2012) also put out Greenhouse Gases has EPA looked at the accumulate affect of all these greenhouse gases from various sources in Brazoria Co, along with proposed emissions from FLNG Pre-treatment plant?

After reading their permit application relating to (PSD), I and others are concerned about whether or not they are proposing use of BACT or not?

How do they (FLNG) calculate their total emissions they will have from the Pre-treatment plant on an annual basis?

Freeport LNG proposes to also build (3) Liquefaction plants @ the existing terminal on Quintana Island which will also put out Greenhouse Gases and other COC's. Please look @ the accumulative impact for Freeport Tx. and surrounding area.

Also, how will they contain all their CO₂ emmissions - in experimental storage in salt domes? or piping the CO₂ from Freeport, Tx to Pearland, Tx to Dendry Co, ^{with} ~~BC~~ pipes full of CO₂ thru out ^{BC} county - could be a safety hazard. Please listen and address my concerns.

Melanie Oldham

Oldham

Attn: Aimee Wilson

Air Permits Section

U.S. EPA Region 6

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 1200
Dallas, Texas 75202

752022733

||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||||



FOREVER

FIRST-CLASS USA

