

Public Education Forum on Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG)

March 1, 2005 · Oxnard, California

Summary Report

Overview

Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) is emerging as a newsworthy issue of growing public interest in California, with two companies proposing LNG deepwater ports offshore from Ventura County. The Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council (Advisory Council) requested information on LNG and the proposed Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port facility, and the Advisory Council's Executive Committee recommended that the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS or Sanctuary) convene a forum to educate the public on this subject. On March 1, 2005 the Sanctuary and the League of Women Voters of Ventura County (League) co-sponsored a highly successful public educational forum on LNG in Oxnard, California. The co-sponsorship was due to a mutual interest in developing a strictly educational LNG forum with knowledgeable speakers, and because neither the Sanctuary nor the League had taken a position on LNG or on the proposed BHP Billiton Cabrillo Port facility.

Representatives of BHP Billiton, U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), California State Lands Commission, Environmental Defense Center, and Border Power Plant Working Group provided 15-minute presentations, followed by a question and answer session. Pam Pecarich, League Co-President, served as the forum moderator. Approximately 300 people attended the event including: California Fish and Game Commissioner Bob Hattoy; staff from the Office of Senator Dianne Feinstein, the California Coastal Commission, U.S. Navy, Minerals Management Service, USCG, National Park Service; staff from the offices of State Assemblymembers Fran Pavley and Pedro Nava; Ed Moses, Director of Santa Barbara County Housing and Community Development Department; staff from Ventura County Supervisor Steve Bennett's office; and, Ventura City Council member Neal Andrews. The atmosphere throughout the event was calm and productive and the crowd was eager to learn.

Highlights of the forum included:

- Clarification of federal and state agency roles and mandated timelines in the federal and state environmental review processes, and the Deepwater Port Act process;
- Clarification of the Governor's role in approving deepwater port permits;
- Clarification of next steps in the environmental review processes including opportunities for public comment;
- Explanation of economic, environmental, and safety concerns associated with LNG and the proposed Cabrillo Port facility;
- Discussion of the repeal of California LNG siting legislation resulting in the absence of a statewide process to comprehensively review the need for LNG and to select LNG facility sites and technology; and,
- Identification of alternative means of increasing energy supplies.

Additional details are provided in the remainder of this summary report, which is divided into three sections: *Select Background*, *Presentation Highlights*, and *Question/Answer Session*.

Select Background

- On September 3, 2003 BHP Billiton LNG International, Inc. submitted a Deepwater Port Act application to the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and the U.S. Maritime Administration (MARAD) and an application for a lease of State lands to the California State Lands Commission to own, construct and operate Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port, to be located 12.2 nautical miles (about 14 miles) off the coast of Ventura County and 10.8 nautical miles (about 12.43 miles) from the nearest CINMS boundary
- January, 2004 Steven Meheen, BHP's Cabrillo Port Project Manager, provided to the Advisory Council a presentation on the BHP Billiton project proposal
- Advisory Council members expressed an interest in learning more about LNG and in learning more about BHP's proposed facilities (as well as the LNG deepwater port proposed by a second company, Crystal Energy, LLC, at the existing Platform Grace in federal waters), and the Advisory Council's Executive Committee recommended convening an evening public information forum on this subject matter
- In October, 2004 the USCG and California State Lands Commission released a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) analyzing the proposed BHP Billiton Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port and several alternatives to that proposal, as per the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- From November through December, 2004 the USCG and California State Lands Commission held public hearings and solicited public and government agency comments on the Draft EIS/EIR for the proposed BHP Billiton Cabrillo Port LNG Deepwater Port
- December 20th 2004 the public comment period on the Cabrillo Port DEIS/DEIR closed
- On January 5, 2005 the USCG and MARAD notified BHP Billiton that they required additional information from the company in order to complete the EIS/EIR, and that in order to complete the EIS/EIR within the statutory timeframe required by the Deepwater Port they must suspend processing of the license application (i.e., "stop the clock") until the required information is received, analyzed, and incorporated into a Final EIS/EIR
- Although not a primary topic of the March 1, 2005 forum, speakers did address the proposed Crystal Energy Clearwater Port LNG facility during the question and answer session. In early 2004 Crystal Energy, LLC, filed an application for a Deepwater Port license for a proposed LNG import terminal with the USCG, and filed an application for a lease of State lands with the California State Lands Commission. Revised applications were submitted to both agencies in July 2004. As of March 1, 2005, the USCG and the California State Lands Commission had not received a *complete* Deepwater Port Act application from Crystal Energy, LLC, for the proposed Clearwater Port facility.

Presentation Highlights

1. Steven Meheen, Cabrillo Port Project Manager, BHP Billiton LNG International, Inc.

- Energy Information Administration historical data and projections show an increasing need for natural gas imports through 2025 with domestic consumption greater than domestic production, and with projected declines in Canadian imports; LNG sources would be required to meet the need for imported natural gas
- Explained details of the proposed Cabrillo Port facility and characteristics of LNG (colorless, odorless, non-toxic, inflammable, non-corrosive)
- Explained this site chosen for: access to Southern California Gas Company's transmission and distribution networks, preferable operating conditions, minimal environmental impact, and minimal societal impact
- California has the highest energy cost in the U.S. and California needs as much diversity as possible in its energy supply to reduce reliance on any single source
- Concluding points:
 - A long-term, dedicated gas supply will moderate natural gas and electricity prices
 - Cleaner burning natural gas is the fossil fuel of choice
 - California Energy Commission predicts rising prices and supply shortfalls
 - LNG will increase California's natural gas supply diversity, reduce California's reliance on diminishing domestic resources, and reduce reliance on interstate pipeline systems
 - Cabrillo Port will create permanent California-based jobs and annual economic benefits of \$25.5 million.
- FOR MORE INFORMATION ON CABRILLO PORT:

Visit these web sites:

- www.lngsolutions.com
- www.bhpbilliton.com

Call: 805-604-2790

2. Lt. Ken Kusano, Assistant Project Manager and Project Engineer, Deepwater Ports Standards Division, USCG

- A Deepwater Port is defined in the Deepwater Port Act (33 U.S.C. sec. 1501) as:

“Any fixed or floating manmade structure other than a vessel, or any group of such structures, that are located beyond State seaward boundaries and that are

used or intended for use as a port or terminal for the transportation, storage, or further handling of oil or natural gas....”

- Role of the USCG Deepwater Ports Standards Division:
 - “Independent Broker” - neither proponent nor opponent of any Deepwater Port
 - Facilitator between Federal & State agencies

- History of the Deepwater Port Act:
 - Deepwater Port Act of 1974, passed in 1975
 - Only applied to importation of crude oil at offshore terminals
 - Purpose: promote transportation efficiency; protect the environment
 - Deepwater Port Modernization Act of 1996
 - Congress recognized a need to enhance the Nation’s energy supply
 - Updated the existing Act, reduced regulatory burden and promoted innovation, flexibility and efficiency
 - Secretary of Transportation delegated responsibilities to USCG and MARAD
 - Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (MTSA)
 - President signed on November 25, 2002
 - Amended the DWPA to include natural gas
 - Compliance and consistency with NEPA

- Deepwater Port Act mandated 356 day license application processing timeline:
 - 21 day Deepwater Port license application completeness review
 - 5 days to issue Notice of Application
 - days 0 to 240 – National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, including public scoping
 - days 240 to 285 – Federal and State agency review period
 - day 330 – Deepwater Port license application Record of Decision (ROD) issued

- FOR MORE INFORMATION:
 - USCG Deepwater Ports Standards Division
http://www.uscg.mil/hq/g-m/mso/mso_5.htm
 - US Department of Transportation dockets on the BHP Deepwater Port license application and environmental analyses:
<http://dms.dot.gov/search/searchFormSimple.cfm> Docket no. 16877

3. *Cy Oggins, Project Manager and Environmental Scientist in the Environmental Planning and Management Division, California State Lands Commission*

- The State Lands “Commission” is comprised of: the Lieutenant Governor, the State Controller, and the State Director of Finance [the State Lands Commission is assisted by a dedicated staff of specialists in land management, boundary determination, mineral resources, engineering, and the natural and environmental sciences]

- The State Lands Commission manages and protects the State’s “sovereign lands” (which include the beds of all naturally navigable rivers, lakes, and streams and all ungranted tidelands and submerged lands underlying “State waters” from the Mean High Tide line to 3 nautical miles offshore) as well as land-locked State “school lands” (lands that are dedicated to provide revenue for California’s retired teachers). The Commission applies the Public Trust Doctrine to ensure that State lands are used for, as examples, water-oriented commerce, navigation, and fisheries, water-oriented recreation, and preservation of land in a natural state. Implementation of the Public Trust Doctrine requires careful balancing of competing uses to ensure that such uses of public trust lands best meet the needs of the citizens of the State.
- The role of the California State Lands Commission in the LNG process:
 - Processing applications for leases to use State lands for pipeline rights-of-way associated with proposed liquefied natural gas terminal(s) in Federal waters (beyond 3 nautical miles offshore)
 - Serve as the lead agency in evaluating LNG projects pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
 - Provide engineering/safety analysis to verify safety of pipelines and marine terminals
- When will the California State Lands Commission act?
 - After release of the Final EIS/EIR (no project will be approved until CEQA requirements are met and this Commission certifies the EIR as “adequate”)
 - Estimated date for Commission action on EIR is summer or fall 2005
- Next steps:
 - Agencies determine if any revised sections of the Draft EIS/EIR should be re-circulated for public comment
 - Issue a Final EIS/EIR including responses to public and agency comments
 - California State Lands Commission hearings on EIR and lease application
 - California Coastal Commission hearings
 - Governor’s decision on whether or not to approve the Federal deepwater port license
- FOR MORE INFORMATION:
 - California State Lands Commission
<http://www.slc.ca.gov>
 - Cabrillo Port Environmental Review Process
<http://www.cabrilloport.ene.com>
 - Cy Oggins
916-574-1884, ogginsc@slc.ca.gov

4. *Linda Krop, Chief Counsel, Environmental Defense Center*

- For purposes of this forum clarified her status as a representative of the Environmental Defense Center, and not as a representative of the Sanctuary Advisory Council
- Provided ecological highlights of the unique Channel Islands region
- Concerns about importing LNG:
 - This is new technology that is untested and dangerous
 - Will result in significant environmental effects
 - Will have a disproportionate impact on low income and minority communities
 - Safety concerns:
 - LNG spill can result in an explosion or fireball and there are many potential causes of LNG spills
 - Proximity of proposed Cabrillo Port to shipping lanes
 - Impact on other ocean users and marine wildlife
- Cabrillo Port Draft EIS/EIR did not adequately consider:
 - Life cycle impacts of the Cabrillo Port project: exploration, drilling and production, processing, transcontinental tankering, global warming and increased CO2 emissions
 - Hazards posed by an LNG spill (applicant calculates the Area to Be Avoided as 3.7 kilometers, while the correct or FERC method for LNG spills on water yields an Area to Be Avoided of at least 11.9 kilometers and indicates that shipping traffic would be potentially be at risk)
 - Air quality impacts (e.g. cumulative impacts w/ other existing and proposed projects in area)
 - Water quality impacts (e.g. use of seawater for cooling)
 - Impacts to marine wildlife (e.g. acoustic impacts, invasive species in ballast water, increase in risk of vessel collisions with wildlife)
 - Onshore impacts (e.g. proximity of pipeline to schools, impacts to coastal wetlands)
 - Impacts on recreation, commercial operations (fishing/whale watching), conflicts with other land use and preservation priorities, aesthetics, environmental justice
- Alternatives to LNG:
 - Conservation (industrial, residential, commercial, power plant) could yield a total energy savings 2 ½ times greater than the energy provided by the proposed Cabrillo Port project
 - Renewable energy: wind, solar, geothermal, biomass
- For more information:
 - Environmental Defense Center
<http://www.edcnet.org>

5. *Bill Powers, Chair, Border Powerplant Working Group*

- Domestic supplies of natural gas are not running out:
 - The Department of Energy predicts about a 20% increase in domestic production from 2001 to 2025 in response to about 1.8% per year assumed growth rate in demand
- U.S. domestic natural gas production and Canadian production will rise considerably to meet the 1.8% per year projected growth in demand
- The arrival of LNG will not reduce gas prices:
 - The Department of Energy predicts natural gas prices will rise to \$3.95/MMBtu (million British thermal units) by 2025 (assumes no LNG on west coast until 2020), whereas the cost to get LNG to California is well over \$4/MMBtu, and the marginal cost of domestic production is well under \$3/MMBtu
 - There is no consensus among government and industry analysts whether LNG will have any impact on price
 - LNG has a high cost relative to domestic gas and only Baja LNG will become competitive around 2015-2020
- Issue is one of non-competitive natural gas trading, not shortage of domestic supply
- U.S. gas consumption has remained static between 1998 and 2004, and in 2004 production was high relative to consumption, and gas storage is at a historic high
- Aggressive efficiency and renewable energy sources are a cost effective alternative to LNG and have the potential to reduce demand by the equivalent of at least two LNG terminals
- Conclusion: Gas demand reduction is the best public policy approach
 - There is tremendous public support for renewable energy sources
 - The conservation effort in spring 2001 was probably the most unifying event for California citizenry in 25 years
 - Public interest is best served by decreasing demand aggressively with efficiency and renewable energy sources, not increasing supply via LNG
 - The biggest political obstacles to implementing demand reduction policy will be utilities and companies with financial interest in natural gas and LNG supply businesses
- FOR MORE INFORMATION:
 - Border Power Plant Working Group
<http://www.borderpowerplants.org/>

- Bill Powers
619-295-2072

6. *Steven Meheen: opportunity to respond to other presentations*

- The EIS is an agency document and BHP is the impartial party that paid for it
- The price of natural gas has doubled and has not been below \$5/Mmbtu for months
- Additional natural gas supplies are the answer

Question/Answer Session

1. *Will the agencies compare and contrast the Crystal Energy and BHP Billiton project proposals?*

Cy Oggins: Crystal Energy initially filed an application for a Deepwater Port license with the USCG on January 28, 2004 and an application for a lease of State lands to the California State Lands Commission on February 10, 2004; both the Federal and State applications were deemed incomplete. Crystal Energy submitted revised applications in July 2004 and additional responses to agency comments in January 2005. Both the Federal and State applications remain incomplete and, therefore, the environmental review of this proposed project has not started. When it does start, the process will be the same as that for the BHP application, with public scoping meetings to determine the scope of a project EIS/EIR, public meetings on the Draft EIS/EIR, etc. It is doubtful that the Crystal Energy application will go to the California State Lands Commission, for a decision at a noticed public hearing, before 2006.

Ken Kusano: The USCG is still collecting information from other Federal agencies.

2. *If there were a project in California what criteria should it meet? (Directed to Bill Powers)*

Bill Powers: It should be far away from people, far offshore. It should not use seawater for regasification. Note that these criteria do not account for individual siting issues.

3. *If it is decided that the State needs an LNG terminal what type is best?*

Steven Meheen: Something far offshore with minimal environmental and societal impact.

Linda Krop: Look at each project specifically. This EIS does not provide a sufficiently broad range of options, but rather it looks at a minor tweaking of the main alternative, which is poorly located.

4. *How will LNG affect the price of gas? (Directed to Bill Powers)*

Bill Powers: In the last couple of years natural gas prices have risen high when demand has dropped and storage is at all time highs. Independent giants are raising Cain over the market out of control. High prices result from the market being poorly regulated, not from supply.

5. *Will the energy supply be more constant?*

Steven Meheen: The economic impact will be \$25 million per year in taxes, local purchasing and jobs.

6. *What is the safety record of LNG facilities on the East Coast?*

Ken Kusano: The most significant LNG project is an onshore LNG terminal in Boston,

which has been in existence since the 1970's and has not had a major safety incident to date. USCG Sector Boston has an extensive security plan for incoming vessels and has increased security requirements since September 11th. Certain vessels entering Boston Harbor may be classified as "High Interest Vessels" by the Captain of the Port, such as LNG carriers, chemical tankers and cruise ships. Classification is based on factors such as cargo, port of call and the current Department of Homeland Security designated threat level. Due to their classification as High Interest Vessels, some precautions when LNG tankers enter Boston Harbor include: an area bridge is temporarily closed (for approximately 10 minutes) and flight patterns and air traffic at Logan International Airport may be temporarily altered in an effort to achieve a safe vessel transit.

7. *Why is it dangerous to have a facility 14 miles offshore?*

Linda Krop: There are three tanks on the LNG supertanker. Release of LNG from just one tank could affect an eleven-mile area. For this reason the Environmental Defense Center asked the agencies to look at the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) approach and come up with a new analysis.

Cy Oggins: We are reviewing and will respond in writing to each comment received on the Draft EIS/EIR during the public comment period, including those of the Environmental Defense Center. The USCG and California State Lands Commission staffs are also seeking an independent review by Sandia National Laboratories, which released a relevant paper in December 2004 (entitled *Guidance on Risk Analysis and Safety Implications of a LNG Spill Over Water*), of portions of the public safety analysis and conclusions contained in the draft EIS/EIR. As required by the State CEQA Guidelines (see section 15088.5), if such review results in significant new information or data being added to the EIS/EIR, we would be obliged to, for example, recirculate the public safety section of the draft EIS/EIR for additional public comment.

Ken Kusano: The report was very specific to this project and did not compare or use old models from the 1970's, like the FERC model. This is partly because the FERC model uses land mass as a heating medium, which freezes; this project's model uses seawater, which has much greater heat mass.

8. *Compressed natural gas buses are used throughout the city. LNG is not compressed like CNG so why is LNG dangerous 14 miles offshore?*

Steven Meheen: Buses have diesel engines replaced or converted to run on LNG. Motor vehicles can get more gas in a smaller space with liquid. CNG is pressurized but its range is limited because you cannot carry as much. LNG offshore won't cause any danger to society onshore.

9. *If a pipeline is run to Ormond Beach how much environmental damage to wetlands would be prevented?*

Steven Meheen: The pipeline would either come to Pt. Mugu or the Reliant Energy property.

We will drill a horizontal tunnel about 1 mile offshore and there will be no excavation of the beach or wetland. It will be either on the Naval Air Weapons Station COTAR structure, or at Reliant. It will be a minimum of 50 feet below the wetlands.

Cy Oggins: Input from the State Coastal Conservancy and the California Department of Fish and Game is incorporated into the document.

10. *If LNG doesn't work what can we do to increase supply? If not LNG what can we do to prevent a crisis?*

Linda Krop: an analysis of increased energy conservation and efficiency found that conservation and efficiency yield a 5% savings across the board (industrial, residential, commercial and power plant). Upgrading the oldest power plants you get about 70% of the energy from an LNG project. Increasing renewable energy sources (wind, solar, biodiesel) can yield the equivalent of an LNG terminal.

Ken Kusano: Many comments on the EIS emphasized the need to conserve. While energy conservation is a laudable goal, Federal agencies are required to look at the energy needs of the entire U.S. and those agencies do not have control over conservation measures by citizens.

[Note: Energy conservation was analyzed by the USCG and State Lands Commission in the public draft EIS/EIR; at this time, the Federal and State lead agencies have not identified if or how that analysis will be modified.]

Bill Powers: I commend the LNG industry for convincing the public to believe that we need more natural gas. The reality is that consumption has declined over the last 10 years. The California Energy Commission has stated that the arrival of LNG could modulate price, not advocated that we need LNG. I disagree with Steven in that ratepayers will pay for it, whereas he maintains that they will not. How to make money in the gas business is by building new facilities. Policy should not be left to proponents of gas projects.

Steven Meheen: Natural gas contracts are not long-term. Public utilities will not underpin the LNG business if the market will not support it. Don't mistake public utilities for private entities. I agree that the Ormond plant should be refitted, but whose money will be spent to do it? These are deregulated enterprises. The industry will do it when the market demands it. BHP is here to sell gas for a reasonable price and to benefit its shareholders.

11. *If we want natural gas is there another way to get it?*

Steven Meheen: We will always get natural gas as long as it's available. The question is, "At what price?" Wells are in a state of decline, decreasing at 1.5% per year. The Gulf of Mexico tends to produce more oil than gas.

Bill Powers: Our coalition has been an intervener in the process, but we have been denied at

every step and are about to issue a lawsuit. In addition, 20 California Congressional Representatives and 20 California Senators have asked for an open process and been denied.

12. *When does BHP plan to have the port open if approved? (Directed to Steven Meheen)*

BHP plans to have it in operation by 2009 or 2010, then the life of the project will be dictated by how long it is useful.

13. *How large are the pipelines that travel past mobile home parks and schools?*

Steven Meheen: The line is 36 inches in diameter going up the beach, these pipelines onshore will be owned by Southern California Gas Company just as the current ones are.

[Additional clarification: The proposed project is for two new 24-inch pipelines offshore that will cross below the shoreline/beach via horizontal directional drilling, and one new 36-inch line onshore within Oxnard and/or Ventura County.]

14. *Do tankers go back empty?*

Steven Meheen: They keep a small percentage in their tanks and also use it for transport fuel.

15. *How much of the LNG would be for beyond California borders?*

Steven Meheen: Current rules would prohibit California from selling the LNG beyond its borders.

16. *If there is a spill who is responsible for the cleanup?*

Steven Meheen: BHP Billiton is responsible.

17. *What is the latest date on which the Governor can veto the project?*

Ken Kusano: The 0 – 240 day window is for the NEPA process. After 240 days, the Governor has 45 days to make a decision. In this case public comments closed on December 20, 2004 and the Final EIS/EIR would have been released around February 11 or 18. If the clock had not stopped, the Governor would have had until about April 5. With the clock stopped I estimate this deadline will occur two to six months beyond April 5. The “clock start” date is subject to change based on the information request we receive from BHP.

18. *What are the costs to tax payers?*

Steven Meheen: There are no costs to tax payers for any portion of BHP Billiton’s project.

Bill Powers: The project will not go forward without a Southern California Gas long-term contract project. Bankers will not back it without learning if they will get the money from

you.

Steven Meheen: BHP is capable of undertaking the project without a banker.

19. *Australia is looking to sign a natural gas contract. Will we end up with dirty gas from Indonesia?*

Steven Meheen: We will use Scarborough Field, with an economic life of 38 years. We have the ability to get gas from Indonesia, but no desire to do so. Our desire is to develop our assets in Australia.

20. *Can you convey the health effects?*

Steven Meheen: I'm not aware of any carcinogenic problems.

Ken Kusano: Pig farms and cattle farms produce methane. It's an asphyxiate.

Steven Meheen: When pressured in a confined space it's explosive.

21. *BHP's recently proposed pipeline will pass within 1500 feet of a school, violating the California Code. This is not taken into consideration in the EIS.*

Steven Meheen: BHP is in direct consultation with the School Superintendent. The routes are proposed by Southern California Gas, which owns and operates the pipelines. The reference that this violates California Code is probably not correct.

Linda Krop: George Shaw from the California Department of Education raised a similar concern. When the State Department of Education is concerned it's something to look into.

22. *Will the public comment period be extended after the agencies get more information?*

Cy Oggins: There are specific triggers under the CEQA that indicate whether all or portions of an EIR need to be recirculated. [see the State CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5] If these requirements are met, the modified portions will be recirculated. Also, we will receive additional comments on the Final EIS/EIR. California State Lands Commission policy is not to act for a minimum of 15 days after the final document is on the street. It is our understanding that the Governor will need a certified EIR in order to act on the federal deepwater port license, and that if the Governor cannot act, the federal license is presumed to be approved pursuant to the Federal Deepwater Port Act.

Ken Kusano: The public comment period on the Draft EIS/EIR closed on December 20, 2004. If any sections are re-released there will be an additional comment period.

23. *Why has the process for BHP's Cabrillo Port been halted?*

Ken Kusano: Members of the public are the "graders" for the Draft EIS. According to the

Deepwater Port Act there is no way for the USCG to stop the clock. Congress wrote the law and if the USCG does not abide by the timeline we violate the law. It can only be stopped if it is determined that we do not have adequate information.

24. *Will California or residents be ensured that we get preference in gas if we bear the risks of the project?*

Steven Meheen: For BHP it's our gas so we can sell it to whomever we like.

25. *Why is there no process to decide on siting of the facility? Why is there no process for public involvement?*

Bill Powers: Write a letter to your local Assemblymember or Senator asking them not to just pay lip service to the Energy Plan.

Chris Mobley (Sanctuary Manager): The sanctuary system encourages all citizens and consumers to make responsible decisions by becoming informed. For example, we have coral reefs in Florida. Anything we can do to decrease carbon dioxide emissions can potentially help to decrease global warming and its effects on coral reefs. You can do many things politically, but there are also things each consumer can do. Consumers should become informed and make good environmental choices, such as conserving energy.

Linda Krop: Support the request for evidentiary hearings before the California Public Utilities Commission, to ensure public disclosure of real supply and demand figures for natural gas procurement. Contact the Governor's office; he has the ability to veto license applications. Six months ago the Governor's office told us they didn't think this was an issue for the local community, but look at the crowd at this forum. The LNG Siting Act requested that the State look at this issue on a statewide basis during the "crisis" in the 1970's in terms of the best place, the best technology, etc.... But, because we didn't have a natural gas crisis that Act was repealed. Now we have a race to the finish line since likely only one project may be favored by the Governor's office. Whoever gets approved first could be it. Require of the Governor a comprehensive Statewide review so we can decide: 1) whether we need LNG, and if so 2) where and what is the best way to do it. Request that the Governor implement the existing California energy Action Plan, which prioritizes conservation, efficiency and renewables.