

**Why worry if the energy industry says LNG is safe?**

By Tim Riley and Hayden Riley

Malibu and other coastal communities throughout America are currently being targeted by the energy industry for building large, vulnerable and dangerous Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) importation facilities - attempting to industrialize our precious coastline and beaches and making America dependant on more imported fossil fuel.

America, which is clearly dependent on foreign oil, will soon become dependent on foreign gas as well, if the LNG proponents have their way.

Currently the natural gas California doesn't produce for its own use, it imports from the good old USA. LNG investors however, want to change that by increasing our dependence on foreign gas from Pacific Rim countries, i.e. Malaysia, Indonesia, and Australia. They want us to export more American dollars for more foreign fossil fuel, while jeopardizing our precious coastal communities.

A constant fleet of enormous tankers is required to deliver LNG. Typically, each floating tanker is longer than three football fields, takes more than five miles to halt, holds 33 million gallons of LNG which equals 20 billion gallons of natural gas, which according to a study done for the U.S. Pentagon - has the energy equivalent of 55 Hiroshima bombs.

It is this tremendous volume of energy stored in floating tanks that makes LNG such an ever-present horrifying danger. The release of such an enormous volume of gas would cause mass destruction.

It is no wonder LNG tankers have been described as 'floating bombs' and 'terrorist targets'. September 21, 2004, The Providence Journal article, "Lloyd's Executive Likens LNG Attack to Nuclear Explosion," reported a Lloyd's of London Insurance executive likened an LNG attack to a nuclear explosion. "The assertion, which is contested by industry experts, was in a speech that the chairman, Peter Levene, delivered last night to business leaders in Houston."

"Gas carriers too, whether at sea or in ports, make obvious targets," said Levene. "Specialists reckon that a terrorist attack on an LNG tanker would have the force of a small nuclear explosion."

The first commercial LNG facility built in the US had a major industrial accident known as the Cleveland Disaster. In 1944, LNG holding tanks failed and released their contents into the streets and sewers and their vaporous cloud ignited and fire engulfed the nearby residents and commercial establishments. The fiery blast devastated approximately one square mile, killed 128 and left 680 homeless. Footage of the disaster looks like Hiroshima after the bomb.

One LNG tanker holds more than 20 times the volume of gas that incinerated one square mile of Cleveland.

The proposed BHPB LNG facility off Malibu would hold 60 times the volume of gas that incinerated one square mile of Cleveland.

The BHPB (FSRU) and the Crystal Energy (Platform Grace) LNG proposals off Malibu are labeled 'innovative' by LNG proponents. Their offshore proposals have never actually been tried or tested anywhere on earth before. Malibu residents will be guinea pigs!

It is speculation that their proposals will work flawlessly the first time out of the box and will never have an accident. It is pure Pollyanna to assume the LNG facilities and pipelines anchored in a seismically active area will withstand earthquakes, hurricanes and tsunamis.

According to a recent U.S. Department of the Interior and U.S. Geological Survey:  
"The estimated probability of a magnitude 6.5 or larger earthquake (comparable in size to the 2003 San Simeon quake) occurring in the next 30 years within 30 miles of Platform Grace is 50-60%; for Cabrillo Port, the estimate is a 35% likelihood. Combining these probabilities of earthquake occurrence with relationships that give expected ground motions yields the estimated seismic-shaking hazard. In parts of the project area, the estimated shaking hazard is as high as along the San Andreas Fault."

The LNG proponents cannot guarantee our communities that the offshore LNG facilities will never break free from the sea floor and bound uncontrollably towards shore producing a massive disaster. Particularly where, "BHP Billiton is mystified how one of its supposedly hurricane-proof offshore oil and gas platforms broke its moorings and drifted out of control for almost 270 kilometres," according to the Australian Financial Review, published September 28, 2005.

A Malibu LNG disaster must never become part of their learning curve!

LNG, tankers, offshore platforms, billions of gallons of natural gas, industrial-sized pipelines, earthquakes, liquefaction, onshore winds, storms, rough seas, tsunami, fog, collisions, lightening, metal fatigue, defects, corrosion, leakage, 'innovative' technology, human error, Pacific missile range, and terrorists is a recipe for disaster - posing a realistic danger to our coastal communities every second of every day.

The city of Oxnard, California rejected LNG in 1977, after their formal Environmental Impact Report (EIR) determined an offshore LNG tanker accident releasing its full cargo (5 tanks) onto the water, would vaporize and drift downwind onto shore, dispersing 30-miles before reaching its ignitable level, exposing 70,000 people to instant death.

The laws of physics have not changed since 1977. The properties of LNG have not changed since 1977. Just the LNG computer modeling and 'worst case' scenarios keep changing since 1977.

A Sandia report in December of 2004, entitled, Guidance on Risk Analysis and Safety Implications of a Large Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Spill Over Water determined that a 'worst case' scenario 5 meter squared hole in 3 LNG tanks spilling for 8 minutes would cause a flammable LNG vapor cloud to extend approximately 2.2 miles.

Then in March of 2006, a new Sandia Report reviewing the BHPB Malibu proposal determined that a 'worst case' 2 tank spill scenario would produce a flammable vapor cloud that could extend 7.3 miles.

We are gravely concerned about these ever changing inconsistent 'worst case' scenarios, particularly where Sandia has admitted, "Currently, the potential for an LNG cargo tank breach, whether accidental or intentional, the dynamics and dispersion of a large spill, and the hazards of such a spill, are not fully understood..."

"Due to limited experience and experimental testing associated with large-scale spills over water, most studies use simplifying assumptions to calculate and predict the hazards of a large LNG spill. The range of assumptions and estimates for many complicated spill scenarios can lead to significant variability in estimating the probability, hazards, consequences, and overall risks of large LNG spills over water."

Which is accurate - the 30 mile - the 2.2 mile or the 7.3 mile LNG vapor cloud inferno?

The federal Deepwater Port Act authorizes Governor Schwarzenegger to disapprove offshore LNG facilities.

The Malibu community must make sure that Arnold stops the risky LNG industrialization of our precious coastline.

---

Attorney Tim Riley and his wife Hayden Riley are consumer protection advocates from Oxnard Shores, California, who wrote, produced and directed the documentary film, The Risks and Danger of LNG, an Official Selection of the Malibu Film Festival. The film offsets the energy industry 'safety' myths by revealing LNG's documented risks and danger; and exposes LNG's vulnerability to accidental disaster and terrorism, and demonstrates how massive its destruction can be to our coastal communities if we just sit idly by. It is the film the energy industry doesn't want you to see.