



Save Passamaquoddy Bay

A 3-Nation Alliance

(US • Passamaquoddy • Canada)

PO Box 222 • Eastport, ME 04631

(207)853-2922

info@SavePassamaquoddyBay.org

www.SavePassamaquoddyBay.org

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE Room 1A
Washington, DC 20426

eFiled on 2014 October 14

**Re: Downeast LNG, Docket Nos. PF14-19, CP07-52, CP07-53, CP07-53-001
FERC Impropriety**

Dear Ms. Bose,

Save Passamaquoddy Bay has previously pointed out Downeast LNG's filing that indicates they now propose to regasify a mere 100 standard cubic feet of natural gas per day.^{1, 2, 3, 4} FERC has published and distributed to the public a printed document containing that same insignificant volume.⁵

Now, however, **without mentioning a previous error by either FERC or Downeast LNG**, FERC has published to the docket indicating that Downeast LNG intends to regasify 100 **million** standard cubic feet per day⁶ — **in conflict with the applicant's own filing to the docket and FERC's previous publication.**

Who is the public now to believe — FERC's self-conflicting information or Downeast LNG's filed information? Is it not the applicant's duty to file accurate information to the docket, and to file corrections when errors are made? **Did Downeast LNG make an error or did FERC err in its latest filing?**

Or, is the public to understand that it is FERC's obligation to correct applicant's errors to the docket, if Downeast LNG actually made an error; that the applicant

¹ PF14-19, 20140911-5034(29776187), Resource Report 1, Downeast LNG;

² PF14-19, 20140923-5035, Piddly Regasification Volume, Save Passamaquoddy Bay.

³ PF14-19, CP07-52, et al., 20140924-5072, Motion to Dismiss, Save Passamaquoddy Bay.

⁴ PF14-19, CP07-52, et al., 20141002-5004, Motion for Summary Dismissal, Save Passamaquoddy Bay.

⁵ PF14-19, 20140923-5035, Piddly Regasification Volume, Save Passamaquoddy Bay.

⁶ PF14-19, 20141003-3026, FERC to Prepare EIS; Hold Public Scoping Meeting.

does not have to file accurate information to the docket, since “Uncle FERC” will take care of embarrassing applicant errors?

Where in the regulations is FERC authorized to file in applicants’ stead?

Why should public stakeholders trust FERC and its permitting process under these conflict-of-interest circumstances?

Since FERC does not respond to official parties’ questions (other than the applicant and some elected officials) until *years later* in the Environmental Impact Statement — at what is, essentially, the last minute in the permitting process — *Save Passamaquoddy Bay protests FERC’s ongoing lack of responsiveness to intervenors’ pertinent questions requiring timely answers, and protests the anticipated lack of FERC responsiveness to the questions in this comment.*

Very truly,

Robert Godfrey
Researcher & Webmaster

CC: Sen. Angus King
Sen. Susan Collins
Rep. Mike Michaud
Rep. Chellie Pingree
Office of the Inspector General