

Resolution Against LNG (Liquefied Natural Gas) Tankers and Terminals in the Columbia River

1
2
3
4 **WHEREAS**, the Republican-controlled Congress passed the 2005 Energy Bill, which
5 granted the presidential-appointee panel at FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory
6 Commission) the sole and exclusive authority to site LNG (liquefied natural gas)
7 terminals in the United States, even over the objections of the affected states' governors;
8

9 **WHEREAS**, there are plans to site LNG terminals in the Columbia River estuary near
10 Astoria, as well as at Coos Bay in order to supply California with vast quantities of
11 natural gas after California's citizens and politicians united to adamantly oppose LNG
12 in California's harbors and along their coastlines;
13

14 **WHEREAS**, a typical LNG tanker, which is over 3 football fields long and carries 35
15 million gallons of LNG--which is the equivalent of 20 billion gallons of natural gas --
16 could explode with the energy of 55 Hiroshima bombs, engulfing nearby communities
17 in an inferno;
18

19 **WHEREAS**, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) released a report on Jan. 8,
20 2007 which states that LNG tankers are prime terrorist targets and the Coast Guard is
21 stretched too thin to provide adequate protection for those tankers;
22

23 **WHEREAS**, LNG in the Columbia River estuary creates a threat to critical salmon
24 habitat and each outgoing LNG tanker would take 20 million gallons of fresh water
25 with it as dead weight to stabilize the empty ship ;
26

27 **WHEREAS**, due to the extreme risk of explosion, the Coast Guard requires a 1500-ft.
28 'safety exclusion zone' on each side of LNG tankers, which would force boaters,
29 recreational and commercial fishermen to the margins of the Columbia River and 24
30 hour surveillance cameras would invade the privacy of ordinary citizens;
31

32 **WHEREAS**, the National Grange, the oldest farm and rural public interest organization
33 in the United States, vigorously opposes LNG tankers, terminals and pipelines because
34 they threaten public safety, degrade the environment and obstruct the movement of
35 farm products down the Columbia River to market;
36

37 **WHEREAS**, Congressman Brian Baird (D), along with 19th Legislative District
38 representatives Dean Takko (D-Longview), Brian Blake (D-Aberdeen) and state senator
39 Brian Hatfield (D-Raymond) have announced their opposition to LNG in the Columbia
40 River;
41

42 **WHEREAS**, other governors have taken has taken a leadership role in fighting LNG,
43 but Gov. Gregoire, Senator Murray and Senator Cantwell are, as yet, unwilling to
44 oppose LNG in the Columbia River;

45
46 **THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, we, the Washington State Democrats call on
47 each and every one of our Washington state and federal representatives and the Oregon
48 Democratic Central Committee and United States Congressman Wu (D-OR) to oppose
49 LNG in the Columbia River because importing even more foreign fossil fuels is a major
50 step in the wrong direction and the Columbia River should not be exploited as the back
51 door for California's natural gas imports.

- 52
53 1. http://timrileylaw.com/LNG_TANKERS.htm
54 2. [http://www.oregonlive.com/oregonian/stories/index.ssf?/base/editorial/1188](http://www.oregonlive.com/oregonian/stories/index.ssf?/base/editorial/1188255348196890.xml&coll=7)
55 [255348196890.xml&coll=7](http://www.oregonlive.com/oregonian/stories/index.ssf?/base/editorial/1188255348196890.xml&coll=7)
56

57
58 Submitted by the 12th Legislative District Democrats to the Washington State
59 Democratic Central Committee for consideration at its January 26, 2008 meeting in the
60 Vancouver. (Date Submitted 1/14/2008)

61
62 The WSDCC Resolutions Committee "AMENDED THIS RESOLUTION AND
63 RECOMMENDED A PASS" at its January 26, 2008 meeting in Vancouver.

64
65 The WSDCC "PASSED" this resolution at its January 26, 2008 meeting in Vancouver.