

From: [rcwebcontact](#)
To: [Rules Coordinator](#)
Subject: The Form "Rules Comment Form" was submitted
Date: Monday, July 24, 2023 9:20:08 AM



General Comment

Here is a new comment from the Web.

Comment

Choose Form

Ch. 5

Name

Diane Teter

Address

915 S 7th Ave

City

Edinburg

State

TX

Zip

78539

Business Phone, Fax

9562490872

Email Confidentiality Preference

No, I request my e-mail address to remain confidential

Email Address

[REDACTED]

Comments concerning proposed rulemakings

I am commenting on Carbon Capture and Storage Regulation to be regulated by Texas Railroad Commission, and I am in opposition as the past permits have shown that there are consistently conflict-of-interests of the commissioners, and especially Ms. Craddick, when regulating the oil/gas industries in Texas. I am in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas where 3 proposed LNG export terminals/pipelines are to be sited on the Brownsville Ship Channel. Below you will find my letter to the editor in the local newspapers. Why should anyone from our RGV area care about the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration's online meeting held in early June? Were there concerns raised in northern cities which would coincide with the RGLNG (Rio Grande) export terminal, its Rio Bravo pipelines, and CCSS (Carbon Capture Storage & Sequestration) proposed for our nearby coastal cities of SPI, Laguna Vista, Pt. Isabel? Yes, we should care and take note! 1) The new permit system for CO₂ is not designed for so many risks that this untested transport pipeline/hub system poses as CO₂ is a corrosive gas and when mixed with various water impurities and other gases as nitrous oxides and sulfur dioxides -- the full consequences are UNKNOWN. 2) CO₂ is odorless, colorless, heavier than air and can cause asphyxiation and should be regulated by a congressional mandate - but has NOT. 3) There is a whole geologic ecosystem beneath our earth's surface which are/will be impacted, and the consequences are UNKNOWN. 4) There are geologic sites which are hazardous and/or incompatible to CO₂ storage and should be disseminated to the public but are NOT. 5) Hubs for CCSS are proposed and tax credits are given to the oil and gas industries for pipelines and an unproven technology as a lifeline to justify their use as alternatives fuels for climate

change. With the transport pipelines and hubs proposed for CO2 and the different kinds of facilities, different impurities, different amounts of water added along with offshore pipelines, the contamination and monitoring needed pose a whole new risk of the UNKNOWN. Do we want our RGV to be an experiment of the unknown for Rio Grande LNG/Rio Bravo Pipeline whose fossil fuel industries are falling behind renewables - and again must be subsidized and compensated - while our local citizens, their health, and environment are sacrificed for their company profit? Diane Teter, Edinburg

check

Origin

144.202.66.84