

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 8/11/25 7:01 PM
<b>Received:</b> July 30, 2025
<b>Status:</b> Pending Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> mdp-hwh2-vtri
<b>Comments Due:</b> August 08, 2025
<b>Submission Type:</b> API

**Docket:** DOE-HQ-2025-0240

Importation or Exportation of Liquefied Natural Gas or Electric Energy; Applications, Authorizations, etc.: Mexico Pacific Ltd. LLC

**Comment On:** DOE-HQ-2025-0240-0001

Importation or Exportation of Liquefied Natural Gas or Electric Energy; Applications, Authorizations, etc.: Mexico Pacific Ltd. LLC

**Document:** DOE-HQ-2025-0240-DRAFT-0246

Comment on FR Doc # 2025-12763

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Andres Garcia

**Email:** jandgato.mx@gmail.com

---

## General Comment

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the request by Mexico Pacific Limited LLC (MPL) for an extraordinary seven-year extension to its deadline for commencing export operations, as detailed in Docket No. 18-70-LNG. Granting this extension from December 14, 2025, to December 14, 2032, would be contrary to the public interest, undermine U.S. climate commitments, and reward a lack of diligence from the applicant.

My opposition is based on the following key points:

1. The Unprecedented Length of the Extension Signals a Non-Viable Project.

A seven-year extension is not a minor adjustment; it is an admission that the project is failing to meet its original, approved timeline by a significant margin. The applicant's vague justification of "circumstances beyond its control" is insufficient to warrant such a lengthy reprieve. This raises serious questions about the project's financial and commercial viability. Granting this extension risks allowing MPL to hold this export authorization speculatively, preventing the market from supporting more viable, timely, and potentially less environmentally damaging projects.

2. The Extension Contradicts U.S. and Global Climate Goals.

The world has changed dramatically since this project was initially approved. The scientific consensus on the urgency of the climate crisis has grown, and the U.S. has made significant commitments to transition towards a clean energy economy. Locking in a massive fossil fuel infrastructure project until at least 2032—with an operational lifespan of decades beyond that—is fundamentally inconsistent with these climate goals. The lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions from the upstream sourcing of fracked gas to the liquefaction and final combustion of the LNG would be immense, exacerbating climate change for generations.

3. The Original Environmental and Economic Assessments Are Outdated.

The basis for the original authorization rested on environmental and market analyses that are now several years old. A seven-year delay necessitates a complete re-evaluation. The global energy landscape, the proven impacts of methane leakage from gas infrastructure, and the social and environmental justice implications for the communities in Sonora, Mexico, must be thoroughly reassessed under current conditions, not under the outdated assumptions of the original application. The DOE cannot reasonably determine that this project remains in the public interest without a new, comprehensive review.

Conclusion:

The Department of Energy should not reward a project's failure to launch with a seven-year extension. Doing so would set a dangerous precedent, undermine the credibility of the DOE's authorization process, and commit the U.S. and Mexico to decades of harmful fossil fuel emissions.

I strongly urge the Department of Energy to deny the extension request from Mexico Pacific Limited LLC. If the applicant cannot meet its deadline, the authorization should be allowed to expire as intended.

Respectfully,