

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

MAGNOLIA LNG, LLC - DOCKET NO. CP14-347-000
KINDER MORGAN LOUISIANA PIPELINE, LLC - DOCKET NO.
CP14-511-000

SEPTEMBER 3, 2015
7:03 P.M.

~~~~~

~~~~~

LOCATION OF:

HISTORIC CASH & CARRY BUILDING
330 Arena Road
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70601

LAKE CHARLES REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
P.O. Box 4969
Lake Charles, Louisiana 70606-4969
(337) 478-9637 Fax: (337) 478-9627

LAKE CHARLES REPORTING SERVICE, INC.
BELYNDA CHAMPAGNE, CCR-RPR
337-478-9637

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

A P P E A R A N C E S

MS. JULIA YUAN
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, NE
Washington, DC 20426

REPORTED BY: Belynda Champagne, CCR-RPR

1 P R O C E E D I N G S :

2 MS. YUAN: Good evening, on behalf of the
3 Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, I want to
4 welcome all of you out to the public comment
5 meeting on the draft Environmental Impact
6 Statement or EIS, for the Magnolia LNG and
7 Lake Charles Expansion Projects.

8 Let the record show that the draft EIS
9 comment meeting began at 7:03 on September 3rd,
10 2015 in Lake Charles, Louisiana.

11 My name is Julia Yuan and I'm an
12 environmental project manager with the Office of
13 Energy Projects, which is division of the FERC.
14 To my left is Robert Kopka, who is also with
15 FERC. Keith Rogers, also with the FERC, is at
16 the table where you came in. We also have
17 Janelle Rieland and Melissa Jean with Natural
18 Resource Group, or NRG, an environmental
19 consulting company. NRG is assisting FERC staff
20 in our environmental analysis of the projects.

21 I'd also like to mention that
22 representatives from Magnolia LNG and Kinder
23 Morgan are here with us tonight. They have maps
24 and will be around after the meeting to answer
25 any specific questions on the projects you might

1 have.

2 The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S.
3 Coast Guard, U.S. Department of Energy. U.S.
4 Department of Transportation, and U.S.
5 Environmental Protection Agency are
6 participating as cooperating agencies in the
7 preparation of the EIS. I would like to thank
8 the cooperating agencies for their continued
9 assistance with the NEPA review.

10 You'll note we arranged for a court
11 reporter to transcribe this meeting so that we
12 will have an accurate record of the public
13 comment meeting. If you would like a copy of
14 the transcript, you may make arrangements with
15 the court reporter following the meeting.

16 I want to give you a little background
17 about the project and FERC's role. In
18 April 2014, Magnolia LNG Limited Liability
19 Corporation or Magnolia, filed on application
20 under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act to site,
21 construct, and operate the facilities necessary
22 to liquefy natural gas at a proposed site in
23 Lake Charles, Calcasieu Parish Louisiana.

24 In June 2014, Kinder Morgan Louisiana
25 Pipeline LLC, or Kinder Morgan, filed an

1 application around Section 7 of the Natural Gas
2 Act requesting authorization to construct and
3 operate system modifications that would allow
4 the delivery of natural gas to Magnolia's
5 proposed liquefied natural gas, or LNG, terminal
6 using a new north-to-south path on its existing
7 pipeline system.

8 The projects are collectively referred to
9 as the Magnolia LNG and Lake Charles Expansion
10 Projects. The primary purpose of this meeting
11 is to give you the opportunity to provide
12 specific environmental comments on the draft EIS
13 prepared by the FERC staff on the projects. It
14 will help us the most if your comments are as
15 specific as possible regarding the proposed
16 projects and the draft EIS.

17 I would like again to clarify that these
18 projects are being proposed by Magnolia and
19 Kinder Morgan. They are not projects being
20 proposed by the FERC. Rather, the FERC is the
21 Federal agency responsible for evaluating
22 applications to site and construct onshore and
23 near-shore LNG import or export facilities as
24 well as applications to construct and operate
25 interstate natural gas pipeline facilities.

1 The FERC, therefore, is not an advocate for
2 the projects. Instead, as mentioned throughout
3 this process, the FERC is an advocate for the
4 environmental review process.

5 During our review of the projects, we
6 assembled from a variety of sources, including
7 Magnolia; Kinder Morgan; you, the public,
8 Federal State, and local agencies as well as
9 Indian tribes; and our own independent analysis.
10 We analyzed this information and prepared a
11 draft EIS that was distributed to the public for
12 comment. A Notice of Availability of the draft
13 EIS was issued for projects on July 17th, 2015.

14 We're now near the end of the 45-day
15 comment period of the draft EIS. The comment
16 period ends next Tuesday, September 8, 2015.
17 All comments received, written or spoken, will
18 be addressed in the final EIS. I encourage you,
19 if you plan to submit comments and have not,
20 please do so here tonight either verbally during
21 the comment portion of our meeting or in writing
22 using one of the forms that is available in the
23 back table there. You may also submit comments
24 using the procedures outlined in the Notice of
25 Availability of the draft EIS, including

1 instructions on how to submit your comment
2 electronically. Your comments will be
3 considered with equal weight regardless of
4 whether they're provided verbally during the
5 comment portion of today's meeting or submitted
6 in writing.

7 If you received a copy of the draft EIS,
8 either paper or CD, you will automatically
9 receive a copy of the final EIS. If you did not
10 get a copy of the draft and would like to get a
11 copy of the final EIS, please sign the
12 attendance list at the back of the room,
13 providing your name and address, and we'll make
14 sure you get a copy of the final EIS.

15 I would like to state that neither the
16 draft nor the final EIS are decision-making
17 documents. In other words, the EIS does not
18 determine whether the projects are approved or
19 not.

20 I also want to differentiate between the
21 roles of two distinct FERC groups: The
22 Commission and the environmental staff. Bob,
23 Keith, and I are part of the FERC environmental
24 staff, which oversees the preparation of the EIS
25 for these projects. We do not determine whether

1 or not to approve these projects. Instead, the
2 FERC Commission, consisting of five
3 presidentially appointed commissioners, is
4 responsible for making a determination of
5 whether or not to issue Authorization to
6 Magnolia and a Certificate of Public Convenience
7 and Necessity, for Certificate, to Kinder
8 Morgan. As mentioned earlier, EIS is not a
9 decision-making document but it does assist the
10 Commission in determining whether or not to
11 approve the projects. The Commission will
12 consider the environmental analysis in the EIS,
13 public comments, as well as host of
14 non-environmental information, such as
15 engineering, markets, and rates in order to make
16 its decision to approve or deny Magnolia's and
17 Kinder Morgan's requests for an Authorization or
18 Certificate respectfully.

19 There is no review of FERC decisions by the
20 President or Congress, thus maintaining FERC's
21 role as an independent regulatory agency, and
22 providing for fair and unbiased decisions. Only
23 after taking the environmental and
24 non-environmental factors into consideration
25 will the Commission make its final decision

1 whether or not to approve projects.

2 If the Commission votes to approve the
3 projects, Magnolia will be required to meet
4 certain conditions as outlined in the
5 Authorization, and Kinder Morgan will be
6 required to meet the conditions outlined in the
7 Certificate.

8 FERC environmental staff would monitor the
9 projects during construction and restoration to
10 document environmental compliance with
11 applicable laws and regulations. Magnolia's and
12 Kinder Morgan's proposed mitigation, and the
13 additional conditions required by the
14 Authorization and Certificate.

15 Now, are there any questions about the
16 remaining FERC process or FERC role in the
17 proceedings?

18 Okay. That's my overview on the project
19 and FERC role.

20 Now, we'll move into the part of the
21 meeting where we will hear comments from
22 audience members. If you would rather not speak
23 tonight or don't get to say everything you
24 wanted, you may hand in written comments tonight
25 using the comment forms available in the back

1 table there or you can send those to the
2 Secretary of the Commission by following the
3 procedures outlined in the Notice of
4 Availability of the draft EIS. Either way, your
5 comments will be considered equal weight.

6 As I said before, this meeting is being
7 recorded by a court reporter. So, all your
8 comments will be transcribed and put into the
9 public record. I ask that each speaker first
10 identify themselves and, if appropriate, the
11 agency or group you're representing. Also,
12 please spell your name for the record and speak
13 clearly into the microphone. It is most
14 important that you show respect to the person
15 speaking.

16 We're now ready to call our first speaker,
17 if we have any. We don't have any signed up to
18 speak. Anybody that did not sign up and wants
19 to speak? Anybody? Okay. Going once, twice.
20 Okay.

21 If not, the formal part of this meeting
22 will close. Within the FERC website,
23 www.ferc.gov, there is a link called e-Library.
24 If you type in the document number for the
25 Magnolia LNG Project (CP14-347) or the Lake

1 Charles Expansion Project, which is (CP14-511),
2 you can use e-Library to gain access to
3 everything on the record concerning these
4 projects, as well as all the filings and
5 information submitted by Magnolia and Kinder
6 Morgan.

7 On behalf of the Federal Energy Regulatory
8 Commission, I want to thank you for coming here
9 today. Let the record show that the comment
10 meeting concluded at 7:13.

11 (Whereupon the proceedings concluded)

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

This certification is valid only for a transcript accompanied by my original signature and seal on this page.

I, BELYNDA CHAMPAGNE, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Louisiana, as the officer before whom this testimony was taken, do hereby certify that FERC COMMENT MEETING, upon authority of R.S. 37:2554, did testify as hereinbefore set forth in the foregoing (12) pages; that this testimony was reported by me in the stenotype reporting method, was prepared and transcribed by me or under my personal direction and supervision, and is a true and correct transcript to the best of my ability and understanding; that the transcript has been prepared in compliance with transcript format guidelines required by statute or by rules of the board; that I have acted in compliance with the prohibition on contractual relationships, as defined by Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure Article 1434 and in rules and advisory opinions of the board, that I am not related to counsel or to the parties herein, nor am I otherwise interested in the outcome of this matter.

Signed this 10th day of September, 2015.

BELYNDA CHAMPAGNE
CCR No. 93048
RPR No. 821012