

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. COMMUNICATIONS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>III. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>7</b>
A. FERC did not follow legislative intent	7
i. Shell U.S. Gas & Power, LLC (“Shell”), 148 FERC ¶ 61,163 (Sept. 4, 2014), Docket No. RP14-52-000	7
ii. Emera CNG, LLC (“Emera”), 148 FERC ¶ 61,219 (Sept. 19, 2014), Docket No. CP14-114-000	8
iii. Pivotal LNG, Inc. (“Pivotal” or “Pivotal II”), 151 FERC ¶ 61,006 (Apr. 2, 2015), Docket No. RP15-259-000	9
B. Analysis of how FERC failed to follow the law	10
C. Some consequences of FERC’s failure to follow the law	11
i. Pennsylvania and New Jersey	11
ii. North Carolina	12
iii. Florida inland LNG facilities	12
1. New Fortress Energy, Miami, Florida	13
2. New Fortress Energy, Titusville, FL	13
3. Strom, Inc., Crystal River, Florida	14
4. Eagle Maxville LNG	15
5. JAX LNG of Pivotal LNG	15
D. Importance of methane as a greenhouse gas acknowledged by courts and FERC	15
E. Method of reconsideration	18
<b>IV. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS</b>	<b>19</b>
WWALS Watershed Coalition, Inc. (“WWALS”)	19
LEAD Agency, Inc. (“LEAD”)	20
Kissimmee Waterkeeper (“Kissimmee”)	20
Our Santa Fe River (“OSFR”)	21
Center for a Sustainable Coast	21
Three Rivers Waterkeeper	21
<b>V. REQUEST FOR RULEMAKING</b>	<b>23</b>
A. What FERC’s Strategic Plan and the NGA say FERC should do	23