information concerning impacts of a proposed project on residents, including potential safety issues; potential impacts of construction of the storage facility on property values; potential impacts on threatened and endangered species; potential impacts on wetlands, vegetation, and wildlife habitat; and potential impacts on cultural resources.

***FERC set a Precedent for "Onshore" LNG Export Facilities in 2008**:*

The **Floridian Natural Gas [LNG] Storage** facility slated for development in Indiantown, Martin County, Florida, was touted as the "largest proposed onshore facility in the U.S."[11] The landlocked site was miles from the coast and incapable of pumping LNG directly into a tankship. On August 29, 2008, the Commission granted Floridian a certificate of public convenience and necessity under Section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act to construct and operate its 8 Bcf liquefaction and storage facility (See Docket No. CP08-13-000).

The approval was granted in part on the Commission's adoption of the findings and conclusions of the *Final Environmental Impact Statement*, which stated that staff believed the proposed facility would comply with the Federal Safety Standards contained in Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 193.[12] However, Floridian had used a flawed model (Source5[13]) to calculate the Exclusion Zones for Flammable Vapor-Gas, and as a result, Floridian had to revise their project to Phase 1, a 1 Bcf LNG storage tank (See Docket No. CP13-541-000 Issued July 16, 2015). Interestingly, FERC did not disclaim jurisdiction over the revised inland LNG export project. The U. S. DOE authorized LNG exports from the facility based on the initial 8 Bcf storage capacity.[14] The Commission expressed "relief" that Floridian was aware that a proposed "rail addition" would require FERC approval.[15]

"There is no evidence to suggest that Congress sought to limit export facilities to "coastal LNG terminals that are accessible to oceangoing, bulk-carrier LNG tankers and that are connected to pipelines that deliver gas to or take gas away from the terminal" (See Pivotal LNG's *Petition for Declaratory Order,* Docket RP15-259-000, April 2, 2015). That statement appears to hold true for the Floridian project.

FERC created a Regulatory Gap:

In order to be awarded LNG export authorization from the U. S. DOE, a developer simply declares that their proposed project "shares the same underlying relevant characteristics as the facilities and proposed activities that Emera and Pivotal LNG, Inc.'s Petition for Declaratory Order to which FERC granted exemption."[16] By accepting such claims on their face, the U. S. DOE is usurping FERC's ability to determine jurisdiction on a case-by-case basis.

For non-FERC-jurisdictional LNG export projects, in order to export LNG to non-FTA-nations, the U. S. DOE determines whether a proposed project is in the public's interest,[17] but Congress did not award jurisdictional authority over inland LNG export **facilities** to the U. S. DOE.

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission "decisions affect people's lives"[18]

As former FERC Commissioner Norman Bay (Past FERC Chairman) opined in his dissenting opinion in Pivotal LNG, "While it is difficult to know what the unintended consequences of today's order will be, one consequence is not: the Commission creates a significant and unnecessary gap in FERC's jurisdiction… Residents of a state in which the facility is located, or residents of surrounding states, may reasonably expect the facility to be subject to federal review of its operations and maintenance. While