



April 14, 2022

Kimberly D. Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street, N. E.
Washington, D.C. 20426

Re: Kinder Morgan Louisiana Pipeline LLC
Acadiana Project, Docket No. CP19-484-000
Cost Comparison Statement

Dear Ms. Bose:

In compliance with Section 157.20(c)(3) of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's regulations, 18 C.F.R. § 157.20(c)(3) (2021), Kinder Morgan Louisiana Pipeline LLC ("KMLP") submits the attached Cost Comparison Statement for the Acadiana Project ("Project"), placed in-service on October 20, 2021. The attached statement details the costs incurred for final completion of the Project, including explanations of significant differences in the final costs as compared to the Exhibit K, Detail of Estimated Cost of Facilities, which was included as part of KMLP's certificate application for the Project.

Any questions concerning this filing should be directed to the undersigned at (630) 725-3074 or kevin_palmer@kindermorgan.com.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kevin L. Palmer

Kevin L. Palmer
Director, Regulatory
Kinder Morgan Louisiana Pipeline LLC

Attachment

cc: Andrea Bloomfield, Commission Staff
Service List

**Kinder Morgan Louisiana Pipeline LLC
Acadiana Expansion Project
Docket No. CP19-484-000**

**Cost Comparison Statement Pursuant to
Section 157.20 (c)(3) of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Regulations
SUMMARY OF COSTS - ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL**

Line No.	Description (a)	Estimated Costs of Facilities			Actual Costs of Facilities			Difference (h)	Variance (i)
		Eunice Compression Costs (b)	Columbia Gulf Meter Station Costs (c)	Total Estimated Costs (d)	Eunice Compression Costs (e)	Columbia Gulf Meter Station Costs (f)	Total Actual Costs (g)		
1	Materials	\$ 66,111,072	\$ 485,328	\$ 66,596,400	\$ 63,889,236	\$ 2,549,041	\$ 66,438,278	\$ (158,122)	-0.24%
2	Construction / Installation	34,620,918	842,157	\$ 35,463,075	\$ 26,679,659	\$ 3,024,110	\$ 29,703,769	(5,759,306)	-16.24%
3	Engineering	1,692,474	4,500	\$ 1,696,974	\$ 832,690	\$ 36,576	\$ 869,266	(827,708)	-48.78% 1/
4	Environmental	857,015	-	\$ 857,015	\$ 299,885	\$ 1,180	\$ 301,065	(555,950)	-64.87% 2/
5	Legal/Gov't & Public Affairs/Regulatory	261,604	-	\$ 261,604	\$ 49,367	\$ 810,413	\$ 859,780	598,176	228.66% 3/
6	Inspection	2,190,987	143,778	\$ 2,334,765	\$ 3,550,524	\$ 238,349	\$ 3,788,873	1,454,108	62.28% 4/
7	Land and Right of Way	69,796	80,260	\$ 150,056	\$ 41,005	\$ 86,617	\$ 127,622	(22,434)	-14.95%
8	Other	42,275	-	\$ 42,275	\$ 320,963	\$ -	\$ 320,963	278,688	659.23% 5/
9	Contingency	10,584,614	155,602	\$ 10,740,216	\$ 1,680,523	\$ -	\$ 1,680,523	(9,059,693)	-84.35% 6/
10	Overheads	11,643,076	171,163	\$ 11,814,239	\$ 8,573,926	\$ 545,902	\$ 9,119,828	(2,694,411)	-22.81%
11	AFUDC	12,902,274	189,674	\$ 13,091,948	\$ 9,154,533	\$ 26,630	\$ 9,181,163	(3,910,785)	-29.87% 7/
12	Line Pack & Purge	-	-	\$ -	\$ 626,070	\$ -	\$ 626,070	626,070	8/
13	Total Costs	<u>\$ 140,976,105</u>	<u>\$ 2,072,462</u>	<u>\$ 143,048,567</u>	<u>\$ 115,698,380</u>	<u>\$ 7,318,818</u>	<u>\$ 123,017,199</u>	<u>\$ (20,031,368)</u>	

Explanation of differences:

- 1/ Engineering services were lower than estimated due to competitive bidding in a low demand market.
- 2/ Consulting costs were lower than estimated due to competitive bidding in a low demand market. Environmental materials and maintenance costs were originally included in the Environmental category but were ultimately categorized as Construction / Installation costs in line 2 above.
- 3/ Legal costs were higher than estimated due to higher legal fees associated with court costs in the condemnation process.
- 4/ Inspection costs higher due to additional inspection needed to cover multiple contractor activities simultaneously with the 60 acre site.
- 5/ Other includes internal KM labor charged to the project during commissioning, and permitting fees. Both were originally included in other categories of the estimate.
- 6/ Overall actual Project costs were lower than estimated amounts, and therefore contingency amounts were not used for the Project.
- 7/ Actual Project costs for AFUDC were lower than estimated costs due to the revisions in the spend schedule for the Project and changes in debt/equity rates for KMLP throughout the Project.
- 8/ Original estimate did not include additional pipeline line pack purchased to optimize hydraulic efficiency.