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Forward-Looking Statements / Non-GAAP Financial Measures

This presentation includes forward-looking statements within the meaning of the U.S. Private Securities Litigation Reform Act of 1995 and Section 21E of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. Forward-looking statements include any statement that does not relate strictly to historical or current and include statements accompanied by or using words such as “anticipate,” “believe,” “intend,” “plan,” “projection,” “forecast,” “strategy,” “outlook,” “continue,” “estimate,” “expect,” “may,” or “long-term.” In particular, statements, express or implied, concerning future actions, conditions or events, future operating results or the ability to generate revenues, income or cash flow or to pay dividends are forward-looking statements. Forward-looking statements are not guarantees of performance. They involve risks, uncertainties and assumptions. Future actions, conditions or events and future results of operations of Kinder Morgan, Inc. may differ materially from those expressed in these forward-looking statements. Many of the factors that will determine these results are beyond Kinder Morgan's ability to control or predict. These statements are necessarily based upon various assumptions involving judgments with respect to the future, including, among others, the timing and extent of changes in the supply of and demand for the products we transport and handle; national, international, regional and local economic, competitive, political and regulatory conditions and developments; the timing and success of business development efforts; the timing, cost, and success of expansion projects; technological developments; condition of capital and credit markets; inflation rates; interest rates; the political and economic stability of oil producing nations; energy markets; weather conditions; environmental conditions; business, regulatory and legal decisions; terrorism, including cyber-attacks; and other uncertainties. There is no assurance that any of the actions, events or results of the forward-looking statements will occur, or if any of them do, what impact they will have on our results of operations or financial condition. Because of these uncertainties, you are cautioned not to put undue reliance on any forward-looking statement. Please refer to the slide in this presentation titled "Business Risks" and please read "Risk Factors" and "Information Regarding Forward-Looking Statements" in our most recent Annual Report on Form 10-K and our subsequently filed Exchange Act reports, which are available through the SEC's EDGAR system at www.sec.gov and on our website at www.kindermorgan.com.

KML’s securities have not been registered under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the U.S. Securities Act), or any state securities laws. Accordingly, these securities may not be offered or sold within the United States unless registered under the U.S. Securities Act and applicable state securities laws or except pursuant to exemptions from the registration requirements of the U.S. Securities Act and applicable state securities laws. This presentation does not constitute an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any of KML's securities in the United States.

We use non-generally accepted accounting principles (“non-GAAP”) financial measures in this presentation. Our reconciliation of non-GAAP financial measures to comparable GAAP measures can be found in the Appendix to this presentation. These non-GAAP measures should not be considered as alternatives to GAAP financial measures.
# 2018 Guidance: Published Budget

**Supported by Diversified, Fee-based Cash Flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMI</th>
<th>2018 Budget</th>
<th>Δ from 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted EBITDA (a)</td>
<td>$7.5 billion</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributable Cash Flow (a)</td>
<td>$4.6 billion</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF per Share (a)</td>
<td>$2.05</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend per Share</td>
<td>$0.80</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Capex (b)</td>
<td>$2.2 billion (27%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KML</th>
<th>2018 Budget</th>
<th>Δ from 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted EBITDA (a)</td>
<td>C$474 million</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributable Cash Flow (a)</td>
<td>C$349 million</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF per Share (a)</td>
<td>C$0.96</td>
<td>7% (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividend per Share</td>
<td>C$0.65</td>
<td>0% (c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Capex</td>
<td>C$1.9 billion ~200%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **More than $500 million of free cash flow after dividend and capex available to invest in additional high-return projects and / or to repurchase shares**
- **$2 billion share repurchase program authorized to begin in December 2017 (was to begin in 2018)**
- **Gulf Coast Express is not yet included in backlog, but our budget includes an estimate of KMI’s share of the project’s 2018 spend**

**KML**

- **Growth due primarily to the phased in-service of Base Line Terminal and higher capitalized equity financing costs related to TMEP**
- **2018 budget assumes spending on TMEP in the first part of the year is primarily on advancing permitting process, rather than at full construction levels, until KML has greater clarity on key permits, approvals and judicial reviews**

---

See Appendix for defined terms and reconciliations of non-GAAP measures for the historical period.

(a) Non-GAAP measures of Distributable Cash Flow (“DCF”) and Adjusted EBITDA are before Certain Items and include KM-share of Certain Equity Investee DD&A.

DCF per Share for KML represents DCF available to restricted shareholders divided by total restricted voting shares.

(b) Excludes capital spending by KML, which is a self-funding entity.

(c) 2017 figure pro forma for full year.
Dividend Policy Expectations

- KMI has reduced its net debt by ~$5.9 billion since the end of 3Q 2015
  - Continue to strengthen the balance sheet by funding all growth capital needs at KMI out of internally generated cash flow
  - Expect to end 2017 at 5.1-5.2x net debt/Adjusted EBITDA; longer term target of ~5.0x or lower

- As a result of substantial balance sheet improvement achieved since the end of 2015, KMI announced multiple steps to return significant value to shareholders
  - 60% dividend increase for 2018 from current annual level of $0.50 per share to $0.80 per share
  - 25% annual dividend growth in 2019 and 2020, to $1.00 and $1.25, respectively
  - $2 billion share buyback program starting in December 2017, representing approximately 5% of KMI’s current market cap
Unparalleled Asset Footprint
One of the Largest Energy Infrastructure Companies in North America

- Largest natural gas transmission network in North America
  - Own or operate ~70,000 miles of natural gas pipeline
  - Connected to every important natural gas resource play in the U.S.

- Largest independent transporter of petroleum products in North America
  - Transport ~2.1 MMBbl/d\(^{(a)}\)

- Largest transporter of CO\(_2\) in North America
  - Transport ~1.3 Bcf/d of CO\(_2\)\(^{(a)}\)

- Largest independent terminal operator in North America
  - Own or operate ~155 terminals
  - ~150 MMBbls liquids capacity
  - Handle ~53 MMtons of dry bulk products\(^{(a)}\)
  - 16 Jones Act vessels

- Only Oilsands pipeline serving the West Coast
  - Transports ~300 MBbl/d to Vancouver / Washington State; planned expansion would take capacity to 890 MBbl/d

\(^{(a)}\) 2017 budget.
KMI Overview

Management Aligned with Investors; 14% Stake in KMI

Management & Directors\(^{(a)}\)

Public Float

~321MM (14%) ~1,921MM (86%)

Kinder Morgan, Inc.
(C-corp, NYSE: KMI)

Market Equity $41.2B\(^{(b)}\)
Net Debt 36.6B\(^{(c)}\)
Enterprise Value $77.8B
2017E Dividend per Share: $0.50\(^{(d)}\)
Credit Rating: BBB– / Baa3 / BBB–\(^{(e)}\)

Kinder Morgan Canada Limited
(C-corp, TSX: KML)

Market Equity C$6.1B\(^{(b)}\)
Net Debt (0.0)B\(^{(c)}\)
Enterprise Value C$6.1B
2017E Dividend per Share: C$0.65\(^{(d)}\)
Credit Rating: BBB / BBB-H\(^{(e)}\)

Public Float

~103MM (30%)

\(^{(a)}\) KMI includes Form-4 filers and management unvested restricted shares.
KML includes LTIP shares issued to management.

\(^{(b)}\) Market prices as of 11/24/2017;
KMI market equity based on ~2,242 million shares outstanding (incl. unvested restricted stock) at a price of $17.19, 32 million mandatorily convertible depositary shares at a price of $35.94, ~104 million KML restricted shares (incl. LTIP shares issued to management) at a price of C$17.36, and 50% of KML’s 12 million preferred stock at a price of C$25.76.
KML market equity based on ~346 million restricted and voting shares outstanding (incl. LTIP shares issued to management) at a price of C$17.36, and 50% of KML’s 12 million preferred stock at a price of C$25.76.

\(^{(c)}\) Debt of KMI and its consolidated subsidiaries as of 9/30/2017, net of cash, excluding fair value adjustments, and Kinder Morgan G.P., Inc.’s $100 million preferred stock due 2057, and including 50%of KML’s 12 million preferred stock.
Debt of KML and its consolidated subsidiaries as of 9/30/2017, net of cash, and including 50% of KML’s 12 million preferred stock.

\(^{(d)}\) KMI declared dividend per share per 2017 budget.
KML expected annualized 2017 declared dividend per share.

\(^{(e)}\) KMI corporate credit ratings from S&P (Stable outlook), Moody’s (Stable) and Fitch (Stable), respectively.
KML corporate credit ratings from S&P (Stable outlook), and DBRS (BBB–H = High, Stable outlook), respectively.
KMI: Compelling Investment Thesis
Attractive Relative Value, Best-in-Class Coverage

Attractive Relative Value\(^{(a)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRICE / 2017E DCFPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.5x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med: 14.9x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best-in-Class Coverage\(^{(b)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017E DIVIDEND COVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.0x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med: 1.2x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Best in-class Dividend Growth\(^{(c)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIVIDEND GROWTH CAGR (2017-2020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med: 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMI Positioning

- Best-in-class dividend coverage
- Self-funded since 2016, and for foreseeable future
- Best-in-class dividend growth

Notes: KMI financial measures before Certain Items. See Appendix for defined terms and reconciliations to GAAP measures.
(a) 11/24/2017 share price divided by 2017E DCF per share. Peer estimates per Bloomberg consensus and budget for KMI.
(b) 2017E DCF per share divided by 2017E dividend per share. Peer estimates per Bloomberg consensus and budget for KMI.
(c) Dividend per share CAGR per Bloomberg consensus estimates for peers and public guidance for KMI.
Our Strategy

- **Focus on stable fee-based assets that are core to North American energy infrastructure**
  - Market leader in each of our business segments
  - Fees largely independent of underlying commodity prices and substantially secured by take-or-pay contracts
- **Maintain a strong balance sheet**
  - Our primary investing entity has been investment grade since inception
- **Operate safely and efficiently**
  - Control costs: It’s investors’ money, not management’s – treat it that way
  - Performing better than industry averages; target zero incidents
- **Leverage asset footprint to seek attractive capital investment opportunities, both expansion and acquisition**
  - Since 1997, Kinder Morgan has completed approximately $31.4 billion in acquisitions and invested approximately $27.3 billion in greenfield/expansion projects\(^{(a)}\)
- **Transparency to investors**
- **Keep it simple**

---

Capital Invested
~$59 Billion of Asset Investment & Acquisitions Since Inception\(^{(a,c)}\)

\(\text{Total Invested by Year}^{(b,c)}\)

\(\text{Total Invested by Type}^{(a,c)}\)

\(\text{Total Invested by Segment}^{(a,c)}\)

Note: Includes equity contributions to joint ventures.

(c) Excludes $2.6 billion and $1.8 billion for 2016 50% SNG divestiture and 2012 FTC Rockies divestiture, respectively, in Natural Gas Pipelines segment. Excludes $11.3 billion in EPB asset acquisitions from El Paso prior to KMI’s acquisition of El Paso and $2.0 billion for Citrus acquisition at KMI. Excludes $0.3 billion for 2013 divestiture of Express-Platte pipeline system in Kinder Morgan Canada segment. Excludes $0.8 billion of Products Pipelines legal and other settlements incurred over the past decade. However, we do include these impacts in the denominator of our ROI calculation.
(d) KMI 2017 forecast excludes KML capital expenditures.
Returns on Invested Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Pipes</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.9%(b)</td>
<td>10.9%(b)</td>
<td>10.3%(b,c)</td>
<td>9.9%(b,c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products Pipelines</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM Canada</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return on Investment | 12.3% | 12.7% | 12.6% | 13.1% | 13.6% | 14.3% | 14.4% | 14.1% | 14.8% | 13.9% | 13.5% | 13.6% | 11.9% | 11.4% | 10.3% | 9.7% |

Return on Equity | 17.2% | 19.4% | 20.9% | 21.7% | 23.4% | 23.9% | 22.6% | 22.9% | 25.2% | 25.2% | 24.3% | 24.0% | 24.0% | 21.7% | 20.2% | 15.9% | 13.9% |

- **Targeted returns for new capital investment are substantially above cost of capital**
- **Items leading to decline in returns since 2012:**
  - **Natural Gas Segment** – Inclusion of EPB since 2013 (lower returns due to history of drop-down acquisitions), REX leave-behind costs since 2013 (invested capital in excess of proceeds received); lower volumes on G&P assets since 2015; contract buy-outs on KMLP in 2014 and 2015, unfavorable re-contracted rates on certain Rockies pipelines since 2013
  - **Terminals Segment** – Coal bankruptcies in 2015 and only partial contribution from Jones Act tankers
  - **CO₂ Segment** – Oil price decline
  - **KM Canada Segment** – DCF is adjusted for current FX, but invested capital is not; led to lower returns as CAD/USD ratio has declined since 2013
  - **Return on Equity** – Since 3Q 2015, KMI has been funding growth capital with operating cash flow, which is treated as equity cash flow


(a) G&A is deducted to calculate the combined Return on Investment, but is not allocated to the segments and therefore not deducted to calculate the individual Segment ROI.
(b) Includes EPB assets. The denominator includes approximately $1.1 billion in REX capital not recovered in Nov-2013 sale price (i.e., leave behind). Excluding the leave behind cost would increase the Natural Gas Pipes-ROI to 11.3%, 11.2%, 10.5% and 10.1% in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016, respectively.
(c) Includes NGPL and Citrus investments.
Segment Overview

2017 Budgeted Segment EBDA = $7.7 billion\(^{(a)}\)

93% Pipelines & Terminals
- 73% interstate pipelines
- 9% intrastate pipelines & storage
- 18% gathering, processing & treating
  - 88% fixed-fee (~27% of which is take-or-pay)

Natural Gas Pipelines
- 62% refined products
- 38% crude/liquids

Products Pipelines
- 81% liquids
- 19% bulk

Terminals
- 34% CO\(_2\) transport and sales
- 66% oil production-related
  - Production hedged (MBbl/d)\(^{(b)}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hedged Vol.</th>
<th>% Hedged</th>
<th>Avg. Px.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>$59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>$53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CO\(_2\)
- 100% petroleum pipelines

Kinder Morgan Canada
- 91% of cash flows fee-based for 2017;
  97% fee-based or hedged

---

\(^{(a)}\) 2017 budgeted Segment EBDA before Certain Items and including KM-share of Certain Equity Investee DD&A (non-GAAP measure).

\(^{(b)}\) Percentages based on currently hedged crude oil and propane volumes as of 9/30/2017 relative to crude oil, propane, and heavy NGL (C4+) net equity production projected for 4Q 2017, and the Ryder Scott reserve report for 2018-2021.
KMI’s High Quality Cash Flow

Not all “fee-based” cash flow is created equal

2017 Budgeted Segment EBDA = $7.7 billion (a)

Composition of 91% Fee-based Cash Flow

- 72% of fee-based cash flow secured by take-or-pay contracts
- Other fee-based cash flow supported by stable volumes/fee-based contracts/critical infrastructure between major supply hubs and stable end-user demand
  - Natural Gas Pipelines: G&P cash flow protected by dedicated producers and economically viable acreage
  - Products Pipelines: refined products volumes within ~1.5% of budget over past 7 years
  - Terminals: ~75% of Terminals' Other Fee-based associated with high-utilization liquids assets and requirements contracts for pet coke and steel

(a) Based on 2017 budgeted Segment EBDA before Certain Items and including KM-share of Certain Equity Investee DD&A (non-GAAP measure)
Market Update

Strong Demand

Natural Gas

- Multiple trends driving increased demand for U.S. natural gas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Gen(^{(a)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat gas-share</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal-share</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports to Mexico (Bcf/d)(^{(b,c)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM Pipelines</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-KM</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG Exports (Bcf/d)(^{(b)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net LNG Exports from U.S.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Natural Gas Liquids (NGL)

- U.S.-based petchem NGL demand to increase 47% by 2018
- Total U.S. NGL demand growth of 20% 2016 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017E</th>
<th>2018E</th>
<th>%Δ '16-'18E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. NGL Demand (MMBbl/d)(^{(d)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petchem</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refined Products

- Continued steady, modest volume growth
- Annual inflation-based tariff adjustment mechanism

Crude Oil

- U.S. market expected to balance in 2H 2017, increase thereafter
- Canadian market expected to increase 2017 and 2018

(a) EIA, Short-Term Energy Outlook, November 2017.
(b) WoodMac, Fall 2017 North America Gas Long-term Outlook, November 2017.
(c) KM Pipelines calculation of exports to Mexico includes its deliveries into the NET Mexico pipeline. Non-KM deliveries is adjusted by an offsetting amount.
(d) Wells Fargo research, Quarterly NGL Supply/Demand Update, October 2017.
(e) Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP). Supply represents average annual Western Canada production and Bakken movements.
Natural Gas Transportation & Storage

55% of 2017 Budgeted Segment EBDA before Certain Items

- U.S. natural gas demand(b) expected to rise by 32% through 2026(c)
  - KM moves about 40% of natural gas consumed in the U.S.
- Transportation demand drivers:
  - Exports (LNG + Mexico), power demand and industrial market
- Storage demand drivers:
  - Power and LNG exports have variable-load characteristics which require storage support
  - KM well-positioned to meet demand as the largest storage operator in the U.S. with 689 Bcf out of 4.3 Tcf market (~16%)
  - Increased contracting activity at improved rates in the Interstate and Intrastate markets
- Gathering & processing trends:
  - Gathering supported by overall volume trends
  - Processing supported by new LPG export capacity (docks and fleet) and Gulf Coast petrochemical demand

---

**U.S. Natural Gas Supply/Demand Outlook(e) (Bcf/d)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LNG net exports</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican net exports</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S. demand</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Increase from 2016: 22%, 32%*

**Supply**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcellus/Utica</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permian</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haynesville</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Ford</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total U.S. supply</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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(a) Based on KMI 2017 budgeted Segment EBDA before Certain Items and including KM-share of Certain Equity Investee DD&A (non-GAAP measure).
(b) Including net exports of liquefied natural gas (LNG) and net exports to Mexico.
(c) Wood Mackenzie, Fall 2017 North America Natural Gas Long-Term Outlook, November 2017.
5-year Growth Project Backlog\(^{(a)}\)

~$12 Billion of Attractive, Fee-based Projects

- World class asset footprint has driven attractive growth opportunities, secured by long-term, fee-based contracts with creditworthy counterparties
  - ~85% of backlog is for fee-based pipelines, terminals and associated facilities
  - ~$1.5 billion of annual Adjusted EBITDA expected to be generated from growth projects\(^{(b)}\), excluding CO\(_2\), an approximate 6.8x investment multiple\(^{(c)}\)
  - Target at least 15% unlevered after-tax return to fund CO\(_2\) projects

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Growth Projects(^{(a)}) ($bn)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Pipelines</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products Pipelines</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM Canada</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal non-CO(_2)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO(_2) – S&amp;T(^{(d)})</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO(_2) – EOR(^{(d)})</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(a)}\) 5-year growth project backlog primarily consists of projects in progress for which commercial contracts have been secured. Includes KM’s proportionate share of non-wholly owned projects. Includes estimated capitalized corporate overhead of $0.5 billion. Projects in-service prior to 10/1/2017 excluded.

\(^{(b)}\) Estimated first full-year Adjusted EBITDA generated from fee-based pipelines, terminals and associated facilities. Excludes Adjusted EBITDA from CO\(_2\) projects and includes 100% of TMEP. Includes roughly $150 million of Adjusted EBITDA contribution in the 2017 budget.

\(^{(c)}\) Investment multiple calculated as total project cost divided by first full-year expected Adjusted EBITDA.

\(^{(d)}\) S&T = CO\(_2\) Source & Transportation. EOR = Enhanced Oil Recovery.
Business Risks

- **Regulatory**
  - FERC rate cases (Products pipelines and Natural Gas pipelines)
  - Legislative and regulatory changes
- **CO₂ crude oil production volumes**
- **Throughput on our volume-based assets**
- **Commodity prices**
  - 2017 budget price assumptions: $53/Bbl average strip price for crude, and $3.00/MMBtu average strip price for natural gas
  - Price sensitivities (full-year):
    - $1/Bbl change in oil price = ~$6 million DCF impact
    - 10c/MMBtu change in natural gas price = ~$1 million DCF impact (a)
    - 1% change in NGL/crude ratio = ~$3 million DCF impact
- **Project cost overruns/in-service delays**
- **Economically sensitive businesses (e.g. steel and coal terminals)**
- **Foreign exchange rates**
  - 2017 budget rate assumption of 0.77 CAD/USD
  - Price sensitivity (full-year): 0.01 ratio change = ~$2.3 million DCF impact
- **Environmental (e.g. pipeline/asset failures)**
- **Terrorism**
- **Interest rates**
  - Full-year impact of 100-bp increase in floating rates equates to a ~$102 million increase in interest expense (b)

The above summary is not all inclusive. Please read "Risk Factors" and "Information Regarding Forward-Looking Statements" in our most recent Annual Report on Form 10-K and our subsequently filed Securities Exchange Act reports, which are available through the SEC's EDGAR system at www.sec.gov and on our website at www.kindermorgan.com.

(a) Natural Gas Midstream sensitivity incorporates current hedges, and assumes ethane recovery for majority of year, constant ethane frac spread, and assumes other NGL prices maintain same relationship with oil prices.

(b) As of 9/30/2017 approximately $10.2 billion of KMI’s net debt was floating rate (~30% floating).
The Best is Yet to Come

Positioned to Succeed for the Long-Term

- World class set of midstream assets
- Secure and growing fee-based cash flows
- Disciplined allocator of capital
- Investment grade balance sheet and substantial liquidity
- Balanced dividend policy to optimize flexibility while returning value to shareholders
  - 60% annual dividend growth in 2018, 25% annual growth in both 2019 and 2020
- Experienced management team aligned with investors
- Transparency to investors
Appendix – KMI
### Energy Toll Road

**Security of Cash**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Gas Pipelines</th>
<th>Products Pipelines</th>
<th>Terminals</th>
<th>CO₂</th>
<th>Kinder Morgan Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate &amp; LNG:</td>
<td>Refined products:</td>
<td>Liquids &amp; Jones Act:</td>
<td>S&amp;T:</td>
<td>Essentially no volume risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take-or-pay</td>
<td>primarily volume-based</td>
<td>primarily take-or-pay</td>
<td>minimum volume guarantee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate: ~77% take-or-pay</td>
<td>Crude / liquids: primarily take-or-pay</td>
<td>Bulk: primarily minimum volume guarantee, or requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;P: ~88% fee-based(b) with minimum volume requirements / acreage dedications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Remaining Contract Life</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG: 15.4 yrs.</td>
<td>generally not applicable</td>
<td>Jones Act: 3.4 yrs.(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0 yrs.(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate: 5.3 yrs.(a)</td>
<td>Crude / liquids: 5.2 yrs.</td>
<td>Bulk: 4.9 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;P: 4.2 yrs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pricing Security</strong></td>
<td>Refined products:</td>
<td>Based on contract; typically fixed or tied to PPI</td>
<td>S&amp;T: 83% protected by minimum volumes and floors(b)</td>
<td>Fixed based on toll settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate: primarily fixed based on contract</td>
<td>annual FERC tariff escalator (PPI-FG + 1.23%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>O&amp;G: volumes 73% hedged(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate: primarily fixed margin</td>
<td>Crude / liquids: primarily fixed based on contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;P: primarily fixed price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulatory Security</strong></td>
<td>Pipelines: regulated return</td>
<td>Not price regulated</td>
<td>Primarily unregulated</td>
<td>Regulated return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate: regulated return</td>
<td>Terminals &amp; transmix: not price regulated(f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate: essentially market-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;P: market-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commodity Price Exposure</strong></td>
<td>Minimal, limited to transmix business</td>
<td>No direct exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstate: no direct exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full-yr 2017: $4.4MM in DCF per $1/Bbl change in oil price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate: limited exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G&amp;P: limited exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures as of 1/1/2017, unless otherwise noted.

(a) Includes term sale portfolio.
(b) Based on KMI 2017 budgeted Segment EBDA before Certain Items and including KM-share of Certain Equity Investee DD&A where applicable (non-GAAP measure).
(c) Jones Act vessels: average remaining contract term is 3.4 years, or 5.7 years including options to extend. As of 1/1/2017 taking into account new contracts executed during 2017.
(d) Provisions in TMPL’s negotiated toll settlement allow for the parties to extend the agreement to coincide with in-service of the Trans Mountain expansion project, expected at end of 2019.
(e) Percentage of 4Q 2017 forecast net crude oil, propane and heavy NGL (C4+) net equity production.
(f) Terminals not FERC regulated, except portion of CALNEV.
KMI Overview by Product Served

**Natural Gas is our Largest Market**

- **2017 Budgeted Segment EBDA = $7.7 billion**

- **Natural gas**: ~80% take-or-pay cash flow
- **Refined products**: competitively advantaged connection between refineries and end markets
  - SFPP, Plantation, etc., ~61% of KMT liquids business
  - Piped volumes within ~1.5% of budget over past 7 years
  - KMT liquids terminals utilization ~96% since 2001
- **Crude and condensate**: >95% take-or-pay cash flow
  - KMCC, Splitter, Double H, Wink, Trans Mountain, and ~24% of KMT liquids business
- **Carbon dioxide (CO₂)**: >80% take-or-pay cash flow
- **NGLs**: >95% take-or-pay cash flow

**Stability of Cash Flows**

- **Location matters, contracts matter**

**Refined Product and Liquids Assets**

- **91% of cash flows fee-based for 2017; 97% fee-based or hedged**

(a) All percentages based on 2017 budgeted Segment EBDA before Certain Items and including KM-share of Certain Equity Investee DD&A (non-GAAP measure).
2017 Growth Capital Forecast

(millions)

- KMI’s 2017 forecast growth capital fully funded by internally generated cash flow, with no requirement to access capital markets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMI growth capital&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2017 Forecast&lt;sup&gt;(b)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2016 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Pipelines</td>
<td>$1,627</td>
<td>$1,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ - S&amp;T</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ - EOR</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products Pipelines</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder Morgan Canada</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total growth capital</td>
<td>$3,026</td>
<td>$2,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- KML had zero net debt at IPO and has committed C$4.0 billion construction and C$1.0 billion contingent facilities in place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KML growth capital&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2017 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines</td>
<td>C$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals / other</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total growth capital</td>
<td>C$494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>(a)</sup> KMI and KML growth capital for 2017 have been adjusted to reflect the close of the KML IPO; KMI excludes expenditures for KML-related projects occurring after close of the IPO, and KML excludes expenditures occurring prior to close of the IPO.

<sup>(b)</sup> 2017 includes JV contributions of $631 million and is net of a JV catch-up contribution (Elba Liquefaction) of $216 million.
# KMI Credit Ratios and Liquidity (a)

($ in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leverage metric</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net debt (b) to Adjusted EBITDA</td>
<td>5.0x</td>
<td>5.5x</td>
<td>5.6x</td>
<td>5.3x</td>
<td>5.1-5.2x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revolver capacity (c)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed revolving credit facility</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP / Revolver borrowing</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of credit</td>
<td>(110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess capacity</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 4,830</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-term debt maturities (d)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2,184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: As of 9/30/2017. See Appendix for defined terms and reconciliations of non-GAAP measures for the historical period.

(a) Debt of KMI and its consolidated subsidiaries excluding fair value adjustments.
(b) Debt as defined in footnote above, net of cash, excluding Kinder Morgan G.P. Inc.’s $100 million preferred stock due 2057, and including 50% of KML’s preferred stock.
(c) KMI corporate revolver (maturity in November 2019).
(d) 5-year maturity schedule of annual aggregate long-term debt principal.

Remaining 2017 maturities as of 9/30/2017.

2019 maturities adjusted to reflect repayment of $1.0 billion term loan facility with proceeds from 8/3/2017 5-yr notes offering.
KMI Counterparty Exposure

Strong Customer Credit, Valuable Services Limit KMI’s Risk

High-Quality, Diversified Customer Base

- To date, KMI’s budgeted 2017 DCF has had a $0 impact due to bankruptcies
- KMI’s 2016 DCF was impacted by less than $10 million due to oil & gas bankruptcies
- Greater than 2/3 of revenue generated by end-users (utilities, LDCs, refineries, chemical, large integrateds, etc.)
- KMI’s average customer represents less than 0.10% of annual revenue
- Top 25 customers = ~50% of KMI’s revenue
- Top 217 customers = ~88% of KMI’s revenue
  - <4% of these revenues from customers with B- or lower rating (net exposure is approximately half of this)

Top 25 Customers

- A-Rated or Better: 38%
- BBB Rated or Substantial Credit Support: 54%
- BB+ to B: 4%
- B- or below: 4%

Top 217 Customers

- A-Rated or Better: 30%
- BBB Rated or Substantial Credit Support: 47%
- BB+ to B: 9%
- Not Rated: 10%
- B- or below: 4%

---

(a) Company credit ratings as of 11/24/2017.
(b) Based on budgeted 2017 net revenues, which include our share of unconsolidated joint ventures, net margin for our Texas Intrastate customers, and net of dock premiums for our Canadian customers. Company credit ratings per S&P and Moody’s. The charts above use S&P’s equivalent rating symbols utilizing a blended rate for split-rated companies.
(c) Customers who individually represent >$5 million of 2017 budgeted revenue.
(d) Net exposure is revenues less credit support less market value of capacity.
Asset Integrity and Safety are Top Priorities
Consistent, Better-than-industry Performance Across our Businesses

- Safe operation of our assets is mission critical to our long-term success
- Continuous reduction in risk to the public, employees, contractors, assets and the environment
- We strive for continual improvement in safety and efficiency of existing operations
- Well-executed expansions and effective integration of acquired operations
- Consistently perform better than industry average
  — Track over 36 safety metrics and post monthly updates to our public website
  — Currently better than industry in 30 of 36 metrics

% of Safety Metrics KM Performed Better than or Equal to Industry\(^{(a)}\)

\(^{(a)}\) Based on period-end Kinder Morgan metrics versus most applicable industry performance.
Incidents & Releases
Pipeline Right-of-way

**Liquids Pipelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KM Incidents</th>
<th>Industry 3-yr Avg</th>
<th>Industry 2011 Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTM 9/30/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Natural Gas Pipelines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>KM Incidents</th>
<th>Industry 3-yr Avg</th>
<th>2005 Industry Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTM 9/30/2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: KM totals exclude non-DOT jurisdictional CO₂ Gathering and Crude Gathering for compatibility with industry comparisons.

(a) Failures involving onshore pipelines that occurred on the ROW, including valve sites, in which there is a release of the liquid or carbon dioxide transported resulting in any of the following:
   i. Explosion or fire not intentionally set by the operator
   ii. Release 5 barrels or greater. (NOTE: Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Association (PHMSA) does not record system location for releases less than 5 barrels)
   iii. Death of any person
   iv. Personal injury necessitating hospitalization
   v. Estimated property damage, including cost of clean-up and recovery, value of lost product, and damage to the property of the operator or others, or both, exceeding $50,000; not included: natural gas transportation assets

(b) 2014-2016 most recent PHMSA 3-yr average available.

(c) Excludes El Paso (“EP”) and Copano (“CPNO”) assets in periods prior to acquisition (EP 5/25/2012, CPNO 5/1/2013). An Incident means any of the following:
   • An event involving a release of gas from a pipeline, or of liquefied natural gas, liquefied petroleum gas, refrigerant gas, or gas from an LNG facility, that results in one or more of the following consequences:
     i. A death or personal injury necessitating in-patient hospitalization; or
     ii. Estimated property damage of $50,000 or more, including loss to the operator and others, but excluding cost of gas lost (2010 and earlier rates include cost of gas lost); or
     iii. Unintentional estimated gas loss of 3 million cubic feet or more
   • An event that results in an emergency shutdown of an LNG facility
   • An event that is significant, in the judgment of the operator, even though it didn’t meet criteria i. / ii. above

(d) Rupture defined as a break, burst, or failure that exposes a visible pipeline fracture surface
   • Kinder Morgan rupture rates calculated with current pipeline mileage
   • Industry rate excludes Kinder Morgan data

(e) Prior to KM acquisition of EP on 5/25/2012, ruptures occurred on legacy EP facilities
Employee Safety Statistics\(^{(a)}\)

**KM Lost-time Incident Rate (DART)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KM Rate (3-yr Avg)</th>
<th>KM Rate (12-mo)</th>
<th>Industry 3yr Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Pipelines</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products Pipelines</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM Canada</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OSHA Recordable Incident Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KM Rate (3-yr Avg)</th>
<th>KM Rate (12-mo)</th>
<th>Industry Avg (12-mo)</th>
<th>Industry 2005 Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Pipelines</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products Pipelines</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM Canada</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vehicle Incident Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KM Rate (3-yr Avg)</th>
<th>KM Rate (12-mo)</th>
<th>Industry Avg (12-mo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Gas Pipelines</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products Pipelines</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminals(^{(b)})</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM Canada</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{(a)}\) 12-month safety performance summary as of 9/30/2017.

\(^{(b)}\) Industry average not available for Terminals.
Natural Gas Pipelines
Segment Outlook

Well-positioned connecting key natural gas resources with major demand centers

Long-term Growth Drivers:
- LNG exports
  - Liquefaction facilities
  - Pipeline infrastructure
- Exports to Mexico
- Gas demand for power generation
  - Coal plant retirements
  - Regional gas-fired power demand growth
  - Backstop for wind and solar
- Industrial demand growth
- Shale-driven expansions / extensions
- Acquisitions

Project Backlog:
- $3.4 billion of identified growth projects over next five years (a), including:
  - LNG liquefaction (Elba Island)
  - Transport projects supporting LNG liquefaction
  - Expansions to Mexico border
  - TGP North-South projects

(a) Includes KM share of non-wholly owned projects. Includes projects currently under construction. Capital figures as of October, 2017.
Drivers of Future Growth

LNG Exports

- **U.S. LNG Export Opportunity**
  - 18.5 Bcf/d of FERC approved projects
  - 9.7 Bcf/d of projects under construction
  - 20 Bcf/d of additional projects pending approval

- **Elba Liquefaction** – at KM’s Elba Island, GA terminal

- **LNG Transport**
  - 4.5 MMDth/d of contracted transport capacity
  - Total capital of $951 MM
  - Avg. contract term: 19 years
  - Seven active projects on five KM pipelines

---

### KM Asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM Asset</th>
<th>KM Project/Transportation (Terminal)</th>
<th>Contracted Capacity (MDth/d)</th>
<th>In-Service Date</th>
<th>KM Capital ($MM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGPL</td>
<td>Firm Transport (Sabine Pass)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>In-Service</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>EEC for Shell (Elba Island)</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>9/2018, 11/2018</td>
<td>$85.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGP</td>
<td>SW Louisiana Supply (Cameron)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>3/2018</td>
<td>$178.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGPL</td>
<td>Gulf Coast Southbound (Cameron)</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>4Q/2018</td>
<td>$106.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate</td>
<td>TX Intrastate Crossover (Corpus Christi/Freeport)</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1Q-3Q 2019</td>
<td>$182.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGP</td>
<td>Lone Star (Corpus Christi)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>7/2019</td>
<td>$149.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMLP</td>
<td>Sabine Pass Expansion</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4Q/2019</td>
<td>$122.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMLP</td>
<td>Magnolia LNG Expansion</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>&gt;2022</td>
<td>$127.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Capital project information as of October, 2017.*

*(a) FERC, industry and KM analysis.*
Liquefaction at Elba Island

Elba Liquefaction Company (ELC)\(^{(a)}\) / SLNG

- **Capacity:**
  - LNG output capacity equivalent to 350 MMcf/d

- **Capital (100\%)(b):**
  - ELC: ~$1.4 billion\(^{(a)}\)
  - SLNG: ~$0.4 billion

- **Phased In-service:** Mid 2018 through mid 2019

- **Project Scope:**
  - Facilities for liquefaction (10 modular units)
  - Ship loading facilities; boil-off gas compression

- **Avg. Contract Term:** 20 years

- **Current Status:**
  - FERC certificate issued June 2016
  - DOE FTA and non-FTA authorizations received
  - Fully subscribed by Shell
  - Construction commenced November, 2016

---

\(^{(a)}\) ELC is a 51/49 joint venture of Kinder Morgan and investment funds managed by EIG Global Energy Partners (EIG).

\(^{(b)}\) Capital project information as of October, 2017.
Drivers of Future Growth
Kinder Morgan Delivers ~75% of U.S. Exports to Mexico

- Exports to Mexico are forecasted to increase by 1.9 Bcf/d to 5.6 Bcf/d by 2021\(^{(a)}\)
- KM deliveries to Mexico ~2.8 MMDth/d\(^{(b)}\) through 16 interconnects (12 direct & 4 indirect)
  - KM up 20% from 2015; 75% of 2016 U.S. total
  - Well positioned to serve incremental demand through extensive network connected to multiple prolific supply basins
- KM projects and new long term commitments for export to Mexico entered into since 2013:
  - Capacity: ~2.4 MMDth/d
  - Capital: ~$667 MM

### Mexico Gas Supply (Bcf/d)\(^{(a)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM Asset</th>
<th>KM Project / Transportation (Shipper)</th>
<th>Contracted Capacity (MDth/d)</th>
<th>In-Service Date</th>
<th>KM Capital ($MM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sierrita</td>
<td>Sierrita Gas PL (CFE)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10/2014</td>
<td>$64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPNG</td>
<td>S. Mainline Exp. (CFE)</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>10/2014 - 7/2020</td>
<td>$132.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX Intra</td>
<td>Mier-Monterrey (MexGas/Others)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>12/2014</td>
<td>$94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPNG</td>
<td>Transport (CFE)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2014 / 2017</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGP</td>
<td>S. System Flex (MexGas)</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/2015 - 12/2015 - 10/2016</td>
<td>$229.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGP</td>
<td>Transport (MexGas)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1Q 2016</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX Intra</td>
<td>Crossover Project (^{(c)})</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>9/2016</td>
<td>$125.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPNG</td>
<td>Transport (GIGO)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4Q 2016</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPNG</td>
<td>Trans. (Mexicana de Cobre)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4Q 2016</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierrita</td>
<td>Sierrita Gas PL Expansion (CFE)</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>4/2020</td>
<td>$19.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital project information as of October, 2017.
(a) Wood Mackenzie, Fall 2017 North America Natural Gas Long-Term Outlook, November 2017.
(b) 2016 calendar year average.
(c) Commitment to part of larger Crossover project designed to support LNG Exports, Gulf Coast Industrial demand and Exports to Mexico.
Drivers of Future Growth

Other

- New opportunities in growing export markets
  - Storage and ancillary services in support of LNG liquefaction and exports to Mexico

- Industrial growth markets
  - Well positioned to serve ~$185 billion announced U.S. natural-gas related petrochemical projects (~$96 billion completed or under construction)\(^{(a)}\)

- Residential and commercial markets
  - Small to moderate expansions and extensions off our existing footprint to support LDC growth around the country, especially New England

- Supply-based expansions/extensions
  - Expansions and extensions off existing network to support growth as demand balances with existing supply

- Power generation
  - Continued trend of generators procuring firm transportation and storage services to ensure their performance in ISO capacity reliability programs
  - Increasing need for transportation, storage and ancillary services to backstop variable renewable generation

Contracted Capacity and Term by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Contracted Capacity</th>
<th>Average Term Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>355 Bcf</td>
<td>3 yr, 1 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>19.7 Bcf/d</td>
<td>6 yr, 2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>52 Bcf</td>
<td>1 yr, 8 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>13.5 Bcf/d</td>
<td>7 yr, 8 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNG</td>
<td>18 Bcf</td>
<td>15 yr, 5 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>45 Bcf</td>
<td>5 yr, 4 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>17.4 Bcf/d</td>
<td>5 yr, 2 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midstream</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchases</td>
<td>2.5 Bcf/d</td>
<td>2 yr, 0 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>3.0 Bcf/d</td>
<td>2 yr, 6 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>101.8 Bcf</td>
<td>2 yr, 5 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport (a)</td>
<td>5.1 Bcf/d</td>
<td>6 yr, 10 mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>1.8 Bcf/d</td>
<td>6 yr, 1 mo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Net annual incremental re-contracting exposure (KM share)(b): (% of $7.7 billion 2017 budgeted total KMI Segment EBDA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>(1.1%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midstream</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total GPG</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 1/1/2017.
(a) Gathering contracts not included.
(b) Negative figures represent unfavorable re-contracting exposure. Includes transportation and storage contracts.

Interstate Transport Contracts Avg. = 6 yr, 3 mo
Products Pipelines

Segment Outlook

Long-term Growth Drivers:

- Increased demand for refined products volumes
- Development of shale play liquids transportation and processing (e.g. Utopia and KMCC / splitter)
- Tuck-in acquisitions (e.g. KM Phoenix Terminals)
- Expansion of refined products pipeline systems and Terminal Networks
- Repurposing portions of existing footprint in different product uses

Project Backlog:

- $361 million of identified growth projects over next three years\(^{(a)}\) (first year total Adjusted EBITDA $33 million\(^{(b)}\)), including:
  - Utopia
  - Multiple refined products terminaling and biofuels projects

\(^{(a)}\) Includes KM share of non-wholly owned projects. Includes projects currently under construction. Capital figures as of October, 2017.

\(^{(b)}\) KM Share.

---

Stable, Strategic Assets

- Miles of Pipe: ~9,760
- Terminals: 67
- Tank Capacity: Terminal ~42 MMBbls, Pipelines ~14 MMBbls
- Transmix: 5 facilities
- Condensate Processing: Capability of 100 MMBbl/d
- 2016 Throughput: ~2.1 MMBbl/d
Stability and Growth\(^{(a)}\)

**Refined Products\(^{(b)}\):**
- **2016:**
  - Refined products volumes 1,651 MBbl/d, up 0.3% vs. 2015
  - Gasoline up 1.2%, diesel down 3.5%, jet fuel up 1.7%
- **2017:**
  - 1,676 MBbl/d budgeted, up 1.5% vs. 2016
  - Budget volume sensitivity: 1% change = $7.5M

**NGLs:**
- **2016:**
  - NGL volumes 108 MBbl/d, up 2.7% vs. 2015
  - Drivers: higher volumes on Cochin Pipeline
- **2017:**
  - Budgeted volume up 5.6% vs. 2016
  - Drivers: Increased demand on Cochin; no forecasted turnaround in 2017 at Cypress Pipeline terminus

**Crude/ Condensate:**
- **2016:**
  - Crude/ condensate volumes 323 MBbl/d, up 18.3% vs. 2015
  - Drivers: expansion projects on KMCC/ Double Eagle and acquisition of Double H pipeline
- **2017:**
  - 312 MBbl/d budgeted, down 3.3% vs. 2016
  - Drivers: Decreased production from the Eagle Ford

\(^{(a)}\) All volumes reflect KM-share for joint ventures.
\(^{(b)}\) Parkway divested July 2016. Parkway volumes and revenue not included.
\(^{(c)}\) EIA, Short-term Energy Outlook, January 2017.
\(^{(d)}\) Combined throughput of KM crude / condensate pipelines: KMCC, Double Eagle and Double H.
**Utopia Pipeline Project**

**Project Scope**
- 50/50 JV with Riverstone Holdings closed on June 28, 2016
- 215 mile new build and existing 67 mile 12” pipeline
- Will transport ethane and ethane-propane mix from points in Harrison County, Ohio to Windsor, Ontario, Canada
- Supported by long-term, fee-based transportation agreement
- Initial pipeline capacity of 50 MBbl/d; expandable to 75 MBbl/d
- Approximate $540 million (100%) investment

**Market Drivers**
- Utopia will provide a new feedstock source for petrochemical companies in Ontario, and a new market outlet for Utica NGL producers
- Common carrier pipeline system is supported by a long-term (>20 years), fee-based transportation services agreement

**Project Status and Timeline**
- ROW acquisition ongoing
- Commencement of construction 1Q 2017
- Planned in-service date of January 2018

---

(a) 100% project cost, excluding AFUDC.
Terminals
Segment Outlook

**Long-term Growth Drivers**
- Refined product supply and demand growth
- Gulf Coast liquids exports
- Chemical infrastructure and base business growth built on production increases
- Tuck-in acquisitions

**Project Backlog**
- $0.7 billion of identified growth projects over next 2 years\(^{(a)}\), including:
  - Houston Ship Channel network expansion
  - Edmonton merchant crude terminal
  - Jones Act tanker builds

---

\(^{(a)}\) Includes KM share of non-wholly owned projects. Includes projects currently under construction. Capital figures as of October, 2017.

\(^{(b)}\) Includes 4 new tankers being delivered in 2017.
Stable Fee-Based Business

- ~2/3 of KMT’s 2017 budgeted EBDA is supported by take-or-pay contracts

**Liquids**
- 73% Take-or-pay
  - fixed monthly lease payments (MWC)
  - minimum throughput guarantees
  - Jones Act tanker charters
- 27% Other fee-based
  - ancillary fees for blending, additives, dock services, etc.
  - throughput fees

**Bulk**
- 37% Take-or-pay
- 23% Requirements
  - tied to petroleum coke or steel production
- 40% Other fee-based
  - throughput & ancillaries

Note: All data is based on 2017 budget.
Diversified Revenues

- Diversified revenues across liquids and bulk

### 2017 Budget ($ millions) (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ millions</th>
<th>(percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquids</strong></td>
<td>$1,426</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulk</strong></td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$1,926</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Top-10 Customers ($ millions)

|               | $911       | 47%       |

### Average remaining contract term (years)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquids</strong></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bulk</strong></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 2017 budget includes non-controlling interests in certain terminals.
(b) No single customer is greater than 9.5% of revenues.
(c) Budget weighted average as of 1/1/2017.
KMT Presence in Liquids Hubs

Terminals Segment

KMT Liquids
- 90 million Bbls of capacity
- ~1.0 billion Bbls throughput
- 97.5% utilization
- $1.43 billion revenues
- $957 million EBDA

Liquids Revenues

All data is based on 2017 budget.
(a) Size is relative to revenues.
(b) Terminal utilizations reflect tankage unavailable for lease due to API inspections and routine maintenance.
High Demand Liquids Hubs

Critical infrastructure to industry and our customers, 100% contracted

- **Houston Ship Channel** – largest integrated refined product terminaling system in the world
- **New York Harbor** – global refined product clearing hub with liquid, transparent markets
- **Edmonton** – largest independent Canadian merchant crude terminaling system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terminals Segment</th>
<th>EBDA(a) ($ millions)</th>
<th>Total Terminal Capacity(b) (million Bbls)</th>
<th>Capacity added since 2010(b) (million Bbls)</th>
<th>Average Remaining Contract(c) (years)</th>
<th>Average Utilization (2010-2017B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston Ship Channel</td>
<td>$336</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Harbor</td>
<td>$121</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0(d)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terminal utilizations reflect tankage unavailable for lease due to API inspections and routine maintenance

(a) Based on 2017 budget.
(b) Includes tankage currently under construction and to be completed in 2017.
(c) As of 1/1/2017.
(d) Excludes Base Line Terminal which will be phased in service throughout 2018 – 7.5 year average contract life.
Tankers – APT Jones Act Fleet

All of APT’s available vessels are sailing under time-charter with limited exposure in 2017 and 2018

- Average term contract length of 3.4 years across 16-vessels
- 4 new vessels delivered in ‘17
  - American Freedom
  - Palmetto State
  - American Liberty
  - American Pride
- Currently-uncontracted vessels:
  - De minimis exposure in 2017 and 2018
- Marketing
  - Short-term charters
  - Bundled terminaling services
  - Prompt market voyages

**KM Fleet Charter Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vessel</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Freedom</td>
<td>1x2-yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Endurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Star State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican Sate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3x1-yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Liberty</td>
<td></td>
<td>1x1-yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3x1-yr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information as of October, 2017.
**CO₂ Segment Outlook**

**Long-term Growth Drivers:**
- Demand for scarce supply of CO₂ drives volume and price
- Expect to maintain current CO₂ production levels with minimal incremental investment
- Billions of barrels of domestic oil still in place to be recovered in the Permian Basin
- >9 billion barrels Original Oil In Place in KM operated fields

**Project Backlog:**
- Identified growth projects totaling $0.4 billion and $1.4 billion in S&T and EOR, respectively, over next 5 years, including:
  - S&T: Southwest Colorado CO₂ production
  - EOR: SACROC / Yates / Goldsmith / Tall Cotton oil production

---

(b) Includes KM share of non-wholly owned projects. Includes projects currently under construction.
KM CO₂ Current Outlook

$4.7 Billion Cumulative Free Cash Flow Generated Since Inception\(^{(a)}\)

### Development Plans 2017-2026

- **SACROC**
  - Continue platform development/redevelopment
  - Expand Bypass Pay/Infill programs
  - Exploit transition zone opportunity

- **Yates**
  - Continue HDH programs and gravity drainage depletion plan
  - Initiate new Westside Waterflood
  - Evaluate HCM pilot

- **Katz**
  - Continue conformance program
  - Optimize flood performance

- **GLSAU**
  - Continue downspacing evaluation
  - Optimize flood performance

- **Tall Cotton**
  - Commence Phase 2 expansion
  - Develop additional project prospects

- **CO₂ S&T**
  - Maintain capacity in existing source fields (McElmo & Doe Canyon)
  - Optimize production and increase efficiency
  - Manage source portfolio to be prepared for increase in demand

### Total Business IRR (2000-2026): 28.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017-2026</th>
<th>Net BOE(^{(b)}) (MMBOE)</th>
<th>KM Share Capex (^{(c)}) ($MM)(^{(e)})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SACROC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLSAU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Cotton</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1,006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂ S&amp;T</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$2,617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DCF ($MM)\(^{(e)}\)

\(^{(a)}\) Net of invested capital.
\(^{(b)}\) Net BOE = Net Crude plus Net NGLs plus Net Residue Gas sold and thereafter divided by 6.
\(^{(c)}\) KM Share Capex is inclusive of Capitalized CO₂ and Capitalized OH.
\(^{(d)}\) 2017 = Budget, 2017 at $53/Bbl, 2018 at $55/Bbl, 2019 at $60/Bbl, 2020+ at $65/Bbl; cost metrics based on 2016 run rate; development plans may change in different price scenarios.
\(^{(e)}\) CO₂ profits not eliminated from S&T.
2017 Projects – Price Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AT IRR % vs Oil Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50 flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACROC-Bypass (Long Lateral)</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACROC-Bypass (Sidetrack Lateral)</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACROC Hawaii</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yates Horizontal Drain Hole Program</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall Cotton Phase 2</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Budgeted 2017 operating cash costs:**
  - SACROC = $17.91 /Bbl
  - Yates = $13.14 /Bbl

(a) Forward curve as of 1/18/2017.
Kinder Morgan Canada

Segment Outlook

Long-term Growth Drivers:

- Expand Oilsands access to the West Coast and offshore markets
  - The Trans Mountain Pipeline Expansion Project (TMEP) expected to more than double capacity, from 300 MBbl/d currently to approximately 890 MBbl/d
  - Strong commercial support from shippers with binding long-term 15 and 20 year contracts for ~708 MBbl/d of firm transport capacity

- Expanded dock capabilities (Westridge)
  - TMEP expected to increase dock capacity to over 600 MBbl/d
  - Access to global markets
Trans Mountain Expansion Project (TMEP)
Only Crude Oil Pipeline Serving Canadian West Coast

- Expansion to 890 MBbl/d from 300 MBbl/d today
  - 615 miles new pipe; 12 new pump stations
  - 630 MBbl/d tanker export capacity; 3 new berths
  - 20 new tanks

- 13 companies contracted for 708 MBbl/d
  - 15 & 20 year take-or-pay contracts
  - Commercial terms approved by NEB May 2013

- Projected Cost
  - Final cost estimate C$7.4 billion (a)
  - Protection on ~24% of construction costs

- Timeline
  - 2016 - NEB recommendation May ‘16
    - Federal approval Dec ‘16
  - 2017 - B.C. approval Jan ‘17
    - Final cost estimate accepted by shippers Mar ‘17
    - KMI FID May ‘17
    - Began limited construction Sep ‘17
  - Targeted in-service Dec ‘19
    • Slower than expected receipt of permits and approvals could result in delay, currently estimated at up to 9 months
  - 2018 budget assumes spending on TMEP in the first part of the year is primarily on advancing permitting process, rather than at full construction levels, until KML has greater clarity on key permits, approvals and judicial reviews

(a) Including capitalized finance charges.
(b) Canadian Assoc. of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), 2016 Crude Oil Forecast, Markets & Transportation, June 2016, and KM analysis. Supply represents Western Canada production and Bakken movements.
Use of Non-GAAP Financial Measures

The non- generally accepted accounting principles (non-GAAP) financial measures of distributable cash flow (DCF), both in the aggregate and per share, segment earnings before depreciation, depletion, amortization and amortization of excess cost of equity investments (DD&A) and Certain Items (Segment EBDA before Certain Items), net income before interest expense, taxes, DD&A and Certain Items (Adjusted EBITDA), and adjusted earnings (Adjusted Earnings), both in the aggregate and per share, are presented herein. Our non-GAAP measures described above should not be considered alternatives to GAAP net income or other GAAP measures and have important limitations as analytical tools. Our computations of DCF, Segment EBDA before Certain Items, Adjusted EBITDA and Adjusted Earnings may differ from similarly titled measures used by others. You should not consider these non-GAAP measures in isolation or as substitutes for an analysis of our results as reported under GAAP. Management compensates for the limitations of these non-GAAP measures by reviewing our comparable GAAP measures, understanding the differences between the measures and taking this information into account in its analysis and its decision making processes. Reconciliations of DCF, Segment EBDA before Certain Items, Adjusted EBITDA and Adjusted Earnings to their most directly comparable GAAP financial measures are included herein.

Certain Items are items that are required by GAAP to be reflected in net income, but typically either (1) do not have a cash impact (for example, asset impairments), or (2) by their nature are separately identifiable from our normal business operations and in our view are likely to occur only sporadically (for example certain legal settlements, hurricane impacts and casualty losses).

DCF is a significant performance measure used by us and by external users of our financial statements to evaluate our performance and to measure and estimate the ability of our assets to generate cash earnings after servicing our debt and preferred stock dividends, paying cash taxes and expending sustaining capital, that could be used for discretionary purposes such as common stock dividends, stock repurchases, retirement of debt, or expansion capital expenditures. Management uses this measure and believes it provides users of our financial statements a useful measure reflective of our business’s ability to generate cash earnings to supplement the comparable GAAP measure. We believe the GAAP measure most directly comparable to DCF is net income available to common stockholders. DCF per share is DCF divided by average outstanding common shares and restricted stock awards that participate in dividends.

Segment EBDA before Certain Items is used by management in its analysis of segment performance and management of our business. General and administrative expenses are generally not under the control of our segment operating managers, and therefore, are not included when we measure business segment operating performance. We believe Segment EBDA before Certain Items is a significant performance metric because it provides us and external users of our financial statements additional insight into the ability of our segments to generate segment cash earnings on an ongoing basis. We believe it is useful to investors because it is a measure that management uses to allocate resources to our segments and assess each segment’s performance. We believe the GAAP measure most directly comparable to Segment EBDA before Certain Items is segment earnings before DD&A and amortization of excess cost of equity investments (Segment EBDA). Segment EBDA before Certain Items is calculated by adjusting Segment EBDA for the Certain Items attributable to a segment, which are specifically identified in the footnotes to the accompanying tables when reported.

Adjusted EBITDA is used by management and external users, in conjunction with our net debt, to evaluate certain leverage metrics. Therefore, we believe Adjusted EBITDA is useful to investors. We believe the GAAP measure most directly comparable to Adjusted EBITDA is net income. Adjusted EBITDA is calculated by adjusting net income before interest expense, taxes, and DD&A (EBITDA) for Certain Items, noncontrolling interests before Certain Items, and KMI’s share of Certain Equity Investees’ DD&A and book taxes, which are specifically identified in the footnotes to the accompanying tables when reported.

Adjusted Earnings is used by certain external users of our financial statements to assess the earnings of our business excluding Certain Items as another reflection our business’s ability to generate earnings. We believe the GAAP measure most directly comparable to Adjusted Earnings is net income available to common stockholders. Adjusted Earnings per share is Adjusted Earnings divided by Average Adjusted Common Shares which include KMI’s weighted average common shares outstanding, unvested restricted shares that contain rights to dividends (which may not be dilutive under GAAP) and any shares resulting from dilutive impact of warrants under treasury stock method.

Budgeted Net Income is not provided (the GAAP financial measure most directly comparable to DCF and Adjusted EBITDA) due to the inherent difficulty and impracticability of predicting certain amounts required by GAAP, such as ineffectiveness on commodity, interest rate and foreign currency hedges, unrealized gains and losses on derivatives marked to market, and potential changes in estimates for certain contingent liabilities.

Certain Equity Investees, for the periods during which these are accounted for as equity method investments, include Plantation, Cortez, SNG, ELC, MEP, FEP, EagleHawk, Red Cedar, Bear Creek, Cypress, Parkway, Sierrita, Bighorn, Fort Union, Webb/Duvall, Liberty, Double Eagle, Endeavor, WYCO, GLNG, Ruby, Young Gas, Citrus, NGPL and others. DD&A and sustaining capex for Plantation and Cortez were made beginning in 2017. For joint ventures consolidated by KMI, JV DD&A and sustaining capex are net of our partners’ share of these items.
## GAAP Reconciliation

### Reconciliation of DCF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yr. Ended</th>
<th>12/31/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain Items</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income before Certain Items (Adjusted Earnings)</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD&amp;A</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV DD&amp;A&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book taxes&lt;sup&gt;(b)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash taxes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncontrolling interests&lt;sup&gt;(c)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining capex including KMI share of JV sustaining capex</td>
<td>(540)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;(e)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributable Cash Flow (DCF) attributable to Kinder Morgan, Inc.</td>
<td>4,667</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred stock dividends</td>
<td>(156)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCF attributable to Common Stockholders</td>
<td>4,511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reconciliation of Adjusted EBITDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yr. Ended</th>
<th>12/31/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain Items</td>
<td>933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income before Certain Items (Adjusted Earnings)</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book taxes&lt;sup&gt;(b)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncontrolling interests&lt;sup&gt;(c)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD&amp;A</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV DD&amp;A&lt;sup&gt;(a)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest, net before Certain Items</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted EBITDA</td>
<td>7,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Certain Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition related costs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair value amortization</td>
<td>(143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract early termination revenue</td>
<td>(57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and environmental reserves</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark to market and ineffectiveness</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on impairments and divestitures, net</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project write-offs</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other&lt;sup&gt;(g)&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book taxes on Certain Items</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Certain Items</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Note: Definitions for defined terms found in the Appendix.

- **(a)** Includes KMI share of Certain Equity Investees DD&A.
- **(c)** Before Certain Items. Represents net income allocated to third-party ownership interests in consolidated subsidiaries.
- **(d)** Includes KMI share of Certain Equity Investee sustaining capital expenditures $90 million.
- **(e)** Consists primarily of book to cash timing differences related to certain defined benefit plans partially offset by retiree medical contributions.
- **(f)** Excludes Kinder Morgan G.P. Inc.’s $100 million preferred stock due 2057 and ($43) million non-cash foreign exchange impact on KMI’s Euro-denominated debt.
- **(g)** 2016 Other Certain Items include $14 million employee right-sizing, $5 Nassau crane incident, $4 Berry bankruptcy, $4 CBS closure, $(4) mark to market power contract adj. and $1 other.
Appendix – KML
KML Notice to Investors

In this Appendix – KML ("appendix") all references to “C$” are to Canadian dollars and unless otherwise indicated, all dollar amounts are expressed in Canadian dollars.

United States Matters
KML’s securities have not been and will not be registered under the United States Securities Act of 1933, as amended (the U.S. Securities Act), or any state securities laws. Accordingly, these securities may not be offered or sold within the United States unless registered under the U.S. Securities Act and applicable state securities laws or except pursuant to exemptions from the registration requirements of the U.S. Securities Act and applicable state securities laws. This presentation does not constitute an offer to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any of KML’s securities in the United States.

Forward-Looking Statements
This presentation includes "forward-looking information", "financial outlook" and "forward-looking statements" (collectively referred to as "forward-looking information") within the meaning of applicable securities laws. Forward-looking statements include any statement that does not relate strictly to historical or current facts and include statements accompanied by or using words such as "anticipate," "believe," "intend," "plan," "projection," "forecast," "strategy," "outlook," "continue," "estimate," "expect," "may," or "long-term." Forward-looking statements in this presentation include statements, express or implied, concerning, without limitation: the Trans Mountain Expansion Project ("TMEP") and Base Line Terminal project, including completion of such projects, construction plans, anticipated funding and costs, anticipated capital expenditures, community and Aboriginal engagement, scheduling and in-service dates, the possibility of mitigation to address project delays, future benefits and utilization, anticipated project returns and the impacts of such projects on Adjusted EBITDA and DCF; the anticipated dividends and the intended payment thereof; anticipated growth and the potential growth opportunities of KML’s business; expected demand and market conditions and the anticipated competitive position of KML’s business; and anticipated tolls. Forward-looking statements are not guarantees of performance. They involve significant risks, uncertainties and assumptions. Any financial outlook or other forward-looking information provided in this presentation has been provided for the purpose of providing information relating to management’s current expectations and plans for the future, is based on a number of significant assumptions and may not be appropriate, and should not be used, for any other purpose. Future actions, conditions or events and future results of operations may differ materially from those expressed in forward-looking statements. Many of the factors that will determine these results are beyond the ability of KML to control or predict. The business, financial condition and results of operations of KML, including its ability to pay cash dividends, are substantially dependent on its business, financial condition and results of operations and the successful development of the TMEP. As a result, factors or events that impact KML’s business as well as the costs associated with and the time required to complete (if completed) the TMEP, are likely to have a commensurate impact on KML, the market price and value of its restricted voting shares and KML’s ability to pay dividends. Similarly, given the nature of the relationships between KML and Kinder Morgan, Inc. ("KMI"), factors or events that impact KML may have consequences for KML. Among other things, specific factors that could cause actual results to differ from those indicated in the forward-looking statements provided in this presentation include, without limitation: issues, delays or stoppages associated with major expansion projects, including the TMEP; changes in public opinion, public opposition, the concerns and the resolution of issues relating to the concerns of individuals, special interest or Aboriginal groups, governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and other third parties that may result in higher project or operating costs, project delays or even project cancellations; an increase in the indebtedness of KML and/or significant unanticipated cost overruns or required capital expenditures; the breakdown or failure of equipment, pipelines and facilities, releases or spills, operational disruptions or service interruptions; the ability of KML to access sufficient external sources of financing; and changes in governmental support and the regulatory environment. In addition to the foregoing, important additional information respecting the assumptions, expectations and risks applicable to the forward-looking statements included in this presentation is set out under the sections entitled "Notice to Investors – Forward-Looking Statements", "Notice to Investors – Growth Estimates" and "Risk Factors" in the IPO Prospectus and the section headed "Cautionary Statement Regarding Forward-Looking Information" in the Q3 2017 MD&A as filed under KML’s profile on SEDAR at www.sedar.com.

The assumptions behind KML’s forecasted 2018 Adjusted EBITDA are substantially unchanged from those presented under the headings "Notice to Investors – Growth Estimates" and "The Business – Investment Highlights – Sizeable Growth Project of Strategic National Importance to Canada - Financial Highlights and Growth Estimates" within KML’s final initial public offering prospectus dated May 25, 2017,2017 (the IPO Prospectus, a copy of which is available under KML’s profile on SEDAR at www.sedar.com), except for reduced capitalized equity financing costs due to TMEP capital expenditures expected to be lower through 2018. In addition to the assumptions for Adjusted EBITDA, KML’s forecasted 2018 DCF includes assumptions for expected funding sources and associated costs, cash taxes and sustaining capital expenditures.
KML at a Glance

($ in millions)

General Information

KMI Ownership ~70%
2017F Adjusted EBITDA C$380 - 390 million
2017F DCF C$315 - 320 million
Equity Value C$6.1 billion\(^{(a)}\)
Enterprise Value C$6.1 billion\(^{(a)}\)

Chairman & CEO Steve Kean
President, KML Ian Anderson
Director & CFO Dax Sanders
President, KML Terminals John Schlosser
Headquarters Calgary, AB

Note: Definitions of non-GAAP measures are found on the slide Use of Non-GAAP Measures.

(a) Equity Value and Enterprise Value as of 11/24/2017. Includes KML preferred stock. See KMI Overview slide in main presentation for calculation of KML enterprise value.
# KML Investment Highlights

## Portfolio of Strategically Located Assets
- Canada's only crude and refined products pipeline connected to the West Coast, including B.C. tidewater access
- Leading integrated network of crude tank storage and rail terminals in Western Canada
- The largest mineral concentrate export / import facility on the West Coast of North America
- Owns the Canadian portion of the Cochin pipeline system, which transports light condensate to Alberta

## TMEP - Marquee Growth Project of National Importance
- Expected TMEP tolls of C$5-7/Bbl are significantly lower than WCS to WTI spread of ~US$15/Bbl
- Large scale investment with attractive returns (first full-year contribution of over ~C$1.1 billion in Adjusted EBITDA<sup>a</sup>)
- 80% of new capacity subject to long-term firm commitments (the majority having a 20-year term)
- Majority of shippers, or their parent entity, have an investment grade credit rating<sup>b</sup>

## Strong Existing Business and Potential Organic Growth Beyond TMEP
- Base Line Terminal, a new 4.8 MMBbl terminal facility in Edmonton, is expected to be placed in service throughout 2018
- Controls one of the last remaining parcels of land available for development in Port Metro Vancouver
- Potential Growth from unutilized capacity on Cochin Pipeline (Canada)<sup>c</sup>
- Puget Sound pipeline expansion capability from ~240 MBbl/d to ~500 MBbl/d
- Expanded TMPL system could be further increased to ~1.2 MMBbl/d without significant pipeline looping<sup>d</sup>

## Aligned, Industry Leading Operator and Sponsor
- Kinder Morgan, Inc. is one of the largest energy infrastructure companies in North America
- Investment grade ratings with substantial resources and a world class asset portfolio
- Majority equity ownership and aligned with public shareholders (no multi-voting structure, no incentive distribution rights, no management fees above cost)

## Predictable, Fee-Based Cash Flow with Strong Potential Growth
- Contracted, fee-based cash flows with no direct commodity price exposure
- Potential to more-than-triple EBITDA with in-service of commercially-secured growth projects TMEP<sup>a</sup> and Base Line TMPL system over-subscribed since 2010; ~80% contracted under long-term firm commitments post TMEP
- Initial annualized dividend target of C$0.65 per share, assuming payout of majority of current DCF excluding capitalized equity financing costs

## Investment Grade Capital Structure
- Intend to fund the majority of growth capital through cash flow, debt and preferred shares
- C$4.0 billion Construction and C$1.0 billion Contingent facilities

<sup>a</sup> Includes ~C$200MM projected incremental Adjusted EBITDA attributable to expected spot volumes.
<sup>b</sup> Parent entity may not be a guarantor.
<sup>c</sup> Throughput on the Canadian portion of the Cochin pipeline system has the potential to reach ~110 MBbl/d if additional receipt points in Canada are established.
<sup>d</sup> There are no current plans to expand the TMPL system outside of the current scope of TMEP.
KML’s Portfolio of Strategically Located Assets

**Premier Western Canadian Midstream Asset Portfolio**

**TMPL**
- Transportation capacity of ~300 MBbl/d for crude oil and refined products from Edmonton, Alberta to the west coast of British Columbia

**TMEP**
- Expected to increase transportation capacity of TMPL by ~590 MBbl/d to ~890 MBbl/d
- Westridge Marine Terminal capacity expected to increase to ~630 MBbl/d

**Puget Sound**
- ~240 MBbl/d of crude oil transportation capacity via TMPL from Sumas to Washington State refineries

**Cochin Pipeline (Canada)**
- Transportation capacity of ~110 MBbl/d of light condensate from the U.S. border to Alberta to be used as diluent in bitumen transportation\(^{(a)} \)

**Edmonton Area Terminals**
- Integrated network of tank storage (14.9 MMBbls) and rail terminals, including ownership in the largest origination crude by rail loading facility in North America

**Vancouver Wharves**
- Largest mineral concentrate export / import facility on West Coast, transferring >4.0 MMt tons of bulk cargo and >1.5 MMBbls of liquids annually

---

\(^{(a)}\) Capacity on the U.S. portion of Cochin pipeline system, which will not be owned by KML, is approximately 95 MBbl/d. Throughput on the Canadian portion of the Cochin pipeline system has the potential to reach 110 MBbl/d if additional receipt points in Canada are established.
TMEP
Marquee Growth Project of National Importance

TMEP | ~C$7.4 Billion Growth Project(a)

- Limited construction activities began in September 2017, with targeted in-service schedule of December 31, 2019
  - Slower than expected receipt of permits and approvals could result in delay, currently estimated at up to 9 months(b)
  - 2018 budget assumes spending on TMEP in first part of year is primarily on advancing permitting process, rather than at full construction levels, until KML has greater clarity on key permits, approvals and judicial reviews

- Given very limited pipeline access to tidewater, >70%(c) of Canadian crude products are currently exported to U.S. markets with the bulk of the remainder being consumed domestically
  - Lack of market access results in Canadian crude receiving a material discount to global benchmarks

- TMEP would increase the shipping capacity of TMPL by ~590 MBbl/d to a total of ~890 MBbl/d
  - ~708 MBbl/d of contracted volumes (15 and 20 year contracts), leaving ~182 MBbl/d (~20%) available for spot capacity
  - Fully contracted capacity up to the NEB approved limit

- Completed expansion would result in two active pipelines
  - Line 1 expected to have a capacity of ~350 MBbl/d, based on an assumed slate of light crude oils and refined products
  - Line 2 expected to have a capacity of ~540 MBbl/d, based on an assumed slate of heavy crude oils

---

Project has over C$1.1 billion in Adjusted EBITDA growth potential in first full year of operation(d)

(a) Including capitalized financing costs.
(b) While the exact length of delay is uncertain at this time, assuming an unmitigated delay of nine months, our previously disclosed 2020 estimate of C$900 million in incremental Adjusted EBITDA attributable to this project would be reduced to approximately C$225 million. Each month of change in our in-service date is expected to result in a change of approximately C$75 million of Adjusted EBITDA. These figures exclude the impact of capitalized financing costs and utilization of spot capacity.
(c) Canadian Assoc. of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), 2016 Crude Oil Forecast, Markets & Transportation, June 2016, and KM analysis.
(d) Based on 100% contracted and expected spot capacity utilization. Includes ~C$200MM of annual Adjusted EBITDA related to 182 MBbl/d of expected spot capacity.
KML Has Significant Potential Growth Beyond TMEP

TMPL System

- Puget Sound pipeline capacity is capable of being expanded to ~500 MBbl/d from 240 MBbl/d today
- Capacity of TMEP could be increased to ~1,200 MBbl/d with additional power and capital without significant pipeline looping\(^{(a)}\)

Cochin Pipeline (Canada)

- Canadian portion of the Cochin pipeline system has an additional 15 MBbl/d of capacity compared to the U.S. portion of the pipeline
  - Unused capacity could be utilized with the addition of new receipt points in Canada
- With Canadian bitumen production growth projected through 2030\(^{(b)}\), U.S. diluent imports are expected to remain an integral part of bringing Canadian bitumen to market

Base Line Terminal

- Total expected cost of ~C$724 million (~C$374MM net to KML)
- Base Line is expected to have total tank storage capacity of 4.8 MMBbls
- Expected in-service throughout 2018
- The project is supported by multiple, long-term, high quality customer contracts

Vancouver Wharves

- Control one of last remaining parcels of land available for development in Port Metro Vancouver
- ~C$250 million worth of potential capital projects have been identified and are in various evaluation and development stages

---

\(^{(a)}\) There are no current plans to expand the TMPL system outside of the current scope of TMEP.
\(^{(b)}\) Canadian Assoc. of Petroleum Producers (CAPP), 2016 Crude Oil Forecast, Markets & Transportation, June 2016, and KM analysis.
**KML Governance & Organizational Structure**

### Governance Overview

**Structure following IPO**
- KML owns an approximate 30% interest in its Canadian assets
- Remaining approximate 70% interest indirectly held by KMI\(^{(a)}\)

**Restricted Voting Shares**
- Purchased by the public pursuant to the IPO
- Voting rights at KML shareholder meetings – one vote per share
- Rights to receive dividends, if declared by KML

**Special Voting Shares / Class B Units**
- Held, indirectly, by KMI
- Voting rights at KML shareholder meetings – one vote per share
- No dividends, but rights to receive distributions effectively equivalent to KML dividends
- No IDR, management fees in excess of cost, or disproportionate share of cash flow to KMI

---

**KMI intends to retain a majority interest in KML**

---

\(^{(a)}\) KMI ownership is indirect through its subsidiaries, KMCC and KM Canada Terminals ULC.
Capital costs associated with TMEP are classified into 2 segments: (i) capped costs, and (ii) uncapped costs

Uncapped costs are structured as follows:
- Costs above or below the uncapped cost amount will be reflected in higher or lower tolls for shippers – neutral to the Business
- Benchmark toll changes by ~C$0.07/Bbl per C$100MM of capital cost change (includes return component – i.e. increases in the uncapped costs are recovered and earned on)

Capped costs are structured as follows:
- Costs above the capped cost amount are the responsibility of the Business
- Costs below the capped cost amount will be reflected in lower tolls for shippers by ~C$0.07/Bbl per C$100MM of capital cost for the benchmark toll

**Uncapped costs**(a)
- Price of steel for pipe
- 2 of 7 of the more difficult pipeline construction spreads totaling ~10% of the project
  - 1 mountain spread in the Coquihalla Summit, British Columbia (spread 5b)
  - 1 urban spread between Langley and Burnaby, British Columbia (spread 7)
- Land acquisition costs between Langley and Burnaby
- All consultation and accommodation costs including indigenous and non-indigenous communities
- Burnaby Tunnel

**Capped costs**(a)
- All other Costs

---

Some of higher risk TMEP capital cost components classified as uncapped costs, with respect to which cost overruns will be reflected in increased tolls

(a) Based on current cost estimates of ~C$7.4 billion.
Use of Non-GAAP Measures

Non-GAAP Measures and AFUDC

The supplementary measures “distributable cash flow” and "Adjusted EBITDA" do not have any standardized meaning as prescribed under U.S. GAAP and, therefore, are considered to be non-GAAP measures. “DCF” is net income of the Business before DD&A adjusted for (i) unrealized foreign exchange gains and losses; (ii) income tax expense and cash income taxes (paid) refunded; (iii) sustaining capital expenditures; and (iv) certain items that are required by U.S. GAAP to be reflected in net income, but typically either (a) do not have a cash impact, or (b) by their nature are separately identifiable from the normal business operations and in the view of KML are likely to occur only sporadically. DCF is used to evaluate the performance of the Business and to measure and estimate the ability of the Business to generate cash earnings after servicing its debt, paying cash taxes and expending sustaining capital, that could be used for discretionary purposes such as distributions or expansion capital expenditures. KML believes this measure provides users of its financial statements a useful performance measure reflective of the Business’ ability to generate cash earnings to supplement the comparable U.S. GAAP measure. KML believes that the GAAP measure most directly comparable to distributable cash flow is net income. Adjusted EBITDA is used as a liquidity measure by the Company and external users of its financial statements, in conjunction with net debt, to evaluate certain leverage metrics. “Adjusted EBITDA” is EBITDA adjusted for unrealized foreign exchange gains and losses and certain items, as applicable. KML believes the GAAP measure most directly comparable to Adjusted EBITDA is net income. The Business does not allocate Adjusted EBITDA amongst equity interest holders as it views Adjusted EBITDA as a liquidity measure against the Business’ overall leverage. DCF and Adjusted EBITDA should not be considered alternatives to U.S. GAAP net income or any other GAAP measures. The computation of DCF and Adjusted EBITDA may differ from similarly titled measures used by others. Accordingly, use of such terms may not be comparable to similarly defined measures presented by other entities. Investors should not consider these non-GAAP financial measures in isolation or as a substitute for an analysis of results as reported under U.S. GAAP. See “Non-GAAP Measures – Reconciliation to Net Income” in this appendix.

This appendix includes references to “capitalized financing costs”. Capitalized debt financing costs result in a reduction in interest expense and capitalized equity financing costs result in the recognition of other income.
## KML Non-GAAP Measures

### Reconciliation to Net Income

#### Reconciliation of Net Income (Loss) to Adjusted EBITDA\(^{(a)}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C$MM</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Loss)(^{(b)})</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>($22.9)</td>
<td>$201.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD&amp;A</td>
<td>$88.7</td>
<td>$123.5</td>
<td>$137.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized FX (gain) loss on KMI Loans</td>
<td>$76.0</td>
<td>$175.8</td>
<td>($29.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Expense</td>
<td>$26.5</td>
<td>$62.1</td>
<td>$56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest, Net</td>
<td>$49.5</td>
<td>$30.1</td>
<td>$29.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain item(^{(c)})</td>
<td>($3.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted EBITDA</strong></td>
<td>$256.9</td>
<td>$368.7</td>
<td>$395.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Reconciliation of Net Income (Loss) to DCF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C$MM</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Income (Loss)(^{(b)})</td>
<td>$19.5</td>
<td>($22.9)</td>
<td>$201.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD&amp;A</td>
<td>$88.7</td>
<td>$123.5</td>
<td>$137.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrealized FX (gain) loss on KMI Loans</td>
<td>$76.0</td>
<td>$175.8</td>
<td>($29.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Tax Expense</td>
<td>$26.5</td>
<td>$62.1</td>
<td>$56.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash taxes (paid) refunded</td>
<td>($1.5)</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>($1.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain item(^{(c)})</td>
<td>($3.3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustaining capital expenditures</td>
<td>($58.7)</td>
<td>($66.2)</td>
<td>($46.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DCF</strong></td>
<td>$147.3</td>
<td>$272.7</td>
<td>$318.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Definitions of non-GAAP measures are found on the slide Use of Non-GAAP Measures.

\(^{(a)}\) The reconciliation does not include a reconciliation of forecasted net income to forecasted Adjusted EBITDA amounts included elsewhere in this presentation due to the inherent difficulty and impracticality of forecasting certain amounts required by U.S. GAAP, primarily items such as the impact of fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates and potential changes in estimates of certain contingent liabilities.

\(^{(b)}\) During the years ended December 31, 2014, 2015 and 2016, net income (loss) included C$11.2MM, C$12.9MM and C$17.9MM, respectively, of capitalized equity financing costs.

\(^{(c)}\) 2014 amount represents a gain on the sale of propane pipeline line-fill related to the Cochin Reversal Project.