1.0 INTRODUCTION

On May 23, 2005 Creole Trail LNG, L.P., and Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company filed applications with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) under sections 3(a) and 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA). In Docket No. CP05-360-000 and pursuant to section 3(a) of the NGA, Creole Trail LNG, L.P. seeks authorization to site, construct, and operate a liquefied natural gas (LNG) import terminal in Cameron Parish, Louisiana. Pursuant to section 7(c) of the NGA and as filed in Docket No. CP05-357-000, Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company seeks a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (Certificate) to construct and operate an interconnecting natural gas pipeline between existing pipeline facilities and the proposed Creole Trail LNG import terminal facility in the State of Louisiana.[1] In Docket Nos. CP05-358-000 and CP05-359-000, Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company requests blanket certificates to perform routine activities in connection with the future construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed pipeline and to provide open access natural gas transportation services, respectively. In Docket No. CP05-357-002, Creole Trail Pipeline Company filed an amendment to remove the Hackberry Lateral, described in more detail below, from its proposed project. For the purposes of this environmental impact statement (EIS), the two applicants are collectively referred to as Creole Trail. The project, including the LNG terminal and pipeline components, is collectively referred to as the Creole Trail LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project (Creole Trail Project).

The facilities proposed by Creole Trail would import, store, and vaporize LNG and distribute, on average, approximately 3.3 billion cubic feet per day (Bcfd) of natural gas to markets in the United States, with a total plant capacity of 3.8 Bcfd. To provide these services, Creole Trail requests Commission authorization to construct, install, and operate the following facilities.

An LNG import terminal under section 3(a) of the NGA consisting of:

- a ship unloading slip with two protected berths, each equipped with three liquid unloading arms and one vapor return arm;
- four LNG storage tanks, each with a usable volume of 1,006,400 barrels (160,000 cubic meters (m^3));
- twenty-one high pressure LNG sendout pumps, each with a capacity of 1,686 gallons per minute (gpm) (384 m^3 per hour);
- twenty-one high pressure submerged combustion vaporizers, each with a capacity of 183 million cubic feet per day (MMcfd);
- three boil-off gas compressors; and
- ancillary utilities, buildings, and service facilities at the LNG terminal.

Pipeline facilities under section 7(c) of the NGA consisting of:

- Segment 2: 25.3 miles of dual 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline;

[1] On March 23, 2006, Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company filed a letter with the Commission stating that on or about March 31, 2006, Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company will be merged under Delaware law into Creole Trail Pipeline, L.P. Creole Trail Pipeline, L.P. will be formed solely for the purpose of acquiring Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company and will be the surviving legal entity. Cheniere Creole Trail Pipeline Company requests in its letter that the Commission issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity to Creole Trail Pipeline, L.P.

- Segment 3: 91.5 miles of dual 42-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline;
- 17 meter and regulation (M&R) facilities; and
- associated pipeline facilities including pig launcher and receiver facilities, and eight mainline valves (MLV) along each of the individual pipelines in the dual pipeline system.

On February 17, 2006, Creole Trail filed an application amendment withdrawing the Hackberry Lateral from the project. The Hackberry Lateral was a 6.8-mile-long, 24-inch-diameter pipeline that would have connected the Dominion Gas Storage site in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, to Segment 2 of the proposed pipeline. Since the Hackberry Lateral has been removed from the Creole Trail Project, discussion of this pipeline segment and its environmental impacts has been omitted from the final EIS.

We[2] prepared this EIS to assess the environmental impact associated with construction of the Creole Trail Project in Cameron, Calcasieu, Beauregard, Jefferson Davis, Allen, and Acadia Parishes, Louisiana.

The vertical line in the margin identifies text that has been modified in the final EIS and differs from the corresponding text in the draft EIS.

1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

Creole Trail would site, construct, and operate the proposed LNG terminal to create access to new, competitively priced LNG supplies in response to the growing demand for natural gas in southern Louisiana and throughout the United States. Creole Trail also notes that access to natural gas from diverse supplies around the world would enhance the reliability and stability of the natural gas supply. The purpose of the proposed pipeline is to connect the proposed Creole Trail LNG terminal to the existing interstate and intrastate pipeline systems, and to thereby provide access to Gulf Coast, midwest, northeast, and Atlantic markets. The Creole Trail Project would provide service to shippers desiring to contract for the receipt, storage, and vaporization of LNG and the delivery of natural gas to the points of interconnection along the proposed pipeline routes.

Creole Trail cited the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Energy Information Administration (EIA) reports, testimony provided before Congress by Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan, and government and industry studies to demonstrate an increasing demand for natural gas and a need for additional supplies of natural gas. In its *Annual Energy Outlook 2005*, the EIA projects that natural gas consumption in the United States will grow from 22 trillion cubic feet in 2003 to almost 31 trillion cubic feet in 2025, which represents an annual growth rate of 1.5 percent. About 75 percent of the projected growth in natural gas demand during this period is expected to result from increasing use for electricity generation and industrial applications. In the West South Central region (which includes Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma), natural gas consumption is projected to increase from 5.2 trillion cubic feet in 2003 to about 7.0 trillion cubic feet in 2025, an annualized increase of about 1.3 percent. The EIA report notes that 40 percent of the growth in natural gas demand between 1986 and 2000 was met by imports, predominantly from Canada, but that it is unlikely that future production from Canada will be able to support a continued increase in United States imports.

[2] "We," "us," and "our" refer to the environmental staff of the FERC's Office of Energy Projects.

Increased imports of LNG (as well as anticipated supplies from Alaska) are expected to play an important role in meeting the projected shortfalls in natural gas supplies as demand increases (EIA, 2005). Further, LNG marine transportation is recognized as a viable way of accessing "stranded" natural gas reserves in production areas throughout the world that are inaccessible by conventional pipelines, thereby increasing the availability of existing worldwide supplies to the United States.

A 2004 study prepared by the Louisiana State University (LSU) Center for Energy Studies for the Louisiana Department of Economic Development and Greater New Orleans, Inc. supported construction of LNG terminals in Louisiana (LSU, 2004). The study described the importance of natural gas usage and the impacts of high natural gas prices on the Louisiana economy, noting that Louisiana is the third largest consumer of natural gas in the United States and the second largest industrial user, primarily for the petrochemical industry.

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THIS STATEMENT

The FERC is the federal agency responsible for authorizing applications to construct and operate LNG import and associated pipeline facilities. The U.S. Coast Guard (Coast Guard) is the federal agency responsible for determining the suitability of the waterway for LNG marine traffic. The FERC is the lead federal agency for the preparation of this EIS in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA (40, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 1500-1508) and the FERC's regulations implementing NEPA (18 CFR 380). The FERC will use the results of the EIS as an element in its review of Creole Trail's applications to determine whether to authorize the project. The FERC will consider the environmental issues, including our recommended mitigation measures, as well as non-environmental issues. Final authorization would be granted only if the FERC finds that the proposed project is in the public interest. The environmental impact assessment and mitigation development described herein are important factors in this final determination.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), Coast Guard, and U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) are cooperating agencies for this project. A cooperating federal agency has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to environmental impacts involved with the proposal and is involved in the NEPA analysis. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LADWF) has also assisted us in the preparation of this EIS.

Our principal purposes in preparing this EIS are to:

- identify and assess potential impacts on the human environment that would result from the implementation of the proposed actions;
- describe and assess reasonable alternatives to the proposed actions that would avoid or minimize adverse effects on the human environment;
- identify and recommend specific mitigation measures to minimize environmental impacts; and
- facilitate public involvement in identifying the significant environmental impacts.

Our analysis in this EIS focuses on the facilities that would be under the FERC's jurisdiction (i.e., the LNG import terminal and approximately 116.8 miles of dual sendout pipelines). Because it would be

integral to the proposed project, the EIS will also consider a nonjurisdictional water line required to provide potable and utility water service to the site.

The topics addressed in this EIS include geology; soils and sediments; water resources; wetlands; upland vegetation; wildlife; aquatic resources; essential fish habitat (EFH); threatened, endangered, and special-status species; land use, recreation, and visual resources; socioeconomics; cultural resources; air quality and noise; reliability and safety; cumulative effects; and alternatives. The EIS describes the affected environment as it currently exists, discusses the environmental consequences of the proposed project, and compares the project's potential impact to that of alternatives. The EIS also presents our conclusions and recommended mitigation measures.

1.3 PERMITS, APPROVALS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

As the lead federal agency for the Creole Trail Project, the FERC is required to comply with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA), section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), and section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (CZMA). Each of these statutes has been taken into account in the preparation of this document.

The Coast Guard exercises regulatory authority over LNG facilities that affect the safety and security of port areas and navigable waterways under Executive Order 10173; the Magnuson Act (50 United States Code (USC) section 191); the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972, as amended (33 USC section 1221, et seq.); and the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2002 (46 USC section 701). The Coast Guard is responsible for matters related to navigation safety, vessel engineering and safety standards, and all matters pertaining to the safety of facilities or equipment located in or adjacent to navigable waters up to the last valve immediately before the receiving tanks. The Coast Guard also has authority for LNG facility security plan review, approval and compliance verification as provided in Title 33 CFR Part 105, and siting as it pertains to the management of vessel traffic in and around the LNG facility.

As required by its regulations, the Coast Guard is responsible for issuing a Letter of Recommendation (LOR) as to the suitability of the waterway for LNG marine traffic. The LOR would be based on the following items:

- Density and character of marine traffic;
- Locks, bridges, or other manmade obstruction in the waterway; and
- The following factors adjacent to the facility:
    - Depth of water;
    - Tidal range;
    - Protection from high seas;
    - Natural hazards, including reefs, rocks, and sandbars;
    - Underwater pipes and cables; and
    - Distance of berthed vessels from the channel and the width of the channel.

In accordance with Title 33 CFR Part 127.007, each applicant must submit a Letter of Intent (LOI) to the local Captain of the Port (COTP) to begin the LOR process. On June 14, 2005, the Coast Guard issued a *Navigation and Vessel Inspection Circular – Guidance on Assessing the Suitability of a Waterway for Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Marine Traffic* (NVIC). The purpose of this NVIC is to provide Coast Guard Captains of the Port/Federal Maritime Security Coordinators, members of the LNG industry, and port stakeholders with guidance on assessing the suitability of a waterway for LNG marine traffic that takes into account conventional navigation safety/waterway management issues contemplated by the existing LOI/LOR process, but in addition, will also take completely into account maritime security implications. In accordance with this guidance, each LNG project applicant is to submit a Waterway Suitability Assessment (WSA) to the cognizant COTP. The WSA is to address the transportation of LNG from the LNG tanker's entrance into U.S. territorial waters, through its transit to and from the LNG receiving facility, including operations at the vessel/facility interface. In addition, the WSA should address the navigational safety issues and port security issues introduced by the proposed LNG operations. The NVIC 05-05 also provides specific guidance on the timing and scope of the WSA.

The Coast Guard has elected to act as a cooperating agency in the preparation of this EIS and to assist the FERC with preparation of the maritime safety and security sections (see sections 4.12.5 and 4.12.6).

Section 7 of the ESA, as amended, states that any project authorized, funded, or conducted by any federal agency (e.g., FERC) should not "...jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species which is determined...to be critical..." (16 United States Code (USC) § 1536(a)(2)(1988)). The FERC, or the applicant as a non-federal party, is required to consult with the FWS and NOAA Fisheries to determine whether any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat occur in the vicinity of the proposed project. If, upon review of existing data or data provided by the applicant, the FERC determines that these species or habitats may be affected by the proposed project, the FERC is required to prepare a biological assessment to identify the nature and extent of adverse impact, and to recommend measures that would avoid the habitat and/or species, or would reduce potential impact to acceptable levels. If, however, the FERC determines that no federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat would be affected by the proposed project, no further action is necessary under the ESA. See section 4.7.1 of this EIS for the status of this review.

The MSA, as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-267), established procedures designed to identify, conserve, and enhance EFH for those species regulated under a federal fisheries management plan. The MSA requires federal agencies to consult with NOAA Fisheries on all actions or proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect EFH (MSA §305(b)(2)). Although absolute criteria have not been established for conducting EFH consultations, NOAA Fisheries recommends consolidated EFH consultations with interagency coordination procedures required by other statutes, such as NEPA, the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, or the ESA in order to reduce duplication and improve efficiency (50 CFR 600.920(f)). As part of the consultation process, the FERC has prepared an EFH Assessment included in section 4.6.3 of this EIS.

Section 106 of the NHPA requires the FERC to take into account the effects of its undertakings on properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including prehistoric or historic sites, districts, buildings, structures, objects, or properties of traditional religious or cultural importance, and to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on the undertaking. The FERC has requested that Creole Trail, as a non-federal party, assist in meeting the FERC's obligation under section 106 by preparing the necessary information

and analyses as required by the ACHP procedures in 36 CFR 800. See section 4.10 of this EIS for the status of this review.

The CZMA calls for the "effective management, beneficial use, protection, and development" of the nation's coastal zone and promotes active state involvement in achieving those goals. As a means to reach those goals, the CZMA requires participating states to develop management programs that demonstrate how these states will meet their obligations and responsibilities in managing their coastal areas. In the state of Louisiana, the Department of Natural Resources (LADNR) is the agency responsible for administering the Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP). Because section 307 of the CZMA requires federal agency activities to be consistent to the maximum extent practicable within the enforceable policies of a management program, the FERC has requested that Creole Trail seek a determination of consistency with Louisiana's CZMP. See section 4.8.6 of this EIS for additional discussion of Louisiana's CZMP.

The COE has the authority to issue permits for work or structures in navigable waters under section 10 of the River and Harbors Act and the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States under section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). The COE would regulate the dredging of the marine basin, the construction of the piers, and filling and grading activities in wetlands and waterbodies crossed by the proposed pipelines. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has the authority to review and veto COE decisions on section 404 permits. The Coast Guard has the primary responsibility for reviewing and approving the navigational and security aspects of the project in accordance with 33 CFR 127 and 66.

We have consulted with the U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) as required by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and section 3 of the NGA to determine if any training or activities on any military installations would be affected by the project. No comments or concerns were received from any branch of the military or any military installation in reply to the FERC's scoping notice issued on April 4, 2005. Further, no comments were received from any DOD branch in response to the FERC's draft EIS published in December, 2005.

In addition, in letters dated December 16, 2005 to the Army, Navy, and Air Force at the Pentagon and January 10, 2006 to the COE, we requested any information on effects on military installations. Since no effects have been identified, we conclude that there is no effect on military installations from this project, and therefore no concurrence from the Secretary of Defense is required under the Energy Policy Act. We will notify the DOD of this conclusion in writing to confirm it.

At the federal level, required permits and approval authority outside of the FERC's jurisdiction include compliance with the CWA, the Rivers and Harbors Act, the Clean Air Act (CAA), and issuance by the Coast Guard of a LOR regarding the suitability of the waterway for LNG marine traffic. Major permits, approvals, and consultations required for the Creole Trail Project are identified in table 1.3-1. The FERC encourages cooperation between applicants and state and local authorities, but this does not mean that state and local agencies, through application of state and local laws, may prohibit or unreasonably delay the construction or operation of facilities approved by the FERC. Any state or local permits issued with respect to jurisdictional facilities must be consistent with the conditions of any authorization the FERC may issue.[3]

[3] See, e.g., Schneidewind v. ANR Pipeline Co., 485 U.S. 293 (1988); National Fuel Gas Supply v. Public Service Commission. 894 F.2d 571 (2d Cir. 1990); and Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P., et al., 52 FERC ¶ 61,091 (1990) and 59 FERC ¶ 61,094 (1992).

TABLE 1.3-1

Major Permits, Approvals, and Consultations for the Creole Trail Project

Agency	Permit/Approval/Consultations
FEDERAL	
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Natural Gas Act (NGA), section 3 Authorization (LNG Terminal)
	NGA section 7(c), Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (Pipelines)
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	NHPA 106, Comment on the project and its effect on historic properties
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE)	Section 10, Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 Permit
	Authorization to discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. under section 404, Clean Water Act (CWA)
U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service	Prime Farmland, Hydric Soil/Soil Erosion and Sedimentation, Seed Mixture and CRP Lands Consultation
	Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act Consultation
U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service	Section 7, Endangered Species Act (ESA) consultation
	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, Essential Fish Habitat consultation
	Marine Mammal Protection Act consultation
U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Section 7, ESA consultation
	Migratory Bird Treaty Act consultation
	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Clean Air Act (CAA), sections 171-192, New Source Review
U.S. Department of Homeland Security U.S. Coast Guard	33 CFR 127, Waterfront Facilities Handling Liquefied Natural Gas and Liquefied Hazardous Gas, Letter of Recommendation
	Permission for establishment of aids to navigation
	Spill prevention and spill response plan approval
U.S. Department of Defense	Consultation as required by section 311 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 and section 3 of the NGA
STATE	
Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality	CAA, Part 70 Air Permit
	CWA, section 401, Water Quality Certification
	Louisiana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (LAPDES) • Construction and industrial (operation) stormwater discharge permits • Hydrostatic test water discharge permits • Industrial wastewater discharge permits
Louisiana Department of Natural Resources Coastal Management Division	CZMA, Coastal Use Permit (CZMP consistency determination)
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries	State-listed threatened and endangered species consultations
	State Scenic Rivers
	Consultations regarding activities in Calcasieu Lake and protection of oyster resources
	Consultations regarding establishment and maintenance of artificial reefs in waters of Louisiana and in waters of the federal exclusive economic zones adjacent to Louisiana waters

TABLE 1.3-1 (cont'd)

Major Permits, Approvals, and Consultations for the Creole Trail Project

Agency	Permit/Approval/Consultations
Louisiana Department of Culture, Recreation, and Tourism, Office of cultural Development Division of Archaeology	Section 106, National Historic Preservation Act, Review and comment on undertakings potentially affecting cultural resources
Louisiana Department of Transportation	Road crossing permits
LOCAL	
Cameron Parish Police Jury	Building permits and road crossing permits
	Floodplain development permit
Calcasieu Parish Police Jury	Building permits and road crossing permits
Beauregard Parish Police Jury	Building permits and road crossing permits
Jefferson Davis Parish Police Jury	Building permits and road crossing permits
Allen Parish Police Jury	Building permits and road crossing permits
Acadia Parish Police Jury	Building permits and road crossing permits

1.4 PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

On January 26, 2005, Creole Trail filed a request with the FERC to implement the Commission's Pre-Filing Process for the Creole Trail Project. No formal application had been filed with the FERC at that time. On March 18, 2005, the FERC granted Creole Trail's request and established a pre-filing docket number (PF05-08-000) to place information filed by Creole Trail and related documents issued by the FERC into the public record. The purpose of the Pre-Filing Process is to encourage the early involvement of interested stakeholders, facilitate interagency cooperation, and identify and resolve issues before an application is filed with the FERC. On March 29, 2005, Creole Trail filed a letter describing modifications to the proposed Creole Trail pipeline system, including the addition of a pipeline segment (referred to initially as the "Western Leg" and later referred to as "Segment 1") that would connect the originally proposed pipeline with the Sabine Pass LNG, L.P. Terminal.

Between February and April 2005, Creole Trail conducted public outreach activities to inform the public, resource agencies, industry, local government, and other interested parties about the proposed project and to identify public concerns. Company-sponsored outreach activities included two interagency meetings, an interagency teleconference, and meetings with special interest and stakeholder groups. Creole Trail also held six public open house meetings at various locations in the project area and presented information about the project at the FERC's public scoping meetings. Creole Trail considered public views and concerns identified during its outreach activities in the preparation of its Environmental Report.

On April 4, 2005, the FERC issued a *Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Creole Trail LNG and Pipeline Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings* (NOI). The NOI was sent to 924 interested parties including federal, state, and local officials; agency representatives; conservation organizations; local libraries and newspapers; residents within 0.5 mile of the proposed LNG terminal; and property owners along the proposed pipeline routes. On April 20, 2005, the FERC issued a *Notice of Site Visit*, which provided the meeting time and location for interested parties wishing to attend our inspections of the project site.

On April 25, 26, and 27, 2005, FERC conducted public scoping meetings in Eunice, Sulphur, and Cameron, Louisiana, respectively, to provide an opportunity for the general public to learn more about the proposed project and to participate in our analysis by commenting on issues to be included in the EIS. One person commented at the Eunice meeting, 3 at the Sulphur meeting, and 21 at the Cameron meeting. Transcripts of these comments are part of the public record for the Creole Trail Project. All of the commentors at the Cameron meetings spoke in support of the project, citing the potential economic benefits of the project to Louisiana and to Cameron Parish. On April 26, 2005, we conducted an aerial review of the project site by helicopter, and on April 27, 2005, we conducted a ground-based site visit, which was open to the public.

Issuance of the NOI opened the time period for receiving written comments and established a closing date of May 4, 2005, for receiving comments. We continued to receive and accept comments after the close of the comment period. Each of the written and oral statements was evaluated and divided into individual comments. Issues identified in scoping comments and through input from resource agencies are summarized in table 1.4-1. Comments included a letter from U.S. Congressman Charles Boustany, Jr. (7^{th} District, Louisiana) in support of the project. We used the scoping comments to focus the analysis in the draft EIS on potentially significant environmental issues related to the proposed action.

TABLE 1.4-1

Issues Identified During the Public Scoping Process for the Creole Trail LNG Project

Issue	Comments	EIS Section Where Comments are Addressed
General	Support for the project; opposition to the project; public need for project; public involvement in the NEPA process.	1.1, 1.2, 1.4
Alternatives	All reasonable alternative routes should be considered in the EIS; opposition to pipeline route on specific properties.	3.0
Geology and Soils	Potential impacts on aquatic or terrestrial habitat from contaminated sediments; protection of proposed facilities from flooding, hurricanes, and storm surge.	4.1.3, 4.2.1
Water Use and Quality	Potential impacts on water quality; potential erosion along shoreline and banks of ship channel; restoration of lake bottom; hydrostatic testing.	4.1.3, 4.3
Wetlands	Potential impacts on wetlands; placement of and mitigation for dredge material; post-construction wetland restoration and monitoring; impacts on coastal wetland restoration projects.	4.4
Vegetation	Pesticide use, the potential for invasion by exotic species.	4.5
Wildlife and Aquatic Resources	Potential impacts on fisheries, wildlife, nesting waterbirds; potential impacts of lighting or flare towers at the LNG terminal on migratory birds; potential impacts on essential fish habitat.	4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.3
Threatened, Endangered, and Special Status Species	Potential impacts on state and federally listed threatened, endangered, and special status species.	4.7
Land Use, Recreation, and Visual Resources	Potential impacts on current land use; potential impacts on future installation of irrigation pipe in agricultural lands; concern about eminent domain.	4.8
Socioeconomics	Benefits to the local economy, including diversification, job creation, and economic growth; potential economic and environmental effects of secondary development; environmental justice; potential traffic congestion.	4.9
Air Quality and Noise	Existing and potential impacts on air quality; National Ambient Air Quality Standards; federal prevention of Significant Deterioration increments, and state air quality standards; potential impacts on Beaumont-Port Arthur non-attainment area; potential use of shell and tube vaporization technology; air quality mitigation measures.	4.11.1
Reliability and Safety	Protection of LNG ship berths from passing navigation traffic; future reliability with regard to increased ship traffic in Calcasieu Ship Channel; potential impacts of ship traffic on public safety and environment; navigation congestion in the Calcasieu Ship Channel.	4.12.5
Mitigation	A section on mitigation should be included in the EIS.	All sections and 5.2

Creole Trail filed its FERC application on May 23, 2005. On July 1, 2005, Creole Trail filed an amendment to its application in which it withdrew Segment 1 from the proposed pipeline system and reduced the maximum capacity of the proposed pipeline system accordingly.

On July 20, 2005, the FERC issued another *Notice of Site Visit*. We conducted this site visit, which was open to the public, on July 26 and 27, 2005. Creole Trail filed a supplement to its application on August 31, 2005, in which it proposed certain pipeline route modifications, updated reports and plans, and provided additional information that had been requested by the Commission and/or other regulatory agencies.

In addition to the public notice process discussed above, we conducted additional agency consultations to identify issues that should be addressed in this EIS. These consultations included interagency meetings on April 28 and July 28, 2005. Participants at one or both meetings included representation from the COE, NOAA Fisheries, FWS, Coast Guard, EPA, Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LADEQ), and LADWF. Issues discussed during these meetings included the NEPA review process; federal and state review and permitting processes; route alternatives; wetland

impacts and mitigation; aquatic resources and fishing; air quality; EFH; dredge disposal sites, marine traffic, and safety and security planning processes.

The FERC prepared a draft EIS for the Creole Trail Project, and on December 16, 2005, issued a *Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Creole Trail LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project.* The draft EIS was filed with the EPA, and a formal notice was published in the Federal Register announcing that the draft EIS was available and had been mailed to individuals and organizations on the draft EIS mailing list for the project. In accordance with CEQ regulations implementing NEPA, a public comment period was established, ending on February 21, 2006, to allow the public to comment on the draft EIS in the form of written comments. Because recent hurricane activities affected infrastructure in the project area and relatively few comments were received on the project during the scoping period, we did not hold public comment meetings on the draft EIS for the Creole Trail Project.

In addition to comments from cooperating federal agencies, we received comment letters from two federal agencies, two state agencies, one local agency, one individual, and the applicant. Comments on the draft EIS and our responses to those comments are provided in Appendix M of this document. As noted previously, all substantive changes in this final EIS are indicated by vertical bars that appear in the margins. These changes were made in response to comments received on the draft EIS and as a result of updated information that became available after issuance of the draft EIS.

This final EIS was mailed to the agencies, individuals, and organizations on the mailing list included in Appendix A and was filed with the EPA for formal notice of availability. In accordance with the CEQ regulations implementing NEPA, no agency decision on a proposed action may be made until 30 days after the EPA publishes a notice of availability of the final EIS. However, the CEQ regulations provide an exception to this rule when an agency decision is subject to a formal internal process that allows other agencies or the public to make their views known. In such cases, the agency decision may be made at the same time as the notice of the final EIS is published, allowing both periods to run concurrently. Should the Commission authorize the proposed project, it would be subject to a 30-day rehearing period. Therefore, the Commission could issue its decision concurrently with the EPA's notice of availability.

1.5 NONJURISDICTIONAL FACILITIES

The Creole Trail Project would require construction of an approximately 2,400-foot-long, 10-inch-diameter nonjurisdictional water line to provide potable and utility water service to the site. The water line would be constructed from an existing water line belonging to Cameron Parish Water Works, District 10, south of the proposed LNG terminal entrance and would be routed along the east side of the terminal main entrance road. Cameron Parish Water Works District 10 would construct the water line and would be responsible for acquiring all permits and approvals under the CWA, CZMA, ESA, and NHPA that are required for construction of the water line.