APPENDIX C

SOILS FOUND ALONG THE PROPOSED PROJECT

C-1 Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities

C-2 Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

APPENDIX C1

SOIL ASSOCIATIONS CROSSED BY THE PROPOSED GULF CROSSING PROJECT PIPELINE FACILITIES

APPENDIX C-1

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.90	Angie very fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.42	Annona loam, 1 to 4 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.41	Arkabutla silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	If Drained and Protected
0.33	Armistead clay	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
2.50	Ashford silty clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
0.03	Aubrey fine sandy loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	Soft	Moderate	No
0.61	Austin silty clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	Soft	Good	All Areas
0.14	Barclay-Rosebloom complex, occasionally flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
0.16	Bastrop loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.50	Bazette silty clay loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.07	Belk clay, rarely flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.9	Bernaldo fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.03	Bernow fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well Drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.91	Bernow fine sandy loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.05	Bernow fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes, severely eroded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.43	Bernow fine sandy loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
1.69	Bernow fine sandy loam, 8 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.33	Bernow-Bosville complex, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well/ well drained	No	No	No	Moderate/Good	No
0.47	Besner very fine sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.74	Betis loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.08	Betis loamy fine sand, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.16	Bibb fine sandy loam, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.42	Bienville loamy fine sand, 1 to 3 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.08	Bienville loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.17	Bistineau very fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.49	Boggy fine sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.85	Bossier clay, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.17	Bosville fine sandy loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.48	Bowie fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
8.68	Bowie fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.08	Boxville fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
2.62	Boxville fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
0.04	Briley loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.14	Briley loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.09	Bruno loamy sand, frequently flooded	Yes	Excessively drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.21	Bruno sandy loam	No	Excessively drained	No	No	No	Wet	No
0.54	Bude silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.22	Bunyan and Whitesboro soils, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.61	Burleson clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.04	Burleson clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.30	Buxin clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	No	No	No	Wet	All Areas
2.21	Buxin clay, occasionally flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.59	Cahaba fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.39	Calhoun silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	All Areas	No	Wet	All Areas
0.47	Calhoun-Calloway silt loams, gently undulating	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Good/Wet	No
0.31	Callisburg fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes erode d	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.06	Calloway silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.21	Caspiana silty clay loam	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.25	Census water	No	NA	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.74	Columbus silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.70	Commerce silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.31	Coushatta silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.28	Crockett loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.16	Crockett loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes, severely eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.97	Crockett silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.73	Crockett silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.28	Crockett silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, severely eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
1.38	Crockett-Durant complex, 1 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate/Good	No
0.02	Crosstell fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.10	Crosstell fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
1.21	Cuthbert and Redsprings soils, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
6.96	Cuthbert fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.47	Cuthbert gravelly fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.79	Darbonne loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.26	Darco loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained	No	No	No	Good	no
0.63	Darco loamy fine sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Somewhat excessively drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.15	Darden loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Excessively drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
4.36	Darley gravelly fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.71	Darley gravelly fine sandy loam, 12 to 30 percent slope s	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.76	Darley gravelly fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
2.30	Darley gravelly loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.34	Darley gravelly loamy fine sand, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.98	Darley-Sacul association, 12 to 30 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well/well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
5.93	Darley-Sacul complex, 12 to 30 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well/well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.11	Deerford silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	No
0.07	Dela loam, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.07	Dela loam, occasionally flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
2.97	Dennis loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.88	Dennis loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
3.42	Deport clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
2.35	Deport clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
3.80	Derly silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
1.12	Derly-Raino complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained/Poorly Drained	Yes	Yes	No	Good/Wet	No
0.04	Dexter silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.24	Dundee silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.60	Dundee silty clay loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	yes	No	Good	All Areas
3.07	Durant loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.38	Durant loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.43	Durant-Verdigris complex, 0 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained/well Drained	No	No	No	Good/Wet	All Areas
0.16	Eastwood very fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.68	Elbon silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.41	Ellis clay, 5 to 12 percent slopes, severely eroded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
5.02	Estes clay loam, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
2.64	Ferris clay, 5 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.46	Ferris clay, 8 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.62	Ferris-Romia complex, 5 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	Yes	No	Soft	Poor	No
0.38	Ferris-Tarrant complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	Yes	No	Hard	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.68	Fitzhugh-Bates complex, 1 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	Yes/ no	Well drained	No	No	Soft	Moderate/Good	No
0.03	Foley silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	No
0.07	Forbing silt loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
0.41	Forbing silt loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
2.37	Forestdale silty clay loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	All Areas
0.17	Forestdale silty clay loam, occasionally flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	No
5.14	Freestone fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
2.08	Freestone-Hicota complex, 0 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.13	Frizzell silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.95	Frizzell silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.08	Frizzell silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.28	Gallime fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.67	Gallime-Guyton complex, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Well drained/ poorly drained	No/ yes	No	No	Good/Wet	If Drained
0.98	Gallion silt loam	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.01	Gallion silty clay loam	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.03	Gasil loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.20	Gigger silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.37	Gilbert silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	All Areas
1.78	Gilbert-Egypt silt loams, gently undulating	No	Poorly drained/ somewhat poorly drained	Yes/ no	No	No	Wet/ Good	All Areas
1.27	Gore silt loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
1.26	Gore silt loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.89	Gowton loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.16	Grenada silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.26	Grenada silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.17	Grenada silt loam, 8 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
2.66	Grenada-Calhoun silt loams, gently undulating	No	Moderately well drained/ poorly drained	No/ yes	No	No	Wet/Good	All Areas
0.98	Groom silt loam, occassionally flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	No
2.27	Groom silty clay loam, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.85	Gurdon silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	No/ All Areas
0.03	Gurdon very fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.41	Guyton association	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	All Areas
0.48	Guyton silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	If Drained and Protected
0.30	Guyton silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.14	Guyton silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, rarely flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet	No
0.87	Guyton silt loam, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.21	Guyton soils, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.38	Guyton-Messer complex	No	Moderately drained/ poorly drained	Yes/ no	No	No	Wet/good	No
6.24	Guyton-Ouachita silt loams, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained/ well drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Wet-Flooding	No
0.05	Guyton-Rosebloom complex, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
5.32	Hebert silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.34	Hebert silt loam, occasionally flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.37	Hebert silty clay loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.17	Hebert-Perry complex, occasionally flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained/ poorly drained	No/ yes	No	No	Good/Wet	All Areas
0.74	Heiden clay, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.47	Heiden-Ferris complex, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.54	Hopco silty clay loam, occasionally flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.82	Houston Black clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
4.90	Houston Black clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.06	Idee-Forestdale complex	No	Poorly drained/ somewhat poorly drained	Yes/ no	No	No	Wet/Good	All Areas
0.10	Idee-Goodwill complex	No	Well drained/ somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.37	Iuka-Dela association, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.42	Iuka-Dela compex, frequently flooded	Yes/ no	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
2.06	Iuka-Dela complex, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.37	Iulus fine sandy loam, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.06	Ivanhoe silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.04	Jena fine sandy loam, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	If Drained and Protected
0.75	Karma fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.85	Karma fine sandy loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.30	Karma fine sandy loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.58	Karma fine sandy loam, 8 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.34	Karma loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.15	Karma loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.41	Kaufman clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	No	Moderately well drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.30	Kaufman clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Wet	All Areas
1.44	Kirvin gravelly fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
0.38	Kirvin soils, graded, 2 to 8 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
3.62	Kirvin very fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.05	Kirvin very fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
1.04	Kolin silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.06	Kolin silt loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.13	Kolin silt loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
0.27	Konsil fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.36	Kullit very fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.72	Libuse silt loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.79	Lilbert loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.17	Litro clay, frequently flooded	Yes	Poorly drained	Yes	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.05	Loring silt loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.24	Loring silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.63	Loring silt loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.59	Mabank loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.14	Mabank loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.62	Mabank-Crockett complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.23	Madill fine sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
4.32	Mahan fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.14	Mahan fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate/Poor	No
1.68	Mahan fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.10	Malbis fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.11	Malbis fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.75	Malbis fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.26	Mantachie loam, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.81	McKamie very fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well Drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.10	McLaurin loamy fine sand, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.54	Mer Rouge-Gallion complex	No	Well drained/ Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
2.16	Mollicy-Guyton complex, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	Yes	Poorly drained/ Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
0.12	Mollville loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
0.39	Moreland clay	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
1.27	Moreland clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.29	Moreland silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.32	Morse clay, 5 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.17	Muldrow clay loam, rarely flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Good	No
0.29	Muskogee silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.35	Muskogee silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.92	Muskogee silt loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
5.96	Nahatche loam silty clay loam, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.11	Necessity silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
1.85	Necessity-Gilbert silt loams, gently undulating	No	Somewhat poorly drained/ poorly drained	Yes/ No	Yes	No	Good/ Wet	All Areas
1.46	Normangee clay loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.20	Normangee clay loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
0.34	Normangee gravelly clay loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.30	Norwood silt loam	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.28	Norwood silt loam, rarely flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.75	Oaklimeter silt loam	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	If Drained and Protected
0.07	Oil-waste land	No		No	No	No	Insufficient Data	No
0.65	Okay fine sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.17	Okay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.35	Okay loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.04	Oklared fine sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, rarely flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.69	Oklared-Kiomatia complex, occasionally flooded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.76	Ora fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.27	Parisian silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.38	Parsons silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.94	Perry clay	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
3.76	Perry clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.84	Perry clay, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.65	Perry clay, occasionally flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
3.08	Petal and smithdale soils, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained/ well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
1.15	Portland clay	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.78	Portland silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.57	Portland silty clay loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.05	Portland silty clay loam, occasionally flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	No
1.87	Providence silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.97	Providence silt loam, 3 to 6 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.09	Providence silt loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes, severely eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
2.63	Providence silt loam, 5 to 8 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.86	Providence silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.87	Providence-Smithdale association, hilly	Yes	Moderately well drained/ well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.51	Redlake clay, occasionally flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.38	Redlake clay, rarely flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.40	Rentzel loamy fine sand, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.34	Rilla silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.55	Ruple gravelly loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.02	Ruston fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.95	Ruston fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
2.69	Sacul fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
0.08	Sacul fine sandy loam, 15 to 40 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.37	Sacul fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
3.31	Sacul fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.12	Sacul very fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
0.54	Sacul very fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.82	Sailes fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.13	Sardis-Manco complex, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.09	Savannah fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.10	Severn fine sandy loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, rarely flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.33	Severn silt loam, rarely flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.67	Severn very fine sandy loam, frequently flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.44	Severn very fine sandy loam, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
9.91	Sharkey clay	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.09	Sharkey clay, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.05	Sharkey clay, undulating	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.07	Sharkey silty clay loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.58	Sharkey-Tunica complex, gently undulating	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.69	Smithdale fine sandy loam, 12 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.68	Smithdale fine sandy loam, 15 to 35 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.01	Smithdale fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
2.73	Smithdale fine sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
0.02	Smithdale sandy loam, 17 to 40 percent slopes, severely eroded	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.05	Socagee silty clay loam, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
0.33	Stephen silty clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	Soft	Good	No
0.21	Stephen-Eddy complex, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	Soft	Poor/Moderate	No
0.98	Sterlington silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.63	Sterlington silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.69	Sterlington very fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.91	Sterlington-Hebert complex, gently undulating	No	Well drained/ somewhat poorly drained	No	No/ Yes	No	Good	All Areas

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.50	Tenaha loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
2.01	Tenaha loamy fine sand, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.88	Tensas silty clay	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.09	Tensas-Sharkey complex	No	Somewhat poorly drained/ poorly drained	Yes/ No	Yes	No	Good/ Wet	All Areas
2.82	Tensas-Sharkey complex, gently undulating	No	Somewhat poorly drained/ poorly drained	Yes/ No	Yes	No	Good/ Wet	All Areas
0.12	Terrace escarpments	No		No	No	No	Insufficient data	No
0.61	Tinn clay, occasionally flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.59	Trinity clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.10	Trinity clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.81	Tunica clay	No	Poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.08	Udifluvents	Yes		No	No	No	Insufficient data	No
1.11	Varro clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, frequently flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Wet-Flooding	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
0.82	Verdigris silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.70	Waskom silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.81	Water	No		No	No	No	Insufficient data	No
0.11	Water, large	No		No	No	No	Insufficient data	No
0.79	Whakana fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.35	Whakana very fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.90	Whakana-Porum complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained/ well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.59	Wilson silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.04	Wilson silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
1.82	Wilson silty loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.08	Wolfpen loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No

TABLE C-1
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Pipeline Facilities (continued)

Cumulative Length Crossed (miles)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 inches bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
1.77	Wolfpen loamy sand, 1 to 3 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
0.79	Woodson silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Wet	No
2.58	Woodtell fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
10.89	Woodtell fine sandy loam, 5 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
0.06	Woodtell loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
2.09	Woodtell loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.69	Woodtell-Raino complex, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained/ well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
2.06	Wrightsville silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	If Drained
0.27	Yorktown clay, frequently flooded	No	Very poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No

APPENDIX C2

SOIL ASSOCIATIONS CROSSED BY THE PROPOSED GULF CROSSING PROJECT
ABOVEGROUND FACILITIES

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Sherman Compressor Station, MP 0.0								
18.2	Gasil loamy fine sand, 1 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.8	Gasil soils, 2 to 5 percent, eroded	Highly Erodible	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
Paris Compressor Station, MP 71.4								
3.2	Deport Clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
15.2	Ferris Clay, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Highly Erodible	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
1.6	Houston Black Clay, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
Mira Compressor Station, MP 182.7								
9.0	Sacul fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Highly Erodible	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
11.0	Sacul fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Highly Erodible	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
Sterlington Compressor Station, MP 294.8								
18.0	Rilla silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
2.0	Portland silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Oklahoma Contractor Yard OK-CY01 (Bryan County)								
3.0	Boxville fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
1.0	Dennis loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	Yes	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
19.4	Karma fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
8.8	Muskogee silt loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
7.1	Verdigris silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
Oklahoma Contractor Yard OK-CY02 (Bryan County)								
0.8	Boxville fine sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
10.4	Muskogee silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.8	Muskogee silt loam, 3 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Oklahoma Contractor Yard OK-CY03 (Bryan County)								
12.0	Durant-Verdigris complex, 0 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained/ well drained	No	No	No	Good/ Wet	All Areas
6.0	Fitzhugh-Bates complex, 1 to 5 percent slopes, eroded	No	Well drained	No/ Yes	No	Soft	Moderate/ Good	No
10.5	Gowton loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.5	Bernow-Romia complex, 8 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
Texas Contractor Yard TX-CY01 (Lamar County)								
9.2	Normangee clay loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
20.7	Normangee clay loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes, eroded	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
0.1	Wilson silty loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	No

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Texas Contractor Yard TX-CY02 (Morris County)								
15.4	Bernaldo fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
9.8	Freestone fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
10.5	Woodtell fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No
14.3	Woodtell fine sandy loam, 5 to 20 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
Texas Contractor Yard TX-CY03 (Cass County)								
12.0	Bernaldo fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
0.9	Cuthbert gravelly fine sandy loam, 5 to 15 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
4.6	Kirvin very fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
2.7	Lilbert loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
2.4	Mantachie loam, frequently flooded	No	Somewhat poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.8	Tenaha loamy fine sand, 5 to 15 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY01 (Bossier Parish)								
11.4	Armistead clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
3.1	Buxin clay, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
0.5	Gallion silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY02 (DeSoto Parish)								
6.8	Keithville very fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
18.1	Metcalf silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
0.1	Ruston fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY03 (DeSoto Parish)								
5.0	Eastwood fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
20.0	Keithville very fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY04 (Webster Parish)								
7.6	Ruston fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
4.4	Smithdale fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	No

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY05 (Lincoln Parish)								
19.8	Angie very fine sandy loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
5.2	Sacul very fine sandy loam, 1 to 5 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Moderate	All Areas
5.0	Sacul very fine sandy loam, 5 to 12 percent slopes	Yes	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Poor	No
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY06 (Ouachita Parish)								
1.7	Guyton-Rosebloom complex, frequently flooded	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet-Flooding	No
1.9	Ruston-Lucy association, undulating	Yes/ No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	No
21.4	Ruston-Lucy association, hilly	Yes/ No	Well drained	No	No	No	Moderate/ Good	No
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY07 (Ouachita Parish)								
21.0	Herbert silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
9.0	Rilla silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY08 (Ouachita Parish)								
10.4	Alligator clay	No	Poorly/very poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
4.8	Crowley silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
9.8	Wrightsville silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY09 (Ouachita Parish)								
2.7	Dumps	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	No	Insufficient Data
12.3	Hebert silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY10 (Richland Parish)								
9.5	Dexter silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
13.4	Gilbert silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
7.1	Liddieville fine sandy loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas

APPENDIX C-2

TABLE C-2
Soil Associations Crossed by the Proposed Gulf Crossing Project Aboveground Facilities

Area (acres)	Soil Association	Erosion Potential	Drainage Class	Hydric Soil	Severe Compaction Potential	Shallow Bedrock (<60 in. bgs)	Revegetation Potential	Prime Farmland
Louisiana Contractor Yard LA-CY11 (Richland Parish)								
4.7	Calhoun silt loam	No	Poorly drained	Yes	Yes	No	Wet	All Areas
6.5	Gigger-Gilbert silt loams, gently undulating	No	Moderately well drained/ poorly drained	No/ Yes	No/ Yes	No	Good/ Wet	All Areas
7.5	Grenada silt loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
1.3	Grenada-Calhoun silt loams, gently undulating	No	Moderately well drained /poorly drained	Yes/ No	Yes/ No	No	Wet/ Good	All Areas
Mississippi Contractor Yard MS-CY01 (Hinds County)								
4.8	Calloway silt loam	No	Somewhat poorly drained	No	Yes	No	Good	All Areas
3.5	Grenada silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
8.3	Grenada silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	All Areas
3.4	Oaklimeter silt loam	No	Moderately well drained	No	No	No	Good	If Drained and Protected