

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
HYDROCARBONS AND GEOTHERMAL ENERGY OFFICE

CORPUS CHRISTI LIQUEFACTION, LLC;
CCL MIDSACLE 8-9, LLC; AND CHENIERE
MARKETING, LLC

)
)
) DOCKET NO. 23-46-LNG
)
)

ORDER GRANTING LONG-TERM AUTHORIZATION
TO EXPORT LIQUEFIED NATURAL GAS
TO NON-FREE TRADE AGREEMENT NATIONS

DOE/HGEO ORDER NO. 5391

FEBRUARY 26, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	4
II.	BACKGROUND.....	9
	A. DOE’s Prior LNG Studies.....	9
	B. Judicial Decisions Upholding DOE’s Non-FTA Authorizations.....	10
	C. DOE’s Categorical Exclusion and Marine Transport Technical Support Document ...	11
	D. Executive Order Issued on January 20, 2025.....	13
III.	DOE’S 2024 LNG EXPORT STUDY.....	13
	A. Overview.....	13
	B. Methodology.....	14
	C. DOE Proceeding.....	16
	D. DOE’s Findings and Conclusions.....	18
	1. Key Findings.....	18
	2. Conclusions.....	19
IV.	PUBLIC INTEREST STANDARD.....	20
V.	DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST.....	22
	A. Description of Applicant.....	22
	B. Procedural History.....	23
	C. Proposed CCL Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project.....	24
	D. Source of Supply.....	25
	E. Business Model.....	25
VI.	APPLICANT’S PUBLIC INTEREST ANALYSIS.....	26
	A. Overview.....	26
	B. Domestic Natural Gas Supply and Demand.....	27
	C. Local, Regional, and National Economic Benefits.....	28
	D. International Trade and Geopolitical Benefits.....	29
VII.	CURRENT PROCEEDING BEFORE DOE.....	29
	A. Public Citizen’s Motion to Intervene and Protest.....	29
	B. Sierra Club’s Motion to Intervene and Protest.....	31
	C. CCL’s Answer.....	35
VIII.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	38
	A. Procedural Matters.....	39
	B. Economic Issues.....	39
	1. Significance of the 2024 LNG Export Study on Economic Issues.....	39

2. CCL’s Application	42
C. Energy Security	45
D. Issuance of Categorical Exclusion Under NEPA.....	48
E. Other Considerations.....	52
F. Conclusion	52
IX. FINDINGS	58
X. TERMS AND CONDITIONS	58
A. Term of the Authorization.....	58
B. Commencement of Operations Within Seven Years	59
C. Transfer, Assignment, or Change in Control	59
D. Agency Rights.....	60
E. Contract Provisions for the Sale or Transfer of LNG	60
F. Export Quantity.....	61
G. Combined FTA and Non-FTA Export Authorization Volumes	62
XI. ORDER	62
APPENDIX: LONG-TERM EXPORT AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE CORPUS CHRISTI LNG TERMINAL	67

FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS

AEO	Annual Energy Outlook
Bcf/d	Billion Cubic Feet per Day
Bcf/yr	Billion Cubic Feet per Year
CCL	Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
EIA	U.S. Energy Information Administration
FE	Office of Fossil Energy (prior to July 4, 2021)
FECM	Office of Fossil Energy and Carbon Management (from July 4, 2021 through November 19, 2025)
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
FTA	Free Trade Agreement
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HGEO	Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Energy Office (as of November 20, 2025)
LNG	Liquefied Natural Gas
Mcf	Thousand Cubic Feet
MMBtu	Million British Thermal Units
mtpa	Million Metric Tons per Annum
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGA	Natural Gas Act
STEO	Short-Term Energy Outlook
Tcf	Trillion Cubic Feet

I. INTRODUCTION

On April 6, 2023, three entities—Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC (collectively, CCL)—jointly filed an application (Application)¹ with the Department of Energy’s (DOE) Office of Fossil Energy and Carbon Management (FECM) (now known as the Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Energy Office)² under section 3 of the Natural Gas Act (NGA).³ CCL requests long-term, multi-contract authorization to export domestically produced liquefied natural gas (LNG), in a volume equivalent to 170 billion cubic feet per year (Bcf/yr) of natural gas (0.47 Bcf per day (Bcf/d)).⁴ CCL seeks to export this LNG by vessel from the proposed Corpus Christi Liquefaction Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project (Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project or Project), to be located at and adjacent to the existing Corpus Christi LNG Terminal (CCL Terminal) in San Patricio and Nueces Counties, Texas.⁵

In the Application, CCL states that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) previously authorized the construction and operation of various facilities at the CCL Terminal, including (but not limited to) the following:

- (i) The original Liquefaction Project, consisting of Large-Scale Trains 1-3; and
- (ii) The Corpus Christi Liquefaction Stage 3 Project (Stage 3 Project), consisting of Midscale Trains 1-7.⁶

¹ Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, *et al.*, Application for Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Free Trade Agreement and Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations, Docket No. 23-46-LNG (Apr. 6, 2023) [hereinafter App.].

² The Office of Fossil Energy (FE) changed its name to the Office of Fossil Energy and Carbon Management (FECM) on July 4, 2021. Subsequently, on November 20, 2025, FECM changed its name to the Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Energy Office (HGEO). DOE uses the acronym in effect at the time of each order or action discussed herein.

³ 15 U.S.C. § 717b. The authority to regulate the imports and exports of natural gas, including liquefied natural gas, under section 3 of the NGA has been delegated to the Assistant Secretary for FECM (now the Assistant Secretary for HGEO) in Redelegation Order No. S4-DEL-FE1-2023, issued on April 10, 2023.

⁴ App. at 1, 6.

⁵ *Id.* at 1.

⁶ *See id.* at 1-2 n.4 (describing facilities at, or proposed for, the CCL Terminal).

The Liquefaction Project and the Stage 3 Project have begun operations, and portions of the Stage 3 Project are still under construction.⁷ Additionally, we take administrative notice that, on March 10, 2025, FERC granted CCL’s application to site, construct, and operate the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project in a volume equivalent to 170 Bcf/yr, or approximately 3.28 million metric tons per annum (mtpa).⁸ As FERC noted, the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project is a “second expansion” of the CCL Terminal that “includes adding two midscale liquefaction trains (Trains 8 & 9) and associated facilities [to the Stage 3 Project], as well as increasing the authorized loading rate at the CCL Terminal’s existing marine berth.”⁹

In the Application, CCL seeks to export the LNG from the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project to: (i) any country with which the United States has entered into a free trade agreement (FTA) requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas (FTA countries), under NGA section 3(c);¹⁰ and (ii) any other country with which trade is not prohibited by U.S. law or policy (non-FTA countries), under NGA section 3(a).¹¹ On July 19, 2023, in Order No. 5019, DOE granted the FTA portion of the Application in the requested volume of 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas for a term through December 31, 2050.¹²

⁷ See Cheniere Marketing, LLC, *et al.*, DOE Semi-Annual Report for Period of Mar. 1, 2025 through Aug. 31, 2025 (Oct. 1, 2025), <https://www.energy.gov/documents/october-2025-6>.

⁸ See *Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC and CCL Mid-Scale 8-9, LLC*, Order Granting Authorization Under Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, FERC Docket No. CP23-129-000, 190 FERC ¶ 61,149, at P 1 (Mar. 10, 2025), https://elibrary.ferc.gov/eLibrary/filelist?accession_number=20250310-3069&optimized=false&sid=a4490b75-5347-4f66-b9c0-882391a22f03 [hereinafter FERC Order]. For a summary of CCL’s facilities and operations at the CCL Terminal, see *id.* at PP 3-6.

⁹ *Id.* at P 1.

¹⁰ 15 U.S.C. § 717b(c). The United States currently has FTAs requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas with Australia, Bahrain, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jordan, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Oman, Panama, Peru, Republic of Korea, and Singapore. FTAs with Israel and Costa Rica do not require national treatment for trade in natural gas.

¹¹ *Id.* § 717b(a); see App. at 1-2, 6.

¹² *Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, et al.*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5019, Docket No. 23-46-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Free Trade Agreement Nations (July 19, 2023) [hereinafter FTA Order].

CCL requests the non-FTA authorization for a term commencing on the date of first commercial export from the Project and extending through December 31, 2050.¹³ Additionally, CCL requests the authorization on its own behalf and as agent for other entities that hold title to the LNG at the point of export.¹⁴

DOE published a notice of the non-FTA portion of the Application in the *Federal Register* (Notice of Application) on May 8, 2023.¹⁵ The Notice of Application called on interested persons to submit protests, motions to intervene, notices of intervention, and comments by July 7, 2023.¹⁶ In response to the Notice of Application, DOE received the following timely-filed documents: (i) a “Motion to Intervene and Protest” filed by Public Citizen, Inc. (Public Citizen);¹⁷ (ii) a “Motion to Intervene and Protest” filed by Sierra Club;¹⁸ and (iii) one anonymous comment that is non-responsive.¹⁹ Subsequently, CCL submitted an “Answer in Opposition to Protests.”²⁰

DOE has reviewed the non-FTA portion of the Application, Public Citizen’s and Sierra Club’s motions to intervene and protests, CCL’s Answer, relevant portions of DOE’s 2024 LNG

¹³ App. at 6. *See also* U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Extending Natural Gas Export Authorizations to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries Through the Year 2050; Notice of Final Policy Statement and Response to Comments, 85 Fed. Reg. 52,237 (Aug. 25, 2020). Additionally, DOE notes that, effective January 12, 2021, long-term export authorizations contain authority to export the same approved volume of LNG pursuant to transactions with terms of less than two years, including commissioning volumes, on a non-additive basis. *See* U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Including Short-Term Export Authority in Long-Term Authorizations for the Export of Natural Gas on a Non-Additive Basis; Policy Statement, 86 Fed. Reg. 2243 (Jan. 12, 2021).

¹⁴ App. at 2, 6.

¹⁵ Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, *et al.*, Application for Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations; Notice of Application, 88 Fed. Reg. 29,662 (May 8, 2023) [hereinafter Notice of App.].

¹⁶ DOE finds that the requirement for public notice of applications in 10 C.F.R. Part 590 is applicable only to non-FTA applications under NGA section 3(a).

¹⁷ Public Citizen, Inc., Motion to Intervene and Protest, Docket No. 23-46-LNG (July 7, 2023) [hereinafter Public Citizen Pleading].

¹⁸ *See* Sierra Club, Motion to Intervene and Protest, Docket No. 23-46-LNG (July 7, 2023) [hereinafter Sierra Club Pleading].

¹⁹ Comment of Anonymous, Docket No. 23-46-LNG (June 26, 2023). Consistent with DOE practice, DOE will not consider the non-responsive comment.

²⁰ Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, *et al.*, Answer in Opposition to Protests, Docket No. 23-46-LNG (July 24, 2023) [hereinafter CCL Answer].

Export Study (or the 2024 Study),²¹ the public comments received on the 2024 Study, and DOE’s Response to Comments on the 2024 Study,²² among other evidence discussed below. On the basis of this substantial administrative record, and taking into account the considerations directed by Executive Order (E.O.) 14154, *Unleashing American Energy*,²³ DOE has determined that it has not been shown that CCL’s proposed exports of LNG to non-FTA countries will be inconsistent with the public interest, as would be required to deny the Application under NGA section 3(a).

DOE notes that, while CCL is already authorized to export LNG from the Project in a volume equivalent to 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas to FTA countries,²⁴ this Order will give CCL the flexibility to allow exports to non-FTA countries consistent with the maximum production capacity authorized by FERC. Moreover, DOE finds that CCL’s non-FTA exports are likely to yield economic benefits to the United States, diversify global LNG supplies, and improve energy security for U.S. allies and trading partners over the course of the export term. DOE further finds that granting the requested authorization is unlikely to adversely affect the availability of natural gas supplies to domestic consumers or result in natural gas price increases to the extent that they would negate the economic benefits to the United States.

²¹ U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy & Carbon Management, *Energy, Economic, & Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports* (Dec. 2024), <https://hgeo.energy.gov/app/docketindex/docket/index/30> [hereinafter 2024 LNG Export Study or 2024 Study] (providing links); *see infra* § III (DOE’s 2024 LNG Export Study).

²² U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Office of Fossil Energy & Carbon Management, *Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports: Response to Comments* (May 19, 2025), https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-05/2024%20LNG%20Export%20Study_Response%20to%20Comments_Final_05.19.2025.pdf [hereinafter Response to Comments]. DOE published a Notice of Availability of the Response to Comments on May 22, 2025. *See* U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Notice of Availability of Response to Comments for 2024 LNG Export Study: Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports, 90 Fed. Reg. 21,912 (May 22, 2025).

²³ Exec. Order No. 14154 of January 20, 2025, *Unleashing American Energy*, 90 Fed. Reg. 8353, 8357 (Jan. 29, 2025), <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2025-01-29/pdf/2025-01956.pdf> [hereinafter E.O. 14154] (directing the Secretary of Energy to “consider the economic and employment impacts to the United States and the impact to the security of allies and partners that would result from granting the [non-FTA] application”); *see infra* § II.D.

²⁴ *See Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, et al.*, DOE/FEEM Order No. 5019.

To comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA),²⁵ DOE is relying on a categorical exclusion from the preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) or environmental assessment (EA) under NEPA for the Application (Categorical Exclusion). Specifically, DOE is applying categorical exclusion B5.7, *Export of natural gas and associated transportation by marine vessel*.²⁶ This Order grants, without further review, the non-FTA portion of the Application on the basis of this Categorical Exclusion.

In sum, DOE grants the non-FTA portion of the Application in the full volume requested—170 Bcf/yr of natural gas, or 0.47 Bcf/d—subject to the Terms and Conditions and Ordering Paragraphs set forth herein. Because the export volume authorized in CCL’s FTA order and this Order reflect the maximum liquefaction capacity of the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project as approved by FERC, the non-FTA volume in this Order is not additive to CCL’s FTA order (Order No. 5019).

Additionally, this Order brings DOE’s cumulative total of approved non-FTA exports of LNG from the lower-48 states to 53.27 Bcf/d of natural gas (across 43 final orders, including this Order).²⁷

²⁵ 42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*

²⁶ See 10 C.F.R. Part 1021, Subpt. D, App. B, Categorical Exclusion B5.7; *see also* U.S. Dep’t of Energy, National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures, Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. 78,197 (Dec. 4, 2020); *see infra* § II.C.

²⁷ Final non-FTA orders that were later vacated or that expired are not included in this total volume. *See infra* § VIII.F (identifying long-term orders vacated and expired to date). Additionally, DOE has issued one final long-term order authorizing exports of LNG produced from sources from a proposed facility to be constructed in Alaska to non-FTA countries. *See Alaska LNG Project LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3643-A, Docket No. 14-96-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Aug. 20, 2020) (as subsequently amended in DOE/FECM Order No. 3643-C); *see also Sierra Club v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy*, 134 F.4th 568 (D.C. Cir. 2025) (denying petition for review of Alaska LNG order). The Alaska LNG volume (2.55 Bcf/d) is not included in the volumes discussed in this Order, which generally involve the export of LNG produced from the lower-48 states. Because there is no natural gas pipeline interconnection between Alaska and the lower-48 states, DOE generally views those LNG export markets as distinct.

II. BACKGROUND

A. DOE's Prior LNG Studies

Previously, DOE has relied on the following studies to inform its review of applications to export LNG to non-FTA countries under NGA section 3(a):

- DOE's economic study referred to as the 2018 LNG Export Study—the fifth economic study conducted by DOE for use in LNG export decisions—which assessed the effects of varying levels of LNG exports from the lower-48 states to non-FTA countries for the time period 2020-2050;²⁸
- DOE's environmental study referred to as the Addendum,²⁹ which was developed in 2014 to inform DOE's public interest evaluation on potential environmental impacts of unconventional natural gas exploration and production activities, including hydraulic fracturing; and
- DOE's environmental studies referred to as the 2014 Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Report (or the LCA GHG Report)³⁰ and the 2019 LCA GHG Update (or the 2019 Update),³¹ which calculated the life cycle greenhouse gas emissions for LNG exported from the United States.

DOE commenced the 2024 LNG Export Study to provide an updated understanding of the potential effects of U.S. LNG exports on both economic and environmental considerations.³² As explained below, DOE finds that only the economic and energy security portions of the 2024 Study are relevant to this proceeding.

²⁸ See U.S. Dep't of Energy, Study on Macroeconomic Outcomes of LNG Exports; Notice of Availability of the 2018 LNG Export Study and Request for Comments, 83 Fed. Reg. 27,314 (June 12, 2018); U.S. Dep't of Energy, Study on Macroeconomic Outcomes of LNG Exports; Response to Comments Received on Study, 83 Fed. Reg. 67,251 (Dec. 28, 2018). Prior to the 2018 Study, DOE had relied on economic studies evaluating LNG exports conducted in 2011, 2012, 2014, and 2015. See *id.* at 67,254-55.

²⁹ See U.S. Dep't of Energy, Addendum to Environmental Review Documents Concerning Exports of Natural Gas From the United States, 79 Fed. Reg. 48,132 (Aug. 15, 2014); see also <https://www.energy.gov/hgeo/addendum-environmental-review-documents-concerning-exports-natural-gas-united-states> (related documents).

³⁰ See U.S. Dep't of Energy, Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas From the United States, 79 Fed. Reg. 32,260 (June 4, 2014). DOE announced the availability of this report on its website on May 29, 2014. "LCA" refers to the life cycle analysis (LCA) model used in DOE's greenhouse gas analyses.

³¹ See, e.g., Nat'l Energy Tech. Lab., *Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas from the United States: 2019 Update* (DOE/NETL- 2019/2041) (Sep. 12, 2019), <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2019/09/f66/2019%20NETL%20LCA-GHG%20Report.pdf>; U.S. Dep't of Energy, Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas From the United States; Notice of Availability of Report Entitled Life Cycle Greenhouse Gas Perspective on Exporting Liquefied Natural Gas From the United States: 2019 Update and Request for Comments, 84 Fed. Reg. 49,278 (Sep. 19, 2019).

³² See *infra* § III.

B. Judicial Decisions Upholding DOE's Non-FTA Authorizations

In 2015 and 2016, Sierra Club petitioned the D.C. Circuit for review of five long-term LNG export authorizations issued by DOE. The D.C. Circuit denied four of the five petitions for review: one in a published decision issued in August 2017 (*Sierra Club I*),³³ and three in a consolidated, unpublished opinion issued in November 2017 (*Sierra Club II*).³⁴ Sierra Club withdrew its fifth and remaining petition for review.³⁵

In *Sierra Club I*, the D.C. Circuit concluded that DOE had complied with both NGA section 3(a) and NEPA in issuing the challenged non-FTA authorization to Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P. and its related entities (collectively, Freeport). DOE had granted the Freeport application, finding that Freeport's proposed exports were not inconsistent with the public interest under NGA section 3(a). DOE also considered and disclosed the potential environmental impacts of its decision under NEPA. Sierra Club petitioned for review of the Freeport authorization, arguing that DOE fell short of its obligations under both the NGA and NEPA. The D.C. Circuit rejected Sierra Club's arguments in a unanimous decision, holding that, "Sierra Club has given us no reason to question the Department's judgment that the [Freeport] application is not inconsistent with the public interest."³⁶

Subsequently, in the consolidated *Sierra Club II* opinion, the D.C. Circuit ruled that "[t]he court's decision in [*Sierra Club I*] largely governs the resolution of the [three] instant cases."³⁷ Upon its review of the remaining "narrow issues" in those cases, the Court again

³³ *Sierra Club v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, 867 F.3d 189 (D.C. Cir. 2017) [hereinafter *Sierra Club I*] (denying petition for review of the LNG export authorization issued to Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., *et al.*).

³⁴ *Sierra Club v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, 703 Fed. App'x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2017) [hereinafter *Sierra Club II*] (denying petitions for review in Nos. 16-1186, 16-1252, and 16-1253 of the LNG export authorizations issued to Dominion Cove Point LNG, LP; Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, respectively).

³⁵ See *Sierra Club v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, No. 16-1426, Per Curiam Order (D.C. Cir. 2018) (granting Sierra Club's unopposed motion for voluntary dismissal).

³⁶ *Sierra Club I*, 867 F.3d at 203.

³⁷ *Sierra Club II*, 703 Fed. App'x at *2.

rejected Sierra Club’s arguments under the NGA and NEPA, and upheld DOE’s actions in issuing the non-FTA authorizations in those proceedings.³⁸

The D.C. Circuit’s decisions in *Sierra Club I* and *II* continue to guide DOE’s review of applications to export LNG to non-FTA countries.³⁹

C. DOE’s Categorical Exclusion and Marine Transport Technical Support Document

In 2020, DOE revised its NEPA procedures that provide for a categorical exclusion if neither an EIS nor an EA is required—specifically, by promulgating a revised categorical exclusion B5.7, *Export of natural gas and associated transportation by marine vessel* (B5.7 categorical exclusion).⁴⁰

In the accompanying final rule, DOE stated that the revision to the B5.7 categorical exclusion was intended to “focus exclusively on the analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from activities occurring at or after the point of export, which are within the scope of DOE’s export authorization authority under the NGA.”⁴¹ DOE found that “[s]uch impacts begin at the point of export and are limited to the marine transport effects.”⁴²

DOE explained that this revised categorical exclusion follows both the Supreme Court’s holding in *Department of Transportation v. Public Citizen (Public Citizen)*,⁴³ as well as the D.C. Circuit’s holding in a case evaluating FERC’s authority under the NGA, *Sierra Club v. Federal*

³⁸ *Id.* For a more detailed discussion of *Sierra Club I* and *Sierra Club II*, see *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4961, Docket No. 21-98-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations, at 21-24 (Mar. 3, 2023).

³⁹ *See, e.g., id.* at 24.

⁴⁰ *See* U.S. Dep’t of Energy, National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures, Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. 78,197 (Dec. 4, 2020) [hereinafter NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule]; *see also* 10 C.F.R. Part 1021, Subpt. D, App. B, Categorical Exclusion B5.7.

⁴¹ NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,197.

⁴² *Id.* at 78,197; *see also id.* at n.9 (“DOE defines export activities as starting at the point of delivery to the export vessel, and extending to the territorial waters of the receiving country.”); *id.* at 78,198 (“These potential impacts would occur at or after the point of export to non-FTA countries.”).

⁴³ *Dep’t of Transp. v. Pub. Citizen*, 541 U.S. 752 (2004) [hereinafter *Pub. Citizen*].

Energy Regulatory Commission,⁴⁴ that “potential environmental effects considered under NEPA do not include effects that the agency has no authority to prevent.”⁴⁵

Specifically, DOE stated that its discretionary authority under NGA section 3 “is limited to the authorization of exports of natural gas to non-FTA countries.”⁴⁶ DOE thus concluded that, because FERC, not DOE, exercises statutory authority to authorize construction and operation of natural gas export facilities, “DOE need not review potential environmental impacts associated with the construction or operation of [such] facilities.”⁴⁷ In observing that “*Public Citizen* held that an agency has no obligation to ‘gather or consider environmental information if it has no statutory authority to act on that information,’” DOE reiterated that “[t]his final rule is fully consistent with that holding.”⁴⁸ In sum, “[i]mpacts beyond marine transport are beyond the scope of DOE’s NEPA review” in non-FTA export proceedings.⁴⁹

On the basis of data referenced in the accompanying Technical Support Document,⁵⁰ DOE concluded that “the transport of natural gas by marine vessels adhering to applicable maritime safety regulations and established shipping methods and safety standards normally does not pose the potential for significant environmental impacts.”⁵¹

⁴⁴ *Sierra Club v. Fed. Energy Regul. Comm’n*, 827 F.3d 36 (D.C. Cir. 2016).

⁴⁵ NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,198.

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 78,203.

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 78,201 (quoting *Sierra Club v. Fed. Energy Regul. Comm’n*, 867 F.3d 1357, 1372 (D.C. Cir. 2017), in which the D.C. Circuit observed that this “rule was the touchstone of *Public Citizen*”); see also *Seven Cnty. Infrastructure Coal. v. Eagle Cnty., Colo.*, 605 U.S. 168, 188, 191 (2025) (citing *Pub. Citizen*, 541 U.S. at 770, in observing that “agencies are not required to analyze the effects of projects over which they do not exercise regulatory authority,” and that “[a]n agency may decline to evaluate environmental effects from separate projects upstream or downstream from the project at issue”).

⁴⁹ NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,200.

⁵⁰ See *id.* at 78,198 n.16 (citing U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Technical Support Document, Notice of Final Rulemaking, National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures (10 C.F.R. Part 1021) (Nov. 2020), <https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2021/01/f82/technical-support-document-10-cfr-1021-2020-11.pdf>).

⁵¹ *Id.* at 78,200 (reiterating that “[i]mpacts beyond marine transport are beyond the scope of DOE’s NEPA review”); see also *id.* at 78,202.

D. Executive Order Issued on January 20, 2025

E.O. 14154, issued on January 20, 2025, directed the Secretary of Energy to “restart reviews of applications for approvals of [LNG] export projects as expeditiously as possible, consistent with applicable law.”⁵² DOE complied with this directive with its issuance of non-FTA export authorizations beginning in February 2025.⁵³ Additionally, E.O. 14154 states that, “[i]n assessing the ‘Public Interest’ to be advanced by any particular application” to export LNG under NGA section 3(a), the Secretary of Energy “shall consider the economic and employment impacts to the United States and the impact to the security of allies and partners that would result from granting the application.”⁵⁴ This Order likewise complies with that directive.

III. DOE’S 2024 LNG EXPORT STUDY

A. Overview

The 2024 LNG Export Study (or 2024 Study) was conducted as a comprehensive update of DOE’s prior LNG studies (discussed *supra* § II.A) and aimed to capture the recent and complex dynamics of the LNG export market. As a preliminary matter, DOE acknowledges that the 2024 LNG Export Study included an environmental analysis. However, DOE finds that the environmental analysis in the 2024 Study is not required for DOE’s decision on the Application, as DOE’s NEPA review considers all relevant environmental effects from the proposed exports.⁵⁵

Specifically, under DOE’s B5.7 categorical exclusion described above (and consistent

⁵² E.O. 14154, 90 Fed. Reg. at 8357 (§ 8(a)). Because DOE has jurisdiction to regulate exports of LNG under NGA section 3(a) (not approvals of export projects, which are under FERC’s jurisdiction), DOE interprets E.O. 14154 as directing DOE to review non-FTA export applications “as expeditiously as possible.”

⁵³ *See, e.g., Commonwealth LNG, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5238, Docket No. 19-134-LNG, Order Conditionally Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations, at 7 (Feb. 14, 2025).

⁵⁴ E.O. 14154, 90 Fed. Reg. at 8357 (§ 8(a)).

⁵⁵ *See infra* § VIII.D.

with the Supreme Court’s holding in *Public Citizen* and, more recently, *Seven County Infrastructure Coalition v. Eagle County, Colorado (Seven County)*,⁵⁶ this NEPA review is limited to the “potential effects associated with marine transport of LNG” to non-FTA countries.⁵⁷ The environmental portions of the 2024 Study were not limited to marine transport effects, but rather included the integration of potential upstream and downstream environmental effects, which are not reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts of DOE’s export authorizations.⁵⁸ Accordingly, DOE’s discussion of the 2024 Study in this Order focuses only on the economic analysis in the 2024 Study, as well as DOE’s related findings on energy security.⁵⁹

B. Methodology

As relevant here, the 2024 Study included a Summary Report⁶⁰ and two appendices that provided more detail on the key elements within the Study.

First, *Appendix A: Global Energy and Greenhouse Gas Implications of U.S. LNG Exports* (Appendix A) presented, in relevant part, an analysis of the global market demand for U.S. LNG exports across a range of scenarios through 2050. This analysis used the Global Change Analysis Model (GCAM), which is an integrated multisector model of global energy, economy,

⁵⁶ See *supra* § II.C.

⁵⁷ NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,199; see also *id.* at 78,197 (DOE’s NEPA review of applications to export LNG to non-FTA countries is based on “the legal principle that potential environmental effects to be considered by an agency under NEPA do not include effects that the agency has no authority to prevent”).

⁵⁸ See *id.*, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,199 (stating “DOE’s conclusion that potential environmental effects associated with marine transport” are “the only reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts associated with DOE natural gas export authorizations” under NEPA—and noting that these marine transport effects “are minimal”) (emphasis added); see also *id.* at 78,200-01 (explaining that potential upstream and downstream impacts are not part of DOE’s NEPA analyses for natural gas export approvals).

⁵⁹ This focus is also consistent with E.O. 14154 (*supra* § II.D), which directs DOE to review “economic and employment impacts to the United States and the impact to the security of allies and partners that would result from granting [an export] application.”

⁶⁰ U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports: Summary Report (Dec. 2024) [hereinafter Study Summary Report], https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-10/ENERGY%20ECONOMIC%20AND%20ENVIRONMENTAL%20ASSESSMENT%20OF%20U.S.%20LNG%20EXPORTS_0.pdf.

agriculture, land use, water, and climate systems. DOE’s Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) conducted the principal modeling work in Appendix A.⁶¹

Second, *Appendix B: Domestic Energy, Economic, and Greenhouse Gas Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports* (Appendix B) presented an analysis of the implications of the various U.S. LNG export levels on the U.S. economy, among other considerations. The analysis in Appendix B was conducted using an updated and adapted version of U.S. Energy Information Administration’s (EIA) National Energy Modeling System (NEMS) and Industrial Economics, Inc.’s (IEc) Household Energy Impact Distribution Model (HEIDM). OnLocation, Inc. and IEc performed the principal modeling work in Appendix B.⁶²

For each scenario in these Appendices, GCAM was used to estimate the global demand for U.S. LNG exports.⁶³ These projections of the global demand for U.S. LNG for key scenarios were put into NEMS and HEIDM to evaluate domestic impacts, including (i) changes in natural gas prices and consumption across economic sectors, and (ii) changes in energy prices experienced by American households.⁶⁴

The 2024 Study evaluated scenarios that analyzed a combination of assumptions about policy, technology availability, and U.S. LNG export level.⁶⁵ Briefly:

- The 2024 Study contained three categories of policy assumptions: *Defined Policies*, *Commitments*, and *Net Zero 2050*.⁶⁶ For example, the *Defined Policies* scenario included an explicit representation of domestic policies in place at the time.⁶⁷

⁶¹ U.S. Dep’t of Energy, *2024 LNG Export Study: Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports*; Notice of Availability and Request for Comments, at 4 (Dec. 17, 2024), https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2024-12/2024%20LNG%20Export%20Study%20FRN_signed_Study%20Statement%20Added%2012172024.pdf [hereinafter 2024 Study Notice].

⁶² *Id.* at 4-5. The 2024 Study included two other appendices (Appendices C and D) focused on evaluating various environmental and community effects that are beyond the scope of DOE’s review in this Order and thus are not summarized here.

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ *Id.*

⁶⁵ See Study Summary Report at S-15.

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.* at S-16.

- The 2024 Study contained two categories of assumptions for technology availability: *High CCS* [Carbon Capture & Storage] and *Moderate CCS*.⁶⁸
- Within each scenario of policy and technology assumptions, the 2024 Study considered three assumptions of U.S. LNG exports levels: *Existing/FID Exports*, *Model Resolved Exports*, and *High Exports*.⁶⁹
 - *Existing/FID Exports* assumed U.S. LNG exports were held at levels equivalent to 90% of the LNG capacity that was operational or had export authorizations from DOE and reached a final investment decision (FID) as of December 2023 (23.7 Bcf/d).⁷⁰
 - *Model Resolved Exports* assumed U.S. LNG exports estimated at a trajectory determined by the model.⁷¹
 - *High Exports* assumed U.S. LNG exports increased incrementally above *Model Resolved* levels starting in 2035 to reach 20 Bcf/d above *Model Resolved* levels in 2050.⁷²

Additionally, the 2024 Study explored three additional assumptions related to the economic competitiveness of U.S. natural gas: *High U.S. Supply*, *Low U.S. Supply*, and *High Middle East Supply*.⁷³ The analysis in Appendix B used only the levels of LNG exports derived under the global *Defined Policies* assumptions found in Appendix A, while varying the size of U.S. natural oil and gas supply and technological improvements in natural gas extraction.⁷⁴

In sum, using a combination of these assumptions, Appendix A evaluated 14 primary scenarios, as well as six additional sensitivity scenarios on economic competitiveness, and Appendix B evaluated six scenarios spanning a range of U.S. LNG export levels.⁷⁵

C. DOE Proceeding

On December 17, 2024, DOE published the notice of availability of the 2024 LNG

⁶⁸ *See id.* at S-17.

⁶⁹ *Id.* at S-18.

⁷⁰ *Id.*

⁷¹ Study Summary Report at S-18.

⁷² *Id.*

⁷³ *Id.* at S-19.

⁷⁴ *Id.*

⁷⁵ *See id.*

Export Study on its website.⁷⁶ The Notice of Availability was published in the *Federal Register* on December 20, 2024.⁷⁷ The Notice of Availability informed the public that DOE intended to use the 2024 Study to inform its public interest review in pending and future non-FTA applications, invited submission of comments regarding the use of the 2024 Study, and entered the 2024 Study into the administrative record of the 14 pending non-FTA export proceedings identified in the caption of the Notice of Availability.⁷⁸

DOE initially invited public comment on the 2024 Study for 60 days, but extended the comment period for an additional 30 days.⁷⁹ In total, the comment period began on December 20, 2024, and extended through March 20, 2025.⁸⁰ DOE received more than 100,000 comments on the 2024 Study from a variety of sources, including participants in the natural gas industry, industrial users, environmental organizations, think-tanks, academics, and individuals.⁸¹

DOE summarized and responded to these comments in a document entitled *Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports: Response to Comments* (Response to Comments), published on DOE's website on May 19, 2025.⁸² On May 22, 2025, DOE published the Notice of Availability of the Response to Comments in the *Federal Register*.⁸³

⁷⁶ See 2024 Study Notice.

⁷⁷ U.S. Dep't of Energy, 2024 LNG Export Study: Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports; Notice of Availability and Request for Comments, 89 Fed. Reg. 104,132 (Dec. 20, 2024).

⁷⁸ See *id.*

⁷⁹ See U.S. Dep't of Energy, 2024 LNG Export Study: Energy, Economic, and Environmental Assessment of U.S. LNG Exports; Extension of Comment Period, 90 Fed. Reg. 9018 (Feb. 5, 2025).

⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁸¹ The public comments are posted on the 2024 LNG Export Study webpage at <https://hgeo.energy.gov/app/docketindex/docket/index/30>.

⁸² See Response to Comments.

⁸³ See Notice of Availability of Response to Comments.

D. DOE's Findings and Conclusions

1. Key Findings

Upon consideration of the material reviewed (*i.e.*, the 2024 Study, comments, and materials submitted in support of comments), DOE made the following “Key Findings” in the Response to Comments on the 2024 Study, as relevant here:⁸⁴

1. U.S domestic natural gas supply is sufficient to meet domestic and market-based global demand for U.S. natural gas (including LNG).
2. Increasing U.S. LNG exports increases U.S. gross domestic product (GDP).
3. Higher levels of U.S. LNG exports will have a beneficial impact on the U.S. trade balance.
4. Increased LNG exports are projected to have relatively modest impacts on prices and there has not been a consistent effect of U.S. LNG exports on prices to date. The potential price impacts from increased LNG exports modeled in the 2024 Study are within the range of prices observed over the past five years, and those price impacts are below the price increases from U.S. LNG exports modeled in the 2018 LNG Export Study.
5. Increased U.S. LNG exports would enhance national and energy security for the United States, as well as U.S. allies and trading partners.

DOE determined that the public comments received on the 2024 Study “either support or do not provide a sufficient basis to invalidate or undermine these findings.”⁸⁵

⁸⁴ The 2024 Study, as summarized in the Response to Comments, included other Key Findings and Conclusions describing various environmental and community effects that are beyond the scope of DOE’s review in this Order and thus are omitted here and in the next subsection (§ III.D.2), respectively.

⁸⁵ Response to Comments at 47.

2. Conclusions

DOE conducted the 2024 LNG Export Study to identify and assess potential effects of continued expansion of U.S. LNG exports to non-FTA countries. As relevant here, DOE determined in the Response to Comments that the 2024 Study provides support for additional exports of U.S. LNG to non-FTA countries.⁸⁶ A primary conclusion of the 2024 Study—which DOE affirmed in the Response to Comments—is that “domestic natural gas supply is sufficient to meet both domestic demand and the modeled global demand for U.S. LNG in all scenarios, including sensitivity scenarios on U.S. oil and gas supply.”⁸⁷

DOE further concluded that the export of LNG generates net economic benefits for the United States, including increasing GDP in all cases; has a beneficial impact on the U.S. trade balance; and enhances energy security for the United States and its allies and trading partners.⁸⁸ For example, DOE found that the destination flexibility of its FTA and non-FTA authorizations—in which a buyer can deliver LNG to any destination not prohibited by law or policy—enhances global energy security, regardless of the destination region.⁸⁹

DOE also determined that LNG export levels to date have not demonstrated a “consistent effect” on domestic natural gas prices, but that “any domestic price impact is expected to be minimal due to the abundant U.S. supply of natural gas.”⁹⁰ As some commenters noted, and

⁸⁶ See, e.g., *id.* at 46-50.

⁸⁷ *Id.* at 47; see also *id.* at 43 (observing that “market forces work to match supply and demand, such that enough natural gas would be produced to satisfy U.S. demand regardless of export levels, given the very large American resource base”).

⁸⁸ *Id.* at 46-49.

⁸⁹ *Id.* at 48; see also *id.* at 40 (stating that DOE “agrees that LNG exports from the United States contribute to global energy security” due to the destination flexibility of its export authorizations).

⁹⁰ *Id.* at 48; see also *id.* at 17 (stating that the “many simultaneous changes that have occurred in natural gas production and markets in recent years . . . make it challenging to parse out [the] separate effects” of U.S. export levels on domestic prices of natural gas).

DOE agreed, “natural gas supply curves used in modeling show the ability to add significant supply with only small changes in prices.”⁹¹

DOE also stated that it continues to endorse the principle set forth in its 1984 Policy Guidelines⁹² that the market is generally the most efficient means of allocating natural gas supplies. Specifically, DOE observed that market forces ultimately determine the success of any particular LNG export project and, in turn, the “market-derived level of U.S. LNG exports.”⁹³ DOE noted that technological innovations and industry investment are “two factors that influence market demand” for exports of U.S. LNG.⁹⁴

For all of these reasons, DOE concluded that the 2024 Study and the public comments received “support the proposition that exports of LNG from the United States will not be inconsistent with the public interest.”⁹⁵

IV. PUBLIC INTEREST STANDARD

Section 3(a) of the NGA sets forth the standard of review for the non-FTA portion of the Application:

[N]o person shall export any natural gas from the United States to a foreign country or import any natural gas from a foreign country without first having secured an order of the [Secretary of Energy]⁹⁶ authorizing it to do so. The [Secretary] shall issue such order upon application, unless after opportunity for hearing, [the Secretary] finds that the proposed exportation or importation will not be consistent with the public interest. The [Secretary] may by [the Secretary’s] order grant such application, in whole or in part,

⁹¹ Response to Comments at 47.

⁹² U.S. Dep’t of Energy, New Policy Guidelines and Delegations Order Relating to Regulation of Imported Natural Gas, 49 Fed. Reg. 6684 (Feb. 22, 1984) [hereinafter 1984 Policy Guidelines].

⁹³ See Response to Comments at 8-9 (noting that an authorization to export LNG “does not guarantee that any particular project will succeed”); see also *id.* at 42 (discussing market forces and changing market conditions).

⁹⁴ *Id.* at 50.

⁹⁵ *Id.*

⁹⁶ The Secretary’s authority was established by section 301(b) of the Department of Energy Organization Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7151(b), which transferred jurisdiction over import and export authorizations from the Federal Power Commission to the Secretary of Energy; see also *id.* § 7172(f) (section 402(f)).

with such modification and upon such terms and conditions as the [Secretary] may find necessary or appropriate.⁹⁷

DOE, as affirmed by the D.C. Circuit, has consistently interpreted NGA section 3(a) as creating a rebuttable presumption that a proposed exportation of natural gas is in the public interest.⁹⁸

Accordingly, DOE will continue to conduct individual adjudication and grant non-FTA applications unless DOE finds that a proposed exportation “will not be consistent with the public interest.”⁹⁹

NGA section 3(a) does not define “public interest” or identify criteria that must be considered in evaluating the public interest. In evaluating an export application under this standard, DOE applies the principles described in DOE’s 1984 Policy Guidelines and “such other matters as [DOE] finds in the circumstances of a particular case to be appropriate,” including the domestic need for the natural gas to be exported.¹⁰⁰ The goals of the 1984 Policy Guidelines are to minimize federal control and involvement in energy markets and to promote a balanced and mixed energy resource system.¹⁰¹ While the 1984 Policy Guidelines explicitly discuss only

⁹⁷ 15 U.S.C. § 717b(a).

⁹⁸ See *Sierra Club I*, 867 F.3d at 203 (“We have construed [NGA section 3(a)] as containing a ‘general presumption favoring [export] authorization.’”) (quoting *W. Va. Pub. Serv. Comm’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Energy*, 681 F.2d 847, 856 (D.C. Cir. 1982)).

⁹⁹ See *id.* (“there must be ‘an affirmative showing of inconsistency with the public interest’ to deny the application” under NGA section 3(a)) (quoting *Panhandle Producers & Royalty Owners Ass’n v. Econ. Regul. Admin.*, 822 F.2d 1105, 1111 (D.C. Cir. 1987)). As of August 24, 2018, qualifying small-scale exports of natural gas to non-FTA countries are deemed to be consistent with the public interest under NGA section 3(a). See 10 C.F.R. §§ 590.102(p), 590.208(a).

¹⁰⁰ DOE Delegation Order No. 0204-111 (Feb. 22, 1984), at 1 (¶ (b)). Although Delegation Order No. 0204-111 was later rescinded, the focus on the domestic need for natural gas was set forth in the 1984 Policy Guidelines. See 49 Fed. Reg. at 6685, 6690 (incorporating DOE Delegation Order No. 0204-111); see also, e.g., U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Order Denying Petition for Rulemaking on Exports of Liquefied Natural Gas, at 11-12 (July 18, 2023), <https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2023-07/DOE%20Response%20to%20Sierra%20Club%27s%20Petition%20for%20Rulemaking%207.18.2023%20%28002%29.pdf> [hereinafter DOE Order Denying Petition for Rulemaking].

¹⁰¹ 1984 Policy Guidelines, 49 Fed. Reg. at 6685 (stating that “[t]he market, not government, should determine the price and other contract terms of imported [or exported] natural gas,” and emphasizing the importance of “minimizing regulatory impediments to a freely operating market”).

natural gas imports, in 1999 DOE held in Order No. 1473 that the same Policy Guidelines should be applied to natural gas export applications.¹⁰²

Thus, DOE's review of non-FTA applications focuses on: (i) the domestic need for the LNG proposed to be exported, (ii) whether the proposed exports pose a threat to the security of domestic natural gas supplies, (iii) whether the arrangement is consistent with DOE's policy of promoting market competition, and (iv) any other factors bearing on the public interest as determined by DOE.¹⁰³ To conduct this review, DOE looks to record evidence developed in the application proceeding.¹⁰⁴ Before reaching a final decision, DOE must also comply with NEPA.¹⁰⁵

V. DESCRIPTION OF REQUEST

CCL is requesting long-term, multi-contract authorization to export LNG in a volume of 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas from the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project to non-FTA countries, to align with its capacity expansion approved by FERC.¹⁰⁶ Additional information is set forth below.

A. Description of Applicant

Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC, and Cheniere Marketing, LLC are each Delaware limited liability companies with a principal place of business in Houston, Texas. These entities are wholly owned subsidiaries of Cheniere Energy, Inc., a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in Houston, Texas.

¹⁰² *Phillips Alaska Natural Gas Corp., et al.*, DOE/FE Order No. 1473, Docket No. 96-99-LNG, Order Extending Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas from Alaska (Apr. 2, 1999), at 14 (citing *Yukon Pac. Corp.*, DOE/FE Order No. 350, Order Granting Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas From Alaska, 1 FE ¶ 70,259, at p. 71,128 (1989)).

¹⁰³ *See* DOE Order Denying Petition for Rulemaking at 12.

¹⁰⁴ *See id.*

¹⁰⁵ *See supra* § I.

¹⁰⁶ App. at 6; *see also supra* § I.

B. Procedural History

To date, DOE has issued long-term orders authorizing Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC and Cheniere Marketing, LLC (collectively, CMI) to export LNG from the Liquefaction Project (Large-Scale Trains 1-3) in a total volume equivalent to 875.16 Bcf/yr of natural gas to both FTA and non-FTA countries on a non-additive basis. These orders are:

- DOE/FE Order No. 3164, as amended, authorizing CMI to export 767 Bcf/yr to FTA countries through December 31, 2050;¹⁰⁷
- DOE/FE Order No. 3638, as amended, authorizing CMI to export 767 Bcf/yr to non-FTA countries through December 31, 2050;¹⁰⁸
- DOE/FE Order No. 4519, as amended, authorizing CMI to export 108.16 Bcf/yr to FTA countries through December 31, 2050;¹⁰⁹
- DOE/FECM Order No. 4799, authorizing CMI to export 108.16 Bcf/yr to non-FTA countries through December 31, 2050.¹¹⁰

Additionally, DOE has issued orders authorizing Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC¹¹¹ to export LNG from the Stage 3 Project (Midscale Trains 1-7) to both FTA and non-FTA countries in a volume equivalent to 582.14 Bcf/yr on a non-additive basis as follows:

¹⁰⁷ *Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3164, Docket No. 12-99-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Proposed Corpus Christi Liquefaction Project to Free Trade Agreement Nations (Oct. 16, 2012), *amended by* DOE/FE Order Nos. 3538 and 3164-A, Docket Nos. 12-97-LNG and 12-99-LNG, Order Amending Application in Docket No. 12-97-LNG to Add Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC as Applicant, and Granting Request in DOE/FE Order No. 3164, Docket No. 12-99-LNG, to Add Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC as Authorization Holder (Oct. 29, 2014), *further amended by* DOE/FE Order No. 3164-B (Oct. 28, 2020) (extending export term).

¹⁰⁸ *Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3638, Docket No. 12-97-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Proposed Corpus Christi Liquefaction Project to be Located in Corpus Christi, Texas, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 12, 2015), *reh'g denied*, DOE/FE Order No. 3638-A (May 26, 2016), *amended by* DOE/FE Order No. 3638-B (Oct. 28, 2020) (extending export term).

¹⁰⁹ *Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4519, Docket No. 19-124-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Free Trade Agreement Nations (Apr. 14, 2020), *amended by* DOE/FE Order No. 4519-A (Oct. 28, 2020) (extending export term).

¹¹⁰ *Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4799, Docket No. 19-124-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 16, 2022); *see also* App. at 5 & n.9 (identifying orders).

¹¹¹ DOE's orders for the Stage 3 Project were originally held by Corpus Christi Liquefaction Stage III, LLC, but were transferred to its successor, Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, in 2022.

- DOE/FE Order No. 4277, as amended, authorizing Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC to export 582.14 Bcf/yr to FTA countries through December 31, 2050;¹¹² and
- DOE/FE Order No. 4490, as amended, authorizing Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC to export 582.14 Bcf/yr to non-FTA countries through December 31, 2050.¹¹³

With this Order and CCL’s FTA Order approving exports from the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project to non-FTA and FTA countries, respectively, DOE has authorized exports of LNG from the CCL Terminal in a total combined volume equivalent to 1,627.3 Bcf/yr of natural gas to FTA countries and 1,627.3 Bcf/yr of natural gas to non-FTA countries on a non-additive basis. These orders are summarized in Tables 1 and 2 of the Appendix to this Order.

C. Proposed CCL Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project

CCL states that the Project will be located at and adjacent to the CCL Terminal in San Patricio and Nueces Counties, Texas.¹¹⁴ CCL adds that the Project will be developed on “previously disturbed land that was, in large part, already reviewed and approved for use in connection with construction and operation of the CCL Terminal.”¹¹⁵

CCL states that the Project will consist of two midscale liquefaction trains (Midscale Trains 8 and 9), which together will be capable of producing approximately 3.28 mtpa of LNG, equivalent to approximately 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas.¹¹⁶ According to CCL, the Project and its

¹¹² *Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4277, Docket No. 18-78-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Proposed Stage 3 LNG Facilities to be Located at the Corpus Christi LNG Terminal in San Patricio and Nueces Counties, Texas, to Free Trade Agreement Nations (Nov. 9, 2018), *amended by* DOE/FE Order No. 4277-A (Oct. 21, 2020) (extending export term), *amended by* DOE/FECM Order No. 4277-B (Aug. 25, 2022) (reflecting corporate name change).

¹¹³ *Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4490, Docket No. 18-78-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Feb. 10, 2020), *amended by* DOE/FE Order No. 4490-A (Oct. 21, 2020) (extending export term), *amended by* DOE/FECM Order No. 4490-B (Aug. 25, 2022) (reflecting corporate name change).

¹¹⁴ App. at 1.

¹¹⁵ *Id.* at 18.

¹¹⁶ *Id.* at 5 & n.11.

supporting infrastructure will be interconnected and operated, on an integrated basis, with the existing LNG storage tanks, control buildings, marine facilities, and other ancillary facilities at the CCL Terminal.¹¹⁷ CCL further states that the Project will “include[] the addition of certain operational enhancements which consist of refrigerant storage, an end flash gas unit, and a boil-off gas compressor, as well as an increase in the authorized loading rate of LNG carriers.”¹¹⁸

D. Source of Supply

CCL states that feed gas for the Project will be transported to the CCL Terminal by a combination of the previously permitted Corpus Christi pipeline facilities and a new intrastate pipeline, known as the ADCC pipeline, that will connect the Agua Dolce natural gas hub to the CCL Terminal.¹¹⁹ CCL further states that, through these interconnections, the Project will have access to natural gas supplies from almost any point on the U.S. interstate pipeline system through direct delivery or by displacement.¹²⁰

E. Business Model

CCL requests authorization to export LNG on its own behalf and as agent for other entities that hold title to the LNG at the time of export.¹²¹ CCL states that it will comply with all DOE requirements for exporters and agents, including registration requirements.¹²²

According to CCL, the Project is “substantially commercialized, with facilities underpinned by demand associated with a portfolio of long-term LNG export contracts.”¹²³ CCL further states that, to the extent additional long-term agreements are signed, it will file, or cause

¹¹⁷ *Id.* at 5-6.

¹¹⁸ *Id.* at 6.

¹¹⁹ App. at 7 n.14 (stating that “[t]he ADCC Pipeline is under development and is anticipated to be in service in 2024”).

¹²⁰ *Id.* at 7.

¹²¹ *Id.* at 2, 6.

¹²² *Id.* at 6.

¹²³ *See id.* at 7; *see also id.* at 3 (“Applicants have advanced commercialization of the Project to near completion, with most LNG exports from the Project facilities already committed under long-term LNG sales contracts.”).

to be filed, all long-term commercial agreements, once executed, in accordance with DOE's established policy and precedent.¹²⁴

DOE takes administrative notice that Cheniere Energy announced a positive final investment decision of the Corpus Christi Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project on June 24, 2025.¹²⁵

VI. APPLICANT'S PUBLIC INTEREST ANALYSIS

A. Overview

CCL states that NGA section 3(a) creates a presumption that the proposed export of natural gas is in the public interest, which opponents bear the burden of overcoming.¹²⁶ CCL points to its existing authorizations and states that DOE has already determined that the "United States will experience net economic benefits from the issuance of authorizations to export domestically produced LNG[,] citing to the conclusions of the 2018 LNG Export Study."¹²⁷ CCL maintains that the same rationale supporting DOE's grant of authority in those proceedings applies equally here. CCL incorporates by reference DOE's prior LNG export studies and its previous "substantial" record demonstrating the public interest benefits of LNG exports from the CCL Terminal in Docket Nos. 12-97-LNG, 12-99-LNG, 18-78-LNG and 19-124-LNG.¹²⁸

Additionally, CCL points to DOE's 1984 DOE Policy Guidelines, and states that DOE, historically, has referred to the principles of "minimizing federal control and involvement in energy markets and promotion of a balanced and mixed energy resource system."¹²⁹ CCL argues

¹²⁴ *Id.* at 7-8.

¹²⁵ See Press Release, Cheniere Energy, Inc., Cheniere Announces Positive Final Investment Decision on the Corpus Christi Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project and Updated Company Outlook through 2030 (June 24, 2025), <https://lngir.cheniere.com/assets/528109b7ec859156f937714ff4553540/cheniere/news/2025-06-24-Cheniere-Announces-Positive-Final-Investment-321.pdf>.

¹²⁶ App. at 8.

¹²⁷ *Id.* at 12 (citing *Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4799, at 45).

¹²⁸ *Id.* at 13.

¹²⁹ *Id.* at 9 (citing U.S. Dep't of Energy, New Policy Guidelines and Delegations Order Relating to Regulation of Imported Natural Gas, 49 Fed. Reg. 6684, 6685 (Feb. 22, 1984)).

that DOE, in granting prior export authorizations, “has established the domestic need for the [natural] gas as the primary factor weighing on the public interest,” but also takes a broader approach focusing on “(ii) whether the proposed exports pose a threat to the security of domestic natural gas supplies, (iii) whether the arrangement is consistent with DOE’s policy of promoting market competition, and (iv) any other factors bearing on the public interest as determined by DOE, such as international and environmental impacts.”¹³⁰

B. Domestic Natural Gas Supply and Demand

CCL asserts that domestic natural gas supplies are “more than adequate to satisfy both domestic needs and exports of LNG” for the foreseeable future.¹³¹ CCL points to EIA’s finding, in its then-most current *Annual Energy Outlook 2023* (AEO 2023), that ““continued growth in U.S. production,[] combined with relatively little growth in domestic consumption, allows the United States to remain a net exporter of . . . natural gas through 2050 in all AEO2023 cases.””¹³² CCL also emphasizes EIA’s findings that, in 2021, proved reserves of U.S. natural gas increased by over 32%, or 152.1 trillion cubic feet (Tcf), from 473.3 Tcf at year-end 2020 to 625.4 Tcf at year-end 2021, ““establishing a new record for natural gas proved reserves in the United States.””¹³³ Thus, according to CCL, “current projections for both domestic gas supply, as well as consumption, support the assertion that the proposed LNG exports from the Project are not inconsistent with the public interest.”¹³⁴

¹³⁰ *Id.* (quoting *Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4799, at 28).

¹³¹ *Id.*

¹³² App. at 10 (quoting U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *Annual Energy Outlook 2023*, at 6 (with projections to 2050) (Mar. 16, 2023), https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/pdf/AEO2023_Narrative.pdf [hereinafter AEO 2023]).

¹³³ *Id.* at 10 (quoting U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *Proved Reserves of Crude Oil and Natural Gas in the United States, Year-End 2021*, at 2 (Dec. 30, 2022), https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/crudeoilreserves/pdf/usreserves_2021.pdf).

¹³⁴ *Id.* at 9.

C. Local, Regional, and National Economic Benefits

CCL states that the Project “will provide the United States with significant benefits, including stimulating the local, regional, and national economies through direct job creation, purchases of goods and services, wages, increased economic activity and tax revenues, and can promote stability in pricing for domestic natural gas.”¹³⁵

Specifically, CCL states that the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project is expected to have a construction workforce averaging approximately 1,500 workers, with an estimated peak of around 2,100 workers, and will result in approximately 45 new employees during operation.¹³⁶ CCL further asserts that the Project “is estimated to have millions of dollars in total construction payroll, as well as millions of dollars in total material purchases, of which approximately 10 percent is anticipated to be sourced locally (within San Patricio and Nueces counties).”¹³⁷ CCL estimates that, once operational, the Project will “lead to millions of dollars in gross product in annual gains in U.S. business activity and over 800 permanent jobs, as well as millions of dollars in additional federal tax receipts.”¹³⁸

In sum, CCL asserts that the “[e]conomic impacts from construction and other pre-operational activities associated with the Project, for the U.S. as a whole, are anticipated to lead to an increase in employment in the region as well as significant business activity resulting in billions of dollars in total expenditures and gross product.”¹³⁹

¹³⁵ *Id.* at 11.

¹³⁶ *Id.*

¹³⁷ *Id.* (adding that these expenditures, along with spending on equipment and services in the region, “would generate economic activity and support employment and income elsewhere in the economy through the multiplier effect”).

¹³⁸ *App.* at 12.

¹³⁹ *Id.*

D. International Trade and Geopolitical Benefits

CCL states that natural gas exports are consistent with U.S. policy initiatives and global energy priorities.¹⁴⁰ CCL asserts that its requested non-FTA authorization will provide significant trade benefits including promoting liberalization of the global natural gas trade through fostering of a liquid global LNG market, advancing national security and the security of U.S. allies through diversification of global natural gas supplies, and increasing economic trade and ties with foreign nations, “thus improving the U.S. balance of trade, and displacing fuels with more significant environmental impacts in foreign countries.”¹⁴¹ Pointing to U.S. energy and trade policies and “the global energy crisis caused by Russia’s invasion of Ukraine,” CCL maintains that its proposed exports will help “to mitigate international energy shortages from geopolitical events.”¹⁴²

VII. CURRENT PROCEEDING BEFORE DOE

A. Public Citizen’s Motion to Intervene and Protest

On July 7, 2023, Public Citizen filed a motion to intervene and protest opposing CCL’s Application.¹⁴³ Public Citizen states that it is a national, not-for-profit, non-partisan research and advocacy organization representing the interests of household consumers.

In protesting the Application, Public Citizen asserts that the Application is inconsistent with the public interest. First, Public Citizen argues that CCL relies on DOE’s “discredited” 2018 LNG Export Study, which “fail[ed] to accurately measure the disruptive impact record natural gas exports are having on U.S. energy markets that are negatively impacting American consumers.”¹⁴⁴ Quoting EIA’s AEO 2023, Public Citizen argues that “higher LNG exports

¹⁴⁰ *Id.* at 14.

¹⁴¹ *Id.*

¹⁴² *Id.* at 15.

¹⁴³ *See* Public Citizen Pleading, *supra* § I.

¹⁴⁴ *Id.*

create a tighter domestic natural gas market (all else held equal), increasing domestic natural gas prices.”¹⁴⁵

Observing that “the United States is the world’s largest natural gas producer *and* exporter,” Public Citizen argues that LNG exports are now “tether[ing] American consumers to global disruptions, radically upending domestic energy markets, and forcing American families to compete with Berlin and Beijing for U.S. produced energy.”¹⁴⁶ Public Citizen contends that, as a result of both this “globalization” of domestic benchmark prices for natural gas and exposure to increased volatility, “[n]atural gas exports are directly responsible for Americans paying higher prices to heat and cool their homes.”¹⁴⁷ In particular, Public Citizen argues that, in New England, high global LNG prices are contributing to higher winter natural gas futures prices. According to Public Citizen, these high prices are creating “significant economic hardship for tens of millions of American families” and driving inflation in the United States.¹⁴⁸

Additionally, Public Citizen argues that CCL’s claims of “job creation and tax benefits” associated with its proposed exports are offset by “tax breaks.”¹⁴⁹ Specifically, Public Citizen asserts that the Application “omits reference to the \$172 million in local property tax reductions [that] Corpus Christi LNG’s export facility has obtained that mitigate these purported benefits.”¹⁵⁰ Public Citizen also contends that CCL’s parent company, Cheniere Energy, “is entitled to an array of special tax breaks through the Foreign Trade Zone program,” and urges CCL to detail the financial value of all of its tax breaks.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁵ *Id.* at 2 (quoting AEO 2023).

¹⁴⁶ *Id.* at 3.

¹⁴⁷ *Id.*

¹⁴⁸ *Id.*

¹⁴⁹ Public Citizen Pleading at 5.

¹⁵⁰ *Id.*

¹⁵¹ *Id.* (citation omitted).

Finally, addressing energy security, Public Citizen argues that the Application undermines U.S. security, as CCL’s requested exports will more likely benefit China rather than Europe. Public Citizen also raises concerns that “a handful of LNG companies and financial traders” are engaging in “unregulated price gouging” in selling U.S. LNG, “while European and American households struggle to make ends meet.”¹⁵²

B. Sierra Club’s Motion to Intervene and Protest

In support of its motion to intervene, filed on July 7, 2023, Sierra Club states that its interests in this proceeding are based on the impact that CCL’s proposed exports will have on its members and mission.¹⁵³ Sierra Club contends that the proposed exports will harm its members by increasing the prices they pay for energy and by increasing natural gas production, which in turn will lead to a variety of associated environmental harms.¹⁵⁴

In protesting the requested non-FTA authorization, Sierra Club also contends that CCL’s proposed exports are not in the public interest and “should be denied or, in the alternative, heavily conditioned” for several reasons, as summarized below.¹⁵⁵

Domestic energy prices and supply. Sierra Club asserts that CCL’s proposed exports would increase the prices that its members pay for energy, both natural gas and electricity.¹⁵⁶ According to Sierra Club, “exports are increasingly linking domestic [natural] gas prices to prices in the global market,” and these alleged price increases “harm American households and energy intensive industry.”¹⁵⁷ For example, Sierra Club argues that “[i]n 2021, benchmark futures prices at the Henry Hub increased 103% relative to the previous winter, with larger

¹⁵² *Id.* at 6; *see also id.* at 7.

¹⁵³ Sierra Club Pleading at 3.

¹⁵⁴ *See id.* at 1, 3-6.

¹⁵⁵ *Id.* at 3.

¹⁵⁶ *Id.*

¹⁵⁷ *Id.* at 7.

increases elsewhere, including more than quadrupling of the price at the Algonquin Citygate outside Boston.”¹⁵⁸

Sierra Club further contends that DOE must address distributional aspects of potential natural gas price impacts.¹⁵⁹ Sierra Club argues that DOE has never grappled with the distributional impacts of LNG exports, beyond acknowledging that LNG exports have some positive and some negative economic impacts.¹⁶⁰ Sierra Club maintains that “all Americans must pay energy bills, but few own shares (even indirectly, through pension plans and the like) in the gas companies that are benefiting from high gas prices and LNG sales.”¹⁶¹ Sierra Club thus emphasizes that the “distributional and equity impacts of the Project require careful consideration,” so that all consumers are protected through reasonable natural gas prices as contemplated by the NGA.¹⁶²

Environmental impacts. Turning to environmental issues, Sierra Club argues that CCL’s proposed exports will cause environmental harm occurring across the entire LNG lifecycle, which both the NGA and NEPA require DOE to consider.¹⁶³

According to Sierra Club, CCL’s proposed exports cannot qualify for DOE’s existing B.57 categorical exclusion, *Export of natural gas and associated transportation by marine vessel*.¹⁶⁴ Sierra Club argues that this revised categorical exclusion is arbitrary, capricious, and contrary to law.¹⁶⁵ Specifically, Sierra Club states that, “in promulgating the 2020 exclusion,

¹⁵⁸ *Id.* & n.26 (citing FERC, 2021-2022 Winter Energy Market and Reliability Assessment, at 2 (Oct. 25, 2022), <https://www.ferc.gov/media/report-2022-2023-winter-assessment>).

¹⁵⁹ Sierra Club Pleading at 10-12.

¹⁶⁰ *Id.* at 10.

¹⁶¹ *Id.* (citations omitted).

¹⁶² *Id.* at 10-12.

¹⁶³ *Id.* at 14-16.

¹⁶⁴ Sierra Club references 10 C.F.R. Part 1021, Subpt. D, App. B, Categorical Exclusion B5.7, and DOE’s NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, discussed *supra* § II.C.

¹⁶⁵ Sierra Club Pleading at 17.

DOE improperly excluded from NEPA review *all* impacts occurring upstream of the point of export, based on a basic and fundamental legal error.”¹⁶⁶ Sierra Club claims that, because DOE has authority to consider “the impacts of export-induced natural gas production,” the revised B5.7 categorical exclusion “was adopted unlawfully, cannot be relied upon here, and provides no evidence to suggest that all environmental effects occurring before the point of exports will be insignificant.”¹⁶⁷ Similarly, Sierra Club argues that DOE’s treatment of downstream impacts under the revised B5.7 categorical exclusion was also arbitrary. According to Sierra Club, DOE asserted that some downstream impacts are outside of DOE’s scope of NEPA analysis (*e.g.*, downstream impacts relating to regasification and use of exported natural gas) when, in fact, “DOE has authority to consider these impacts when making its public interest determination.”¹⁶⁸

Sierra Club further adds that, DOE “cannot invoke a categorical exclusion” for CCL’s Application “without determining that the proposed action has the ‘integral elements’ of excluded actions as defined in Appendix B to 10 C.F.R. Part 2021.”¹⁶⁹ According to Sierra Club, the Application does not satisfy “integral element 1” (among others) because it “‘threaten[s] a violation’” of Executive Order 14008, *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad* (then in effect).¹⁷⁰

Next, Sierra Club maintains that DOE’s prior life cycle analyses evaluating the greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts associated with LNG exports “are not a substitute for NEPA review” and do not demonstrate that GHG emissions caused by CCL’s proposed exports are consistent with the public interest.¹⁷¹ Sierra Club maintains that, although DOE’s life cycle

¹⁶⁶ *Id.* (emphasis in original).

¹⁶⁷ *Id.* (citing, *e.g.*, *Sierra Club v. Fed. Energy Regul. Comm’n*, 827 F.3d 36 (D.C. Cir. 2016)).

¹⁶⁸ *Id.* at 18-19.

¹⁶⁹ *Id.* at 19.

¹⁷⁰ *Id.* at 20 (citing Exec. Order No. 14008 of Jan. 27, 2021, *Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad*, 86 Fed. Reg. 7619 (Feb. 1, 2021)).

¹⁷¹ Sierra Club Pleading at 23.

analyses may inform NEPA review, “DOE must address the impacts of [the CCL Application] and other LNG proposals within the NEPA framework.”¹⁷²

Sierra Club also argues that DOE’s prior life cycle analyses “ask the wrong questions” by looking only to the “short term.”¹⁷³ Sierra Club asserts that any such life cycle analysis must include a “discussion of whether increasing LNG export[s] will help or hinder achievement of the long-term drastic emission reductions that are essential to avoiding the most catastrophic levels of climate change” over an export term lasting through the year 2050.¹⁷⁴ Sierra Club further contends that natural gas production emits greater amounts of methane than what DOE’s prior analyses have assumed.¹⁷⁵ For these and other reasons, Sierra Club argues that DOE must revisit its prior life cycle analyses and take a “hard look at the climate impact of increasing U.S. LNG exports,” including considering both the impact of such exports on domestic emissions and reasonable forecasts about global impacts, such as U.S. goals for reducing GHG emissions.¹⁷⁶

Project Benefits. Sierra Club argues that the Application “overstates the potential benefits associated with the Project.”¹⁷⁷ Sierra Club acknowledges that, “because of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, there is a geopolitical and humanitarian crisis in Europe.”¹⁷⁸ Sierra Club contends, however, that the proposed CCL Project “would provide no benefit to Europe and is not necessary to assist Europe” due to the construction schedule necessary for the Project.¹⁷⁹ According to Sierra Club, “[e]ven if [CCL] planned to bring the Project online earlier, no additional LNG infrastructure is needed to satisfy the additional demand from Europe.”¹⁸⁰

¹⁷² *Id.*

¹⁷³ *Id.* at 24.

¹⁷⁴ *Id.*

¹⁷⁵ *Id.* at 26-27.

¹⁷⁶ *Id.* at 26.

¹⁷⁷ Sierra Club Pleading at 29 (section heading).

¹⁷⁸ *Id.*

¹⁷⁹ *Id.*

¹⁸⁰ *Id.*

Sierra Club further questions whether the Project “will have a meaningful local economic benefit” by providing local jobs, purchasing goods and services, and tax revenues.¹⁸¹ According to Sierra Club, the Application is too vague to determine whether the Project will provide the various public benefits identified by CCL.¹⁸²

C. CCL’s Answer

CCL contends that the arguments set forth in Public Citizen’s and Sierra Club’s protests are inaccurate, misleading, and raise issues outside of the scope of the Application and, therefore, should be disregarded.¹⁸³ Specifically, CCL states that “much of the opposition is generalized in nature and challenges long-established DOE/FECM policies and precedent, and such challenges have previously been rejected by DOE/FECM and the courts.”¹⁸⁴ CCL maintains that the protests do not provide information to suggest that the proposed exports are inconsistent with the public interest under NGA section 3(a), or to support “conditioning” the export authorization in the manner suggested by Sierra Club.¹⁸⁵

First, CCL disputes Public Citizen’s and Sierra Club’s arguments concerning potential natural gas supply and price impacts associated with increased LNG exports.¹⁸⁶ CCL states that “current projections for U.S. gas supply are more than sufficient to meet both domestic needs as well as the exports proposed by [CCL] and others approved by DOE/FECM.”¹⁸⁷ Citing EIA’s AEO 2023 and DOE’s 2018 LNG Export Study, CCL maintains that future domestic natural gas supply will continue to outpace anticipated demand in the near term and through 2050 with

¹⁸¹ *Id.* at 29-30.

¹⁸² *Id.*

¹⁸³ CCL Answer at 3.

¹⁸⁴ *Id.*

¹⁸⁵ *Id.*

¹⁸⁶ *Id.*

¹⁸⁷ *Id.* at 3-4.

limited price increases, and thus support U.S. LNG export levels.¹⁸⁸ Accordingly, CCL contends that LNG exports do not threaten domestic natural gas supply or cause significant price increases.¹⁸⁹

Next, CCL states that Sierra Club continues to allege that “DOE has not addressed concerns regarding distributional impacts,”¹⁹⁰ without acknowledging that DOE has repeatedly rejected these arguments over the years, including in proceedings in which the D.C. Circuit ruled in DOE’s favor on this issue.¹⁹¹ CCL states that Sierra Club fails to provide any substantial record evidence to contradict DOE or the Court’s findings.¹⁹²

CCL also refutes Sierra Club’s argument that DOE “is required to review impacts from the upstream production associated with the natural gas exported by the [Midscale] Trains 8 & 9 Project.”¹⁹³ CCL maintains that the D.C. Circuit has previously rejected the Sierra Club’s arguments that DOE must consider the indirect effects of export-induced natural gas production and similarly rejected Sierra Club’s challenge to DOE’s treatment of potential downstream GHG emissions.¹⁹⁴

Further, CCL states that DOE “routinely incorporates into its orders its Environmental Studies addressing various aspects of the LNG production and export chain,” and that “Sierra Club’s continued attacks on DOE’s Environmental Studies should be afforded no weight here.”¹⁹⁵ According to CCL, Sierra Club simply makes “generalized claims” about the alleged inadequacies of DOE’s Environmental Studies, but “offers no persuasive reason why [DOE’s]

¹⁸⁸ *Id.* at 4 (citing AEO 2023).

¹⁸⁹ CCL Answer at 3 (section heading).

¹⁹⁰ *Id.* at 6-7.

¹⁹¹ *Id.* at 7 (citing *Sierra Club II*, 703 Fed. App’x at *3).

¹⁹² *Id.*

¹⁹³ *Id.* at 8.

¹⁹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁹⁵ *Id.* at 9.

incorporation of its Environmental Studies cannot satisfy the ‘hard look’ at environmental impacts required by NEPA.”¹⁹⁶

Turning to other environmental concerns raised in the protests, CCL emphasizes that the siting, construction, operation and maintenance of the Project, “a matter squarely within FERC’s jurisdiction to evaluate,” is undergoing NEPA review by FERC.¹⁹⁷ CCL states, however, that “[b]efore FERC has published any environmental documents with respect to the [Midscale] Trains 8 & 9 Project, or even determined whether an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement will be prepared, Sierra Club contends there will be ‘significant environmental impacts’ and makes the conclusory statement that ‘[t]his will be confirmed by NEPA review.’”¹⁹⁸ Moreover, CCL states that “Sierra Club’s demand that [DOE] deviate from its past practice and even duplicate aspects of the environmental review to be performed by FERC is not required by NEPA and would be inconsistent with [DOE] precedent.”¹⁹⁹ CCL argues that Sierra Club’s conclusory comments on the Project impacts should be ignored.²⁰⁰

Finally, CCL argues that the Project will have significant public benefits.²⁰¹ CCL rejects the protestors’ contention that LNG exports from the CCL Project will not help national security and reduce reliance on Russian natural gas in the short term.²⁰² CCL acknowledges that it has “requested an extended construction deadline from FERC (to complete construction and place the facilities in service by 2031) to accommodate the potential for phasing, schedule changes or unforeseen disruptions[,]” but contends that “under optimal conditions, the construction duration is anticipated to be only four years for both trains, and in either case, due to phasing, at least a

¹⁹⁶ CCL Answer at 10.

¹⁹⁷ *Id.* at 12.

¹⁹⁸ *Id.* (citing Sierra Club Pleading at 27).

¹⁹⁹ *Id.* at 13.

²⁰⁰ *Id.* at 12 (section heading).

²⁰¹ *Id.* at 13.

²⁰² CCL Answer at 13-14.

portion of the Project should be operational well before such deadline.”²⁰³ According to CCL, “it is reasonable to assume that the transition away from Russian energy sources will continue over the next decade and beyond,” and therefore, “[t]here is no basis to believe that exports from the Project will not be sent to European nations as replacement for fuels previously provided from Russia.”²⁰⁴

Addressing arguments concerning the estimated economic and tax benefits of the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project, CCL states that it anticipates a construction workforce that will average approximately 1,500 workers, with an estimated peak at about 2,100 workers, and that “the Project is expected to support 45 new workers employed directly by the facility, and through direct and indirect economic effects—lead to millions of dollars in gross product in annual gains in U.S. business activity and over 800 permanent jobs, as well as millions of dollars in additional federal tax receipts.”²⁰⁵ CCL asserts that Public Citizen and Sierra Club “unsuccessfully attempt to undermine such [significant economic] benefits by noting that [CCL] will receive certain tax incentives.”²⁰⁶ CCL argues, however, that they “misunderstand the scope and duration of the tax incentives received by the Project” and that the tax incentives do not eliminate all property taxes paid.²⁰⁷

For these and other reasons set forth in the Answer, CCL argues that DOE should reject both protests.

VIII. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In reviewing the non-FTA portion of the Application, DOE has considered its obligations

²⁰³ *Id.*

²⁰⁴ *Id.* at 14.

²⁰⁵ *Id.* at 16-17; *see also* App. at 11.

²⁰⁶ CCL Answer at 17-18.

²⁰⁷ *Id.* at 17.

under NGA section 3(a) and NEPA, as well as the directives of E.O. 14154. To accomplish these purposes, DOE has examined a range of information addressing economic and non-economic factors, including but not limited to:

- CCL’s Application;
- The Motions to Intervene and Protests filed by Public Citizen and Sierra Club, and CCL’s Answer thereto; and
- Relevant portions of the 2024 LNG Export Study, including comments received in response to the 2024 Study.

A. Procedural Matters

CCL did not oppose Public Citizen’s or Sierra Club’s motion to intervene, and therefore the motions are deemed granted by operation of law.²⁰⁸

B. Economic Issues

1. Significance of the 2024 LNG Export Study on Economic Issues

As discussed above, DOE commissioned the 2024 LNG Export Study and invited public comments on the 2024 Study. DOE evaluated this material in its Response to Comments on the 2024 LNG Export Study, published in the *Federal Register* on May 22, 2025.²⁰⁹

DOE concluded in the Response to Comments that U.S. domestic natural gas supply is sufficient to meet domestic and market-based global demand for U.S. natural gas, including LNG, in all scenarios.²¹⁰ Additionally, DOE found that increasing LNG exports results in an increase to U.S. GDP in all cases examined, including by an estimated \$410 billion cumulatively for the period 2020 through 2050 under the Reference case.²¹¹ Indeed, the 2024 Study shows

²⁰⁸ 10 C.F.R. § 590.303(g); *see also infra* § XI.N.

²⁰⁹ *See supra* § III.C.

²¹⁰ Response to Comments at 43; *see also id.* at 21.

²¹¹ *See id.* at 47.

macroeconomic benefits to the U.S. economy across the range of scenarios analyzed.²¹² DOE also concluded that higher levels of U.S. LNG exports will provide additional economic benefits through improvements to the U.S. trade balance, increased federal and state tax revenues, and increased jobs.²¹³

Turning to the potential impact of LNG exports on domestic natural gas prices, Public Citizen and Sierra Club allege that higher volumes of LNG exports, including CCL’s proposed exports, will lead to large increases in domestic prices of natural gas.²¹⁴ DOE found, however, that “[i]ncreased LNG exports are projected to have relatively modest impacts on prices.”²¹⁵ In particular, “any domestic price impact is expected to be minimal due to the abundant supply of natural gas in the United States.”²¹⁶ DOE further determined that U.S. LNG exports have not had a “consistent effect” on the price of domestic natural gas to date.²¹⁷ Specifically, DOE found that the potential price impacts from increased LNG exports modeled in the 2024 Study “are within the range of prices observed over the past five years” (*i.e.*, since 2018)—and, moreover, are below the long-term price increases from U.S. LNG exports projected in DOE’s prior economic study, the 2018 LNG Export Study.²¹⁸

Table 1 below shows a comparison of EIA’s projections in the *Annual Energy Outlook 2017* (AEO 2017)²¹⁹ that formed the basis of the 2018 LNG Export Study and DOE’s projections

²¹² *See id.*

²¹³ *Id.* at 48 (stating that, although the 2024 Study does not specifically quantify the U.S. trade balance, DOE finds that an increase in the quantity of U.S. products sold abroad works to improve the balance of trade, and thus “DOE agrees that an improved trade balance would be an important benefit of greater LNG exports”); *see also id.* at 49 (stating that the 2024 Study “did not quantify job or wage revenues attributable to the construction and operation of LNG facilities,” but that DOE “postulates that LNG export facilities have a positive impact on the U.S. job market” based on quantitative information provided by several commenters).

²¹⁴ *See* Public Citizen Pleading at 2-3; Sierra Club Pleading at 7-10.

²¹⁵ Response to Comments at 46, 48.

²¹⁶ *Id.* at 46.

²¹⁷ *Id.* at 46-47.

²¹⁸ *Id.*

²¹⁹ U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *Annual Energy Outlook 2017* (with projections to 2050) (Jan. 5, 2017), <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/archive/aeo17/> [hereinafter AEO 2017].

in the 2024 Study.²²⁰ For the year 2050, the 2024 Study projects LNG exports of 56.3 Bcf/d of natural gas—more than quadruple the level projected in the 2018 LNG Export Study at 12.7 Bcf/d.²²¹ Over the same projection period, the 2024 Study projects an average Henry Hub natural gas price of \$4.62/MMBtu, a decrease of 28% from \$6.40/MMBtu in real dollars projected under the 2018 Study.

Table 1: Year 2050 Reference Case Comparisons in AEO 2017 (Basis of 2018 LNG Export Study) and 2024 LNG Export Study

	AEO 2017 Reference Case Without Clean Power Plan	2024 LNG Export Study – Defined Policies: Market Resolved Scenario
Lower-48 Dry Natural Gas Production (Bcf/d)	107.9	139.6
Total Natural Gas Consumption (Bcf/d)	92.4	80.3
Electric Power Sector Consumption (Bcf/d)	31.8	17.8
LNG Exports – Total (Bcf/d)	12.7	56.3
Henry Hub Spot Price (\$/MMBtu) ^(Note 1)	\$6.40 (2022\$)	\$4.62 (2022\$)

Note 1: Prices adjusted to 2022\$ with the AEO 2017 projection of a GDP price index.

²²⁰ 2024 Study Appendix A; *see also* 2024 Study Appendix B at B-57 – B-59.

²²¹ *See* AEO 2017, Table 62 (Natural Gas Imports and Exports), https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/data/browser/#/?id=76-AEO2017®ion=0-0&cases=ref_no_cpp&start=2015&end=2050&f=A&sourcekey=0. AEO 2017 included two versions of the Reference case—one with, and one without, the implementation of a rulemaking by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) called the Clean Power Plan. EPA repealed the Clean Power Plan in 2019. Therefore, we refer only to the AEO 2017 Reference case without the Clean Power Plan.

For these reasons and those set forth in the Response to Comments, we find that Public Citizen’s and Sierra Club’s arguments concerning price impacts are not sufficiently supported by record evidence to overcome DOE’s finding based on the 2024 Study that CCL’s proposed exports will generate net economic benefits to the U.S. economy and will not be inconsistent with the public interest.

2. CCL’s Application

Upon review of the Application, DOE finds that several factors identified in the Application support a grant of CCL’s requested authorization.

First, CCL points to EIA data and projections in asserting that the United States has abundant natural gas resources available to meet both projected future domestic needs and demand for the proposed exports.²²² We agree. In addition to the 2024 LNG Export Study, we take administrative notice of EIA’s most recent authoritative projections, set forth in the *Annual Energy Outlook 2025* (AEO 2025),²²³ to evaluate current and future natural gas supply, demand, and prices. Specifically, DOE has assessed AEO 2025 to evaluate any differences from AEO 2023, which formed the basis for the 2024 Study. We find that EIA’s projections in AEO 2025 continue to show market conditions that will accommodate increased exports of natural gas—well above what is required to meet projected increases in domestic consumption.²²⁴ DOE therefore rejects the protestors’ claim that forecasted demand for natural gas, including the demand related to the proposed export of LNG, will outstrip new resources.

²²² See App. at 9.

²²³ U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *Annual Energy Outlook 2025* (Apr. 15, 2025), <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/> [hereinafter AEO 2025].

²²⁴ U.S. Energy Info. Admin., AEO 2025, Table 13 (last visited Feb. 25, 2026), <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/data/browser/#/?id=13-AEO2025&cases=ref2025&sourcekey=0>.

Second, Public Citizen and Sierra Club raise concerns about the “high prices” of LNG exports creating significant economic hardship for many Americans, with Sierra Club arguing that these prices impact certain households (including low-income, Black, Hispanic, and Native American households) more than the average household.²²⁵ The D.C. Circuit, however, previously rejected an argument by Sierra Club that DOE “erred by failing to consider distributional impacts” when evaluating the public interest under NGA section 3(a).²²⁶ Moreover, neither Public Citizen nor Sierra Club have provided an analysis of distributional consequences of authorizing LNG exports at the household level to support their concerns. CCL described in its Application and Answer the various public benefits that will be produced by the construction and operation of the Project to the local economy and the United States more broadly, including increased employment to support the Project.²²⁷

We also emphasize a principal finding of the 2024 Study: increasing U.S. LNG exports increases U.S. GDP.²²⁸ More specifically, we note that DOE acknowledged the concerns raised by Sierra Club and others that “low-income [] American households all face dramatically higher energy burdens.”²²⁹ Indeed, the 2024 Study employed an analytical tool (the “HEIDM tool”) for the purpose of examining impacts by income class.²³⁰

DOE also found that, with respect to changes in the price of industrial inputs such as natural gas (which, under Sierra Club’s view, could adversely impact U.S. industrial consumers),²³¹ “the impact of any price changes on industrial inputs and thus the cost of other

²²⁵ See Public Citizen Pleading at 2-5; Sierra Club Pleading at 1, 9-12.

²²⁶ See *Sierra Club II*, 703 Fed. App’x at *3 (consolidated case denying three petitions for review of LNG export authorizations).

²²⁷ App. at 11-12; see also Answer at 16-17.

²²⁸ See Response to Comments at 46; see also *id.* at 47 (Key Conclusions).

²²⁹ *Id.* at 25.

²³⁰ *Id.*

²³¹ See *Sierra Club Pleading* at 9-10.

goods is uncertain in a dynamic economy over a period of 25 years.”²³² DOE thus concluded that “impacts on household and industrial energy expenditures, which may be as small as the margin of error of the analysis,” are “insufficient to overcome the other economic benefits associated with increased LNG exports, including GDP, balance of trade, tax revenue, and employment effects.”²³³ Accordingly, we find that the record does not support Public Citizen’s and Sierra Club’s arguments.

Third, we agree that, over the term of the authorization, the proposed exports will improve the United States’ ties with its allies and trade partners and make a positive contribution to the United States’ economy, including the trade balance. For instance, even beyond the economic investment and jobs created from constructing the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project at the CCL Terminal, a similar size project exporting at its peak capacity for one year (0.47 Bcf/d or 170 Bcf) could reduce the trade deficit by up to approximately \$1.1 billion annually based on observed average U.S. LNG export prices for January through December 2024.²³⁴ Further, the increased value of CCL’s exports would spur other domestic economic activity and benefits, including the potential for supporting upstream production and related employment.

In sum, based on the 2024 Study, the most recent data in AEO 2025, and other evidence provided by CCL, DOE finds that the market will be capable of sustaining the level of non-FTA exports requested in CCL’s Application over the authorization term without negative economic impacts that overcome the economic benefits derived from such exports. We also find that CCL’s requested non-FTA export volume is consistent with U.S. policy.

²³² See Response to Comments at 25.

²³³ *Id.*

²³⁴ Specifically, \$6.41/Mcf * 170 Bcf. See U.S. Energy Info. Admin., Natural Gas Monthly, Table 5, LNG Export Prices (p. 20), https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/monthly/pdf/table_05.pdf (Jan. 2026). We note that this value could fluctuate based on U.S. LNG export prices, but the values would have been higher based on export prices in both 2023 (\$7.57/Mcf) and 2022 (\$12.24/Mcf).

C. Energy Security

An efficient, transparent international market for natural gas with diverse sources of supply provides both economic and strategic benefits to the United States and our allies. For example, in light of the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine, there continue to be concerns about energy security for Europe and Central Asia, particularly given the relative share of Russian natural gas supplied to those regions until recently,²³⁵ with continued risk due to the now-expired agreement for the supply of Russian natural gas to Europe.²³⁶

Sierra Club, however, asserts that the export capacity brought online several years from now will not address the immediate energy needs of Europe.²³⁷ Likewise, Public Citizen argues that “China—not Europe—will be the center of LNG growth,” and thus CCL’s “requested exports will more likely benefit China rather than Europe.”²³⁸ These arguments, however, are not supported by current facts.

The United States has an increasingly important role in the EU’s natural gas supply. Since 2022, following Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the vast majority of U.S. LNG exports have been imported by countries in Europe. In 2022, for example, Europe received 69% of all LNG exports from the United States, up from 34% in 2021.²³⁹ Similarly, from January through November 2025, “Europe received 68% of U.S.-origin exports.”²⁴⁰ Further, the European

²³⁵ According to EIA data, until immediately before Russia attacked Ukraine, natural gas imports delivered by pipeline into Europe provided most imported volumes into Europe, with imports sourced from Russia pre-2022 comprising the largest share. See U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *Today in Energy* (Feb. 11, 2022), <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=51258>.

²³⁶ Reuters reports that the five-year agreement between Moscow and Kyiv for the transit of Russian natural gas to Europe via Ukraine expired on January 1, 2025, as Kyiv refused to renew a transit agreement extending or developing a new deal. See Reuters, *Russian gas era in Europe ends as Ukraine stops transit* (Jan. 1, 2025), <https://www.reuters.com/business/energy/russia-halts-gas-exports-europe-via-ukraine-2025-01-01/>.

²³⁷ See Sierra Club Pleading at 29.

²³⁸ Public Citizen Pleading at 7.

²³⁹ See U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *Today in Energy*, “Ten years after first Sabine Pass cargo, U.S. LNG exports are still on the rise” (Feb. 24, 2026), <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=67224>.

²⁴⁰ See *id.*

Commission recently approved a legally binding ban on European Union (EU) imports of Russian natural gas by the end of 2027, and signaled that, to replace Russian supplies, the EU “could import more U.S. LNG” among other measures.²⁴¹ In EIA’s *International Energy Outlook 2023* (IEO 2023), EIA projected that “slow but increasing natural gas demand growth, coupled with the region’s decreasing natural gas production, increases Western Europe’s net natural gas imports by between 2.3 Tcf and 6.2 Tcf by 2050 across all cases.”²⁴² This analysis further supports a key objective of the “EU’s energy union strategy,” as “[LNG] can contribute to diversifying gas supplies, thus improving EU energy security in the short-term.”²⁴³ We thus find that CCL’s proposed exports will continue to be a source of global supplies for the EU to utilize in light of its declining use of Russian natural gas.

In sum, by authorizing increased exports of U.S.-sourced LNG to non-FTA countries, including to U.S. allies in Europe and elsewhere, this Order will enable CCL to help mitigate energy security concerns once it commences exports.²⁴⁴ More generally, to the extent U.S. exports diversify global LNG supplies and increase the volumes of destination-flexible LNG

²⁴¹ See Reuters, *EU proposes ban on Russian gas imports by end of 2027* (June 18, 2025), <https://www.reuters.com/sustainability/boards-policy-regulation/eu-readies-ban-russian-gas-imports-by-end-2027-2025-06-17/#:~:text=To%20replace%20Russian%20supplies%2C%20the,Spain%2C%20Belgium%2C%20the>; see also Council of the European Union, “Council and Parliament strike a deal on rules to phase out Russian gas imports for an energy secure and independent Europe” (Dec. 3, 2025), <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2025/12/03/council-and-parliament-strike-a-deal-on-rules-to-phase-out-russian-gas-imports-for-an-energy-secure-and-independent-europe/#:~:text=The%20regulation%20introduces%20a%20legally,2026%20and%20autumn%202027%20respectively>.

²⁴² U.S. Energy Info. Admin., *International Energy Outlook 2023* (with projections to 2050), at 45 (Oct. 11, 2023), https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/ieo/pdf/IEO2023_Narrative.pdf.

²⁴³ Official website of the European Union (Energy, LNG), https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/carbon-management-and-fossil-fuels/liquefied-natural-gas_en.

²⁴⁴ We note that Europe was the primary destination of U.S. LNG throughout 2024 and 2025. In December 2025, for example, almost 76% of all U.S. LNG exports went to Europe. See U.S. Dep’t of Energy, *U.S. Natural Gas Imports and Exports Monthly*, at 1 (Feb. 2026), <https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2026-02/Natural%20Gas%20Imports%20and%20Exports%20Monthly%20December%202025.pdf>.

available globally, these exports will improve energy security for many U.S. allies and trading partners.²⁴⁵

We further note that, like all authorizations for the export of natural gas, no export will be permitted to any country for which exports are otherwise restricted by U.S. law or policy. For these reasons, we reiterate our finding that authorizing CCL’s volume of exports to non-FTA countries will not be inconsistent with the public interest.

DOE also notes that, in the 2024 LNG Export Study, DOE projected continued high global demand for natural gas through 2050, demonstrating a need for additional LNG export facilities in the United States such as the Project.²⁴⁶ For example, DOE projected in its *Defined Policies: Market Resolved* scenario that U.S. natural gas production will increase 54%, up to 51.0 trillion cubic feet (Tcf) of natural gas, and LNG exports will increase to 20.5 Tcf, between 2020 and 2050.²⁴⁷ This level of LNG demand growth through to 2050 will require substantial investments in new natural gas and LNG projects.

Additionally, we take administrative notice of a report published in October 2024 by the Institute of Energy Economics, Japan (IEEJ), which found that “[g]lobal LNG demand in 2050 is projected to increase by 74% from the present level.”²⁴⁸ According to the IEEJ, “[o]ne of the focal points of increasing demand is Southeast Asia’s emerging markets, notably the power generation sector,” and “[i]f the energy efficiency improvements assumed in these scenarios are not realised, LNG demand would increase further.”²⁴⁹ Similarly, other forecasts project varying

²⁴⁵ As of December 2025, 17% of U.S. LNG exports have gone to FTA countries, and 83% have gone to non-FTA countries. *See id.* at 45.

²⁴⁶ *See* 2024 Study Appendix A, at A-17 – A-22.

²⁴⁷ 2024 Study Appendix B at B-57, https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-10/LNGUpdate_AppendixB_Dec2024.pdf; 2024 Study Appendix A at A-22, https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-10/LNGUpdate_AppendixA_Dec2024.pdf.

²⁴⁸ The Institute of Energy Economics, Japan, IEEJ 2025 Outlook (Oct. 18, 2024), <https://eneken.ieej.or.jp/data/12114.pdf>.

²⁴⁹ *Id.*

levels of global demand for LNG, with many analysts predicting moderate to significant growth in LNG demand globally. Despite this demand in Asian markets, we note that China has not imported a full cargo of U.S. LNG since December 2024.²⁵⁰

In light of these benefits to U.S. and global energy security, we find that CCL’s requested increase in its non-FTA export volume will advance the public interest for reasons that are distinct from and additional to the benefits discussed above.

D. Issuance of Categorical Exclusion Under NEPA

NEPA is “a purely procedural statute.”²⁵¹ DOE’s NEPA procedures provide for a categorical exclusion for actions that normally do not require preparation of either an EIS or an EA—specifically, categorical exclusion B5.7 (10 C.F.R. Part 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B5), *Export of natural gas and associated transportation by marine vessel*.²⁵² In establishing this revised categorical exclusion, DOE concluded that the “potential environmental effects associated with marine transport, the only reasonably foreseeable environmental impacts associated with DOE natural gas export authorizations, are minimal.”²⁵³

Specifically, “[b]ased on prior NEPA reviews and technical reports” summarized in DOE’s Technical Support Document, DOE “determined that transport of natural gas by marine vessel normally does not pose the potential for significant environmental impacts.”²⁵⁴ DOE also

²⁵⁰ See U.S. Energy Info. Admin., “U.S. Natural Gas Exports and Re-Exports by Country” (exports of LNG by vessel to China by year) (Feb. 6, 2026), https://www.eia.gov/dnav/ng/hist/ngm_epg0_eve_nus-nch_mmcfm.htm.

²⁵¹ *Seven Cnty.*, 605 U.S. at 173, 178, 180, 184.

²⁵² See 10 C.F.R. Part 1021, Subpt. D, App. B, Categorical Exclusion B5.7. This categorical exclusion amended the prior B5.7 categorical exclusion. See NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. 78,197, *supra* § II.C.

²⁵³ NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,199 (emphasis added) (citing *Pub. Citizen*, 541 U.S. at 767-68).

²⁵⁴ *Id.* at 78,198 (citing DOE’s Technical Support Document, *see supra* § II.C); *see also id.* at 78,202 (stating that the Technical Support Document was focused on the potential impacts associated with transporting LNG cargo, and “includes consideration of accidents (including spills and fires), safety and security during transport, and some 50 years of experience transporting LNG on marine vessels”); *id.* (finding that “the effectiveness of [agency] regulations and industry practices over decades of LNG transport provide strong evidence that there is normally no potential for significant environmental impacts due to marine transport of LNG”).

observed that LNG shipments associated with export authorizations “comprise less than one percent of vessel calls from U.S. ports annually.”²⁵⁵ Further, “[e]ven with increased LNG exports, the relative proportion of LNG shipments to total shipping is not expected to change substantially.”²⁵⁶ On this basis, DOE concluded that “marine transport from DOE’s actions does not have the potential to markedly affect the global environmental impacts associated with the commercial shipping industry.”²⁵⁷

In this proceeding, Sierra Club asserts that the B5.7 categorical exclusion is “arbitrary” and “was adopted unlawfully.”²⁵⁸ These arguments are unfounded, as DOE properly adopted the B5.7 categorical exclusion through rulemaking, consistent with NEPA and relevant judicial authorities including *Public Citizen*.²⁵⁹

Sierra Club also raises numerous environmental arguments in opposition to the Application, including that CCL’s proposed exports will increase natural gas production and associated air pollution (including emissions of greenhouse gases and ozone precursors), will increase the severity of climate change, and will harm wildlife.²⁶⁰ Sierra Club specifically contends that the proposed exports will increase shipping traffic which allegedly could, in turn, increase air pollution and adversely impact marine life.²⁶¹ Sierra Club also asserts that DOE must “take a hard look at environmental impacts occurring throughout the entire LNG lifecycle,” before it can accurately assess the foreseeable impacts from CCL’s proposed exports.²⁶²

DOE finds that marine transport effects are the only reasonably foreseeable

²⁵⁵ *Id.* at 78,202.

²⁵⁶ *Id.*

²⁵⁷ *Id.*

²⁵⁸ Sierra Club Pleading at 17.

²⁵⁹ See generally NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule.

²⁶⁰ See, e.g., Sierra Club Pleading at 2-5, 19; see also *supra* § VII.B.

²⁶¹ Sierra Club Pleading at 4-5.

²⁶² *Id.* at 15.

environmental impacts from CCL’s proposed exports. As to Sierra Club’s arguments related to shipping traffic and other alleged marine transport effects, DOE has considered these impacts in accordance with NEPA.²⁶³ DOE also finds that there is no legal requirement to consider any other environmental impacts raised by Sierra Club.²⁶⁴ Indeed, the best reading of the statute may preclude DOE from considering environmental effects beyond DOE’s specified jurisdiction.²⁶⁵ Accordingly, on February 26, 2026, DOE issued a categorical exclusion B5.7 determination for the non-FTA portion of CCL’s Application.²⁶⁶ DOE finds here that this action is excluded from further NEPA review obligations pursuant to that categorical exclusion.²⁶⁷

We acknowledge that this position is a departure from DOE’s past practice of broadly considering the potential upstream and downstream environmental effects of authorizing exports of LNG to non-FTA countries, beyond the transportation of the LNG by marine vessel. However, this position is informed by, and consistent with, the Supreme Court’s holdings in *Public Citizen* and, most recently, *Seven County*, which make clear that “agencies are not required to analyze the effects of projects over which they do not exercise regulatory

²⁶³ See NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,199.

²⁶⁴ See *supra* §§ II.C, III.A; see also, e.g., *Seven Cnty.*, 605 U.S. at 177-78 (emphasizing that NEPA, as a “purely procedural” statute, “does not mandate particular results, but simply prescribes the necessary process’ for an agency’s environmental review of a project”) (quoting *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 350 (1989)); *NAACP v. Fed. Power Comm’n*, 425 U.S. 662, 669-70 (1976) (discussing the “content and meaning” of the words “public interest” in the NGA based on the statute’s “principal purpose” of encouraging “the orderly development of plentiful supplies” of natural gas at reasonable prices).

²⁶⁵ See, e.g., *NAACP*, 425 U.S. at 669-70 (expressing the statute’s “principal purpose”); *Sierra Club I*, 867 F.3d at 203 (noting the “general presumption favoring [export] authorization”); *Morrison v. Nat’l Australia Bank*, 561 U.S. 247, 255 (2010) (precluding extraterritorial application of United States law without “clearly expressed” intention of Congress).

²⁶⁶ U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Categorical Exclusion Determination, Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC, *et al.*, Docket No. 23-46-LNG (Feb. 26, 2026). DOE’s determination that the B5.7 categorical exclusion applies to the Application is entitled to “substantial deference.” *Seven Cnty.*, 605 U.S. at 180; see also *id.* at 182 (in evaluating agency decision-making under NEPA, “[c]ourts should afford substantial deference and should not micromanage those agency choices so long as they fall within a broad zone of reasonableness”).

²⁶⁷ See 42 U.S.C. § 4336(a)(2), (b)(2).

authority.”²⁶⁸ As relevant here, DOE’s authority under section 3 of the NGA extends only to the export of natural gas (including LNG) as a commodity,²⁶⁹ not to the end use of natural gas, over which DOE has no control.²⁷⁰ As noted, this position is also consistent with DOE’s review of its statutory authority in the B5.7 categorical exclusion rulemaking in 2020, which was expressly based on DOE’s statutory authority and the legal principle enunciated in *Public Citizen*.²⁷¹

Assuming, *arguendo*, both that DOE has authority to consider all of the environmental effects that Sierra Club asserts, and such effects are reasonably foreseeable from an authorization and require consideration by DOE, we still would determine that CCL’s proposed exports are consistent with the public interest Congress seeks to advance through NGA section 3(a).²⁷² Weighing the findings of the Technical Support Document, the actions of other federal and state agencies to regulate, permit, and mitigate environmental impacts such as those cited by Sierra Club,²⁷³ and the findings of DOE’s past life cycle analyses, against the economic, energy security, and other factors favoring authorization, we find that CCL’s requested non-FTA exports will advance the public interest.

²⁶⁸ *Seven Cnty.*, 605 U.S. at 189 (discussing *Pub. Citizen*, 541 U.S. at 770, and concluding that “nothing in NEPA required the Board to go further and study environmental impacts from upstream or downstream projects separate in time or place from the 88-mile railroad line’s construction and operation”).

²⁶⁹ *See, e.g., Sierra Club*, 827 F.3d at 40 (recognizing that DOE “maintains exclusive jurisdiction over the export of natural gas as a commodity”); NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,197-98, 78,201 (stating that “DOE’s discretionary authority under Section 3 of the NGA is limited to the authorization of exports of natural gas to non-FTA countries,” and that DOE’s review under NEPA “is limited to the marine transport effects” of such exports); *see also supra* § II.C.

²⁷⁰ *See, e.g., Sierra Club*, 134 F.4th at 575 (holding, in denying petition for review of LNG export authorization issued by DOE under NGA section 3(a), that “the impacts of downstream emissions [from U.S. LNG] in foreign countries are not reasonably foreseeable” under NEPA).

²⁷¹ *See* NEPA Implementing Procedures Final Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. at 78,197 (discussing DOE’s limited review in considering environmental effects associated with the export of LNG to non-FTA countries under NEPA, citing *Pub. Citizen*); *id.* at 78,198-99, 78,201. Sierra Club is currently challenging the B5.7 categorical exclusion and its use in the ongoing Venture Global CP2 LNG, LLC proceeding. *See infra* n.321.

²⁷² *Id.* § 717b(a); *see* App. at 1-2, 6.

²⁷³ *See, e.g.,* 42 U.S.C. § 7401 *et seq.*; 33 U.S.C. § 1901 *et seq.*; 33 U.S.C. § 1322(p); 16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*; 14 U.S.C. § 522; Texas Parks & Wildlife Code Ch. 12 & Ch. 61.

E. Other Considerations

DOE notes the continuing uncertainty that all of the proposed LNG export projects will ever be realized because of the time, difficulty, and expense of commercializing, financing, and constructing LNG export terminals, as well as the uncertainties and competition inherent in the global market for LNG.²⁷⁴

More generally, DOE continues to subscribe to the principle set forth in the 1984 Policy Guidelines that, under most circumstances, the market is the most efficient means of allocating natural gas supplies.²⁷⁵ However, agency intervention may be necessary to protect the public in the event there is insufficient domestic natural gas for domestic use, or as a result of other facts or circumstances beyond those presented here.²⁷⁶

F. Conclusion

Upon review of the record evidence and relevant precedent in earlier non-FTA export decisions, DOE has not found an adequate basis to conclude that CCL's proposed exports of U.S. LNG to non-FTA countries will be inconsistent with the public interest. We thus find that Public Citizen and Sierra Club have failed to overcome the statutory presumption that the proposed export authorization is consistent with the public interest. For that reason, we are authorizing CCL's proposed exports to non-FTA countries as set forth below.

In deciding whether to grant a non-FTA export authorization, DOE also considers the

²⁷⁴ See *infra* § VIII.F (identifying long-term orders vacated or expired to date); see also, e.g., *Sierra Club*, 134 F.4th at 574 (discussing DOE's findings as to "the uncertainties in the global energy markets" affecting the "supply and demand responses" for exports of U.S. LNG in the future).

²⁷⁵ 1984 Policy Guidelines, 49 Fed. Reg. at 6684.

²⁷⁶ In previous orders, some commenters asked DOE to clarify the circumstances under which the agency would exercise its authority to revoke (in whole or in part) final LNG export authorizations. DOE stated that it could not precisely identify all the circumstances under which such action might be considered. Subsequently, in 2018, DOE issued a policy statement addressing this issue. See U.S. Dep't of Energy, Policy Statement Regarding Long-Term Authorizations to Export Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries, 83 Fed. Reg. 28,841 (June 21, 2018).

cumulative impacts of the total volume of all non-FTA export authorizations. With the issuance of this Order and the vacatur or expiration of previous long-term non-FTA export authorizations,²⁷⁷ there are currently 43 final non-FTA authorizations from the lower-48 states in a cumulative volume of exports totaling approximately 53.27 Bcf/d of natural gas, or approximately 19.4 trillion cubic feet per year, as follows:²⁷⁸ Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC (2.2 Bcf/d),²⁷⁹ Cameron LNG, LLC (1.7 Bcf/d),²⁸⁰ FLEX I (1.4 Bcf/d),²⁸¹ FLEX II (0.4 Bcf/d),²⁸² Cove Point LNG, LP (0.77 Bcf/d),²⁸³ Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction,

²⁷⁷ To date, DOE has vacated nine long-term non-FTA authorizations (none over the objection of the authorization holder) in the following proceedings: *Eagle LNG Partners Jacksonville II LLC*, Docket No. 17-79-LNG (Mar. 12, 2023), *Bear Head Energy Inc. (formerly Bear Head LNG Corp.) and Bear Head LNG (USA), LLC*, Docket No. 15-33-LNG (Jan. 20, 2023); *Jordan Cove Energy Project L.P.*, Docket No. 12-32-LNG (Apr. 22, 2022); *Air Flow N. Am. Corp.*, Docket No. 14-206-LNG (Dec. 30, 2021); *Emera CNG, LLC*, Docket No. 13-157-CNG (Oct. 20, 2021); *Annova LNG Common Infrastructure, LLC*, Docket No. 19-34-LNG (Apr. 23, 2021); *Floridian Natural Gas Storage Co., LLC*, Docket No. 15-38-LNG (Oct. 22, 2020); *Carib Energy (USA) LLC*, Docket No. 11-141-LNG (Nov. 17, 2020); *Flint Hills Res., LP*, Docket No. 15-168-LNG (Feb. 5, 2019). Additionally, two long-term non-FTA authorizations in the following proceedings have expired: *Pieridae Energy (USA) Ltd.*, Docket No. 14-179-LNG (Jan. 17, 2025); *Magnolia LNG, LLC*, Docket No. 13-132-LNG (Dec. 8, 2023).

²⁷⁸ Subsequent amendments to each order, where applicable, are omitted. Any number discrepancies are due to rounding. Additionally, this cumulative volume of non-FTA exports from the lower-48 states does not include export volumes granted pursuant to DOE's regulations for small-scale exports of natural gas. See 10 C.F.R. §§ 590.102(p), 208(a); U.S. Dep't of Energy, Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Energy Office, Long Term Applications Received by DOE to Export Domestically Produced LNG, CNG, CGL from the Lower-48 States, at 14 (as of Dec. 4, 2025), <https://www.energy.gov/hgeo/articles/summary-lng-export-applications-lower-48-states> (identifying small-scale applications and status).

²⁷⁹ *Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 2961-A, Docket No. 10-111-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas from Sabine Pass LNG Terminal to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Aug. 7, 2012).

²⁸⁰ *Cameron LNG, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3391-A, Docket No. 11-162-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Cameron LNG Terminal in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Sep. 10, 2014).

²⁸¹ *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FE Order No. 3282-C, Docket No. 10-161-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Freeport LNG Terminal on Quintana Island, Texas, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Nov. 14, 2014) (FLEX I Final Order).

²⁸² *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FE Order No. 3357-B, Docket No. 11-161-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Freeport LNG Terminal on Quintana Island, Texas, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Nov. 14, 2014) (FLEX II Final Order).

²⁸³ *Cove Point LNG, LP*, DOE/FE Order No. 3331-A, Docket No. 11-128-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Cove Point LNG Terminal in Calvert County, Maryland, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 7, 2015).

LLC (2.1 Bcf/d),²⁸⁴ Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC Expansion Project (1.38 Bcf/d),²⁸⁵ American LNG Marketing LLC (0.008 Bcf/d),²⁸⁶ Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC Design Increase (0.56 Bcf/d),²⁸⁷ Cameron LNG, LLC Design Increase (0.42 Bcf/d),²⁸⁸ Cameron LNG, LLC Expansion Project (1.41 Bcf/d),²⁸⁹ Lake Charles Exports, LLC (2.0 Bcf/d),²⁹⁰ Lake Charles LNG Export Company, LLC,²⁹¹ Carib Energy (USA), LLC (0.004),²⁹² Southern LNG Company, L.L.C. (0.36 Bcf/d),²⁹³ the FLEX Design Increase (0.34 Bcf/d),²⁹⁴ Golden Pass LNG Terminal LLC (2.57

²⁸⁴ *Cheniere Mktg., LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3638, Docket No. 12-97-LNG, Final Order and Opinion Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Proposed Corpus Christi Liquefaction Project to Be Located in Corpus Christi, Texas, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 12, 2015).

²⁸⁵ *Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3669, Docket Nos. 13-30-LNG, 13-42-LNG, & 13-121-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Sabine Pass LNG Terminal Located in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (June 26, 2015).

²⁸⁶ *American LNG Mktg. LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3690, Docket No. 14-209-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas in ISO Containers Loaded at the Proposed Hialeah Facility Near Medley, Florida, and Exported by Vessel to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Aug. 7, 2015).

²⁸⁷ *Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3792, Docket No. 15-63-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Sabine Pass LNG Terminal Located in Cameron Parish, Louisiana, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 11, 2016).

²⁸⁸ *Cameron LNG, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3797, Docket No. 15-67-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Cameron Terminal Located in Cameron and Calcasieu Parishes, Louisiana, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 18, 2016).

²⁸⁹ *Cameron LNG, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3846, Docket No. 15-90-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from Trains 4 and 5 of the Cameron LNG Terminal Located in Cameron and Calcasieu Parishes, Louisiana, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (July 15, 2016).

²⁹⁰ *Lake Charles Exports, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3324-A, Docket No. 11-59-LNG, Final Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Lake Charles Terminal in Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (July 29, 2016).

²⁹¹ *Lake Charles LNG Export Co., LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3868, Docket No. 13-04-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Lake Charles Terminal in Calcasieu Parish, Louisiana to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (July 29, 2016).

²⁹² *Carib Energy (USA) LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3937, Docket No. 16-98-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas in ISO Containers Loaded at Designated Pivotal LNG, Inc. Facilities and Exported by Vessel to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations in Central America, South America, or the Caribbean (Nov. 28, 2016).

²⁹³ *Southern LNG Co., L.L.C.*, DOE/FE Order No. 3956, Docket No. 12-100-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Elba Island Terminal in Chatham County, Georgia, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Dec. 16, 2016).

²⁹⁴ *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FE Order No. 3957, Docket No. 16-108-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Freeport LNG Terminal on Quintana Island, Texas, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Dec. 19, 2016).

Bcf/d),²⁹⁵ Delfin LNG LLC (1.8 Bcf/d),²⁹⁶ the Lake Charles LNG Export Company, LLC Design Increase (0.33 Bcf/d),²⁹⁷ the Lake Charles Exports, LLC Design Increase,²⁹⁸ Mexico Pacific Limited LLC (1.7 Bcf/d),²⁹⁹ Venture Global Calcasieu Pass, LLC (1.76 Bcf/d),³⁰⁰ ECA Liquefaction, S. de R.L. de C.V. (Mid-Scale Project) (0.44 Bcf/d),³⁰¹ Energía Costa Azul, S. de R.L. de C.V. (Large-Scale Project) (1.74 Bcf/d),³⁰² Port Arthur LNG, LLC (1.91 Bcf/d),³⁰³ Louisiana LNG Infrastructure LLC (formerly Driftwood LNG LLC) (3.88 Bcf/d),³⁰⁴ FLEX4 (0.72 Bcf/d),³⁰⁵ Gulf LNG Liquefaction Company, LLC (1.53 Bcf/d),³⁰⁶ Eagle LNG Partners

²⁹⁵ *Golden Pass LNG Terminal LLC (formerly Golden Pass Products LLC)*, DOE/FE Order No. 3978, Docket No. 12-156-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Golden Pass LNG Terminal Located in Jefferson County, Texas, to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Apr. 25, 2017).

²⁹⁶ *Delfin LNG LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4028, Docket No. 13-147-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from a Proposed Floating Liquefaction Project and Deepwater Port 30 Miles Offshore of Louisiana to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (June 1, 2017).

²⁹⁷ *Lake Charles LNG Export Co., LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4010, Docket No. 16-109-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Lake Charles Terminal in Lake Charles, Louisiana, to Free Trade Agreement and Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (June 29, 2017).

²⁹⁸ *Lake Charles Exports, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4011, Docket No. 16-110-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from the Lake Charles Terminal in Lake Charles, Louisiana, to Free Trade Agreement and Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (June 29, 2017).

²⁹⁹ *Mexico Pacific Ltd. LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4312, Docket No. 18-70-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export U.S.-Sourced Natural Gas by Pipeline to Mexico for Liquefaction and Re-Export in the Form of Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries (Dec. 14, 2018).

³⁰⁰ *Venture Global Calcasieu Pass, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4346, Docket Nos. 13-69-LNG, 14-88-LNG, 15-25-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 5, 2019).

³⁰¹ *ECA Liquefaction, S. de R.L. de C.V.*, DOE/FE Order No. 4364, Docket No. 18-144-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Re-Export U.S.-Sourced Natural Gas in the Form of Liquefied Natural Gas from Mexico to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries (ECA Mid-Scale Project) (Mar. 29, 2019).

³⁰² *Energía Costa Azul, S. de R.L. de C.V.*, DOE/FE Order No. 4365, Docket No. 18-145-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Re-Export U.S.-Sourced Natural Gas in the Form of Liquefied Natural Gas from Mexico to Non-Free Trade Agreement Countries (ECA Large-Scale Project) (Mar. 29, 2019).

³⁰³ *Port Arthur LNG, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4372, Docket No. 15-96-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 2, 2019).

³⁰⁴ *Louisiana LNG Infrastructure LLC (formerly Driftwood LNG LLC)*, DOE/FE Order No. 4373, Docket No. 16-144-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 2, 2019).

³⁰⁵ *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FE Order No. 4374, Docket No. 18-26-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 28, 2019).

³⁰⁶ *Gulf LNG Liquefaction Co., LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4410, Docket No. 12-101-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (July 31, 2019).

Jacksonville LLC (0.14 Bcf/d),³⁰⁷ Venture Global Plaquemines LNG, LLC (3.40 Bcf/d),³⁰⁸ Texas LNG Brownsville LLC (0.56 Bcf/d),³⁰⁹ Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (formerly Corpus Christi Liquefaction Stage III, LLC) (1.59 Bcf/d),³¹⁰ Rio Grande LNG, LLC, Rio Grande LNG Train 4, LLC, and Rio Grande LNG Train 5, LLC (3.61 Bcf/d),³¹¹ Epsilon LNG LLC (1.083 Bcf/d),³¹² Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (0.3 Bcf/d),³¹³ Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC (0.42 Bcf/d),³¹⁴ Vista Pacifico LNG, S.A.P.I. de C.V. (Mid-Scale Project) (0.55 Bcf/d),³¹⁵ FLEX Design Increase (0.24 Bcf/d),³¹⁶ NFE Altamira FLNG, S. de R.L. de C.V. (0.40 Bcf/d),³¹⁷ Port Arthur LNG Phase II, LLC (1.91 Bcf/d),³¹⁸ Commonwealth LNG,

³⁰⁷ *Eagle LNG Partners Jacksonville LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4445, Docket No. 16-15-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Oct. 3, 2019).

³⁰⁸ *Venture Global Plaquemines LNG, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4446, Docket No. 16-28-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Oct. 16, 2019).

³⁰⁹ *Texas LNG Brownsville LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4489, Docket No. 15-62-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Feb. 10, 2020).

³¹⁰ *Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC (formerly Corpus Christi Liquefaction Stage III, LLC)*, DOE/FE Order No. 4490, Docket No. 18-78-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Feb. 10, 2020).

³¹¹ *Rio Grande LNG, LLC, et al.* DOE/FE Order No. 4492, Docket No. 15-190-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Feb. 10, 2020).

³¹² *Epsilon LNG LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4629, Docket No. 20-31-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Natural Gas to Mexico for Liquefaction, and to Re-Export U.S. Sourced Natural Gas in the Form of Liquefied Natural Gas from Mexico to Free Trade Agreement and Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Dec. 8, 2020).

³¹³ *Cheniere Mktg., LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4799, Docket No. 19-124-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 16, 2022).

³¹⁴ *Sabine Pass Liquefaction, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4800, Docket No. 19-125-LNG, Order Granting Long Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 16, 2022).

³¹⁵ *Vista Pacifico LNG, S.A.P.I. de C.V.*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4929, Docket No. 20-153-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Re-Export U.S.-Sourced Natural Gas in the Form of Liquefied Natural Gas from Mexico to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Dec. 20, 2022).

³¹⁶ *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FECM Order No. 4961, Docket No. 21-98-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Mar. 3, 2023).

³¹⁷ *NFE Altamira FLNG, S. de R.L. de C.V.*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5156, Docket No. 22-110-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Re-Export U.S.-Sourced Natural Gas in the Form of Liquefied Natural Gas from Mexico to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Aug. 31, 2024).

³¹⁸ *Port Arthur LNG Phase II, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5292, Docket No. 20-23-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (May 29, 2025).

LLC (1.21 Bcf/d),³¹⁹ Venture Global CP2 LNG, LLC (3.96 Bcf/d),³²⁰ and this Order.

We note that the volumes authorized for export in the *Lake Charles Exports* and *Lake Charles LNG Export* orders are both 2.0 Bcf/d and 0.33 Bcf/d, respectively, yet are not additive to one another because the source of LNG approved under all of those orders is the Lake Charles Terminal.³²¹

DOE further notes that, to date, the cumulative total of U.S. and Mexico LNG export capacity, using U.S.-sourced natural gas, that is operating or under construction across 15 mid- or large-scale export projects with a non-FTA export authorization from DOE is 34.54 Bcf/d of natural gas.³²²

DOE will continue taking a measured approach in reviewing the other pending applications to export natural gas. Specifically, DOE will continue to assess the cumulative impacts of each succeeding request for export authorization on the public interest with due regard to the effect on domestic natural gas supply and demand fundamentals.

Two reasons support this approach. First, the 2024 LNG Export Study, like any study based on assumptions and economic projections, is inherently limited in its predictive accuracy. Second, the market for natural gas has experienced changes due to economic, geopolitical,

³¹⁹ *Commonwealth LNG, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5238-A, Docket No. 19-134-LNG, Final Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Aug. 29, 2025).

³²⁰ *Venture Global CP2 LNG, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5264-A, Docket No. 21-131-LNG, Final Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations (Oct. 21, 2025) [hereinafter CP2 LNG Final Order]. On November 20, 2025, intervenors Sierra Club and Natural Resources Defense Council filed a Request for Rehearing of the CP2 LNG Final Order. Additionally, while that rehearing proceeding is ongoing, Sierra Club and Natural Resources Defense Council filed a petition for review of the CP2 LNG Final Order. See *Sierra Club, et al. v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, Joint Petition for Review of Orders of the United States Department of Energy, Case No. 26-1036 (D.C. Cir. Feb. 17, 2026). Petitioners are challenging: (i) the CP2 LNG Final Order; and (ii) DOE's B5.7 categorical exclusion rulemaking discussed herein, "both as applied" in the Final Order and "on its face." *Id.* at 2-3.

³²¹ *Lake Charles LNG Export Co., LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4010, at 55; see also *Lake Charles Exports, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 4011, at 54.

³²² U.S. Dep't of Energy, Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Exports Snapshot (Dec. 2025), https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2025-12/LNG%20Snapshot%20Dec%2031%202025_0.pdf (Total of 34.54 Bcf/d calculated by adding Columns "Under Construction Pursuant to FID" & "Operating").

technological, and regulatory developments. The market of the future very likely will not resemble the market of today. In recognition of these factors, DOE intends to monitor developments that could potentially undermine the public interest in grants of successive applications for exports of domestically produced LNG and to attach terms and conditions to LNG export authorizations to protect the public interest.

IX. FINDINGS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions set forth above, we find that it has not been shown that a grant of the requested non-FTA authorization will be inconsistent with the public interest. Accordingly, DOE grants the non-FTA portion of CCL's Application, subject to the Terms and Conditions and Ordering Paragraphs set forth below.

X. TERMS AND CONDITIONS

To ensure that the authorization issued by this Order is not inconsistent with the public interest, DOE has attached the following Terms and Conditions to the authorization. CCL must abide by each Term and Condition or face appropriate sanction.

A. Term of the Authorization

Consistent with DOE's current practice and CCL's request, DOE grants CCL's authorization for a term to commence on the date of first export from the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project and to extend through December 31, 2050. However, CCL will be permitted to continue exporting the approved volume of LNG from the Project for a total of three years following the end of the export term on December 31, 2050, solely to export any approved volume of LNG that it is unable to export during the original export period (the Make-Up Volume). The three-year term during which the Make-Up Volume may be exported, known as the Make-Up Period,

will extend through December 31, 2053.³²³

B. Commencement of Operations Within Seven Years

Consistent with DOE's non-FTA authorizations to date, DOE adds as a condition of this authorization that CCL must commence exports from the Project no later than seven years from the date of issuance of this Order. The purpose of this condition is to ensure that other entities that may seek similar authorizations are not frustrated in their efforts to obtain those authorizations by authorization holders that are not engaged in actual export operations.

C. Transfer, Assignment, or Change in Control

DOE's natural gas regulations prohibit authorization holders from transferring or assigning authorizations to import or export natural gas without specific authorization by the Assistant Secretary for Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Energy Office.³²⁴ DOE has found that this requirement applies to any change of control of the authorization holder. This condition was deemed necessary to ensure that DOE will be given an adequate opportunity to assess the public interest impacts of such a transfer or change.

DOE construes a change in control to mean a change, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct the management or policies of an entity whether such power is exercised through one or more intermediary companies or pursuant to an agreement, written or oral, and whether such power is established through ownership or voting of securities, or common directors, officers, or stockholders, or voting trusts, holding trusts, or debt holdings, or contract, or any other direct or

³²³ See *Port Arthur LNG Phase II, LLC*, DOE/FECM Order No. 5292-A, Docket No. 20-23-LNG, Order Amending Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations, at 3-5 (June 30, 2025).

³²⁴ 10 C.F.R. § 590.405.

indirect means.³²⁵ A rebuttable presumption that control exists will arise from the ownership or the power to vote, directly or indirectly, 10% or more of the voting securities of such entity.³²⁶

D. Agency Rights

CCL requests authorization to export LNG on its own behalf and as agent for other entities that hold title to the LNG at the time of export, pursuant to long-term contracts. DOE previously has determined that, in LNG export orders in which Agency Rights have been granted, DOE shall require registration materials filed for, or by, a LNG title-holder (Registrant) to include the same company identification information and long-term contract information of the Registrant as if the Registrant had filed an application to export LNG on its own behalf.³²⁷

To ensure that the public interest is served, this authorization will require that, where CCL proposes to export LNG as agent for other entities that hold title to the LNG (Registrants), CCL must register those entities with DOE in accordance with the procedures and requirements described herein.

E. Contract Provisions for the Sale or Transfer of LNG

DOE will require that CCL file or cause to be filed with DOE any relevant long-term commercial agreements pursuant to which CCL exports LNG on its own behalf or as agent for a Registrant. DOE finds that the submission of all such agreements or contracts within 30 days of their execution using the procedures described below will be consistent with the “to the extent

³²⁵ See U.S. Dep’t of Energy, Procedures for Changes in Control Affecting Applications and Authorizations to Import or Export Natural Gas, 79 Fed. Reg. 65,541, 65,542 (Nov. 5, 2014).

³²⁶ See *id.*

³²⁷ See, e.g., *Cameron LNG, LLC*, DOE/FE Order No. 3846, Docket No. 15-90-LNG, Opinion and Order Granting Long-Term, Multi-Contract Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas by Vessel from Trains 4 and 5 of the Cameron LNG Terminal to Non-Free Trade Agreement Nations, at 128-29 (July 15, 2016); *Freeport LNG Expansion, L.P., et al.*, DOE/FE Order No. 2913, Docket No. 10-160-LNG, Order Granting Long-Term Authorization to Export Liquefied Natural Gas from the Freeport LNG Terminal to Free Trade Agreement Nations, at 7-8 (Feb. 10, 2011).

practicable” requirement of section 590.202(b).³²⁸

In addition, DOE finds that section 590.202(c) of DOE’s regulations³²⁹ requires that CCL file, or cause to be filed, all long-term contracts associated with the long-term supply of natural gas to the Project, whether signed by CCL or the Registrant, within 30 days of their execution.

DOE recognizes that some information in CCL’s or a Registrant’s long-term commercial agreements associated with the export of LNG, and/or long-term contracts associated with the long-term supply of natural gas to the Project, may be commercially sensitive. DOE therefore will provide CCL the option to file or cause to be filed either unredacted contracts, or in the alternative: (A) CCL may file, or cause to be filed, long-term contracts under seal, but it also will file either: (i) a copy of each long-term contract with commercially sensitive information redacted, or (ii) a summary of all major provisions of the contract(s) including, but not limited to, the parties to each contract, contract term, quantity, any take or pay or equivalent provisions/conditions, destination, re-sale provisions, and other relevant provisions; and (B) the filing must demonstrate why the redacted or non-disclosed information should be exempted from public disclosure.

To ensure that DOE destination and reporting requirements included in this Order are conveyed to subsequent title holders, DOE will include as a condition of this authorization that future contracts for the sale or transfer of LNG exported pursuant to this Order shall include an acknowledgement of these requirements.

F. Export Quantity

This Order grants CCL’s Application to export LNG to non-FTA countries in the full volume of LNG requested, equivalent to 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas.

³²⁸ 10 C.F.R. § 590.202(b).

³²⁹ *Id.* § 590.202(c).

G. Combined FTA and Non-FTA Export Authorization Volumes

CCL is currently authorized in DOE/FECM Order No. 5019 to export domestically produced LNG to FTA countries in a volume equivalent to 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas. The source of LNG for that FTA Order and this Order reflect the planned liquefaction capacity of the Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project, as approved by FERC. Accordingly, CCL may not treat the FTA and non-FTA export volumes as additive to one another.

Additionally, with the issuance of this Order, Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; Cheniere Marketing, LLC; and/or CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC are authorized to export domestically produced LNG from the Corpus Christi LNG Terminal to both FTA and non-FTA countries in a volume totaling 1627.3 Bcf/yr of natural gas on a non-additive basis, as shown in the Appendix to this Order.

XI. ORDER

Pursuant to section 3 of the Natural Gas Act, it is ordered that:

A. Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC (collectively, CCL) are jointly authorized to export domestically produced LNG by vessel from the Corpus Christi Liquefaction Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project (Project), to be located at and adjacent to the existing Corpus Christi LNG Terminal (CCL Terminal) in San Patricio and Nueces Counties, Texas. The volume authorized in this Order is equivalent to 170 Bcf/yr of natural gas for a term to commence on the date of first export and to extend through December 31, 2050. CCL may continue exporting any Make-Up Volume for a three-year Make-Up Period following the export term, *i.e.*, through December 31, 2053.³³⁰ CCL is authorized to export this

³³⁰ See Term & Condition A, *supra* § X.A. This three-year Make-Up Period does not affect or modify the export volume previously authorized in CCL's FTA authorization or in this Order. Insofar as CCL may seek to export additional volumes not previously authorized, it will be required to obtain appropriate authorization from DOE.

LNG on its own behalf and as agent for other entities that hold title to the natural gas, pursuant to one or more contracts of any duration.³³¹

B. This LNG may be exported to any country with which the United States does not have a FTA requiring national treatment for trade in natural gas, which currently has or in the future develops the capacity to import LNG, and with which trade is not prohibited by U.S. law or policy.

C. CCL must commence export operations using the planned Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project no later than seven years from the date of issuance of this Order.

D. CCL shall ensure that all transactions authorized by this Order are permitted and lawful under U.S. laws and policies, including the rules, regulations, orders, policies, and other determinations of the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the U.S. Department of the Treasury. Failure to comply with these requirements could result in rescission of this authorization and/or other civil or criminal penalties.

E. This Order is conditioned on CCL's on-going compliance with any other preventative and mitigative measures at the Project imposed by federal or state agencies.

F. (i) CCL shall file, or cause others to file, with the U.S. Department of Energy, Hydrocarbons and Geothermal Energy Office, Office of Strategic Resources, Office of Global Energy Security (EX-34) a non-redacted copy of all executed long-term contracts associated with the long-term export of LNG from the Project on its own behalf or as agent for other entities. The non-redacted copies must be filed within 30 days of their execution and may be filed under seal, as described above.

(ii) CCL shall file, or cause others to file, with the Office of Global Energy Security a

³³¹ See U.S. Dep't of Energy, Including Short-Term Export Authority in Long-Term Authorizations for the Export of Natural Gas on a Non-Additive Basis, 86 Fed. Reg. 2243 (Jan. 12, 2021).

non-redacted copy of all executed long-term contracts associated with the long-term supply of natural gas to the Project. The non-redacted copies must be filed within 30 days of their execution and may be filed under seal, as described above.

G. CCL is permitted to use its authorization to export LNG as agent for other LNG title-holders (Registrants), after registering those entities with DOE. Registration materials shall include an agreement by the Registrant to supply CCL with all information necessary to permit CCL to register that person or entity with DOE, including: (1) the Registrant's agreement to comply with this Order and all applicable requirements of DOE's regulations at 10 C.F.R. Part 590, including but not limited to destination restrictions; (2) the exact legal name of the Registrant, state/location of incorporation/registration, primary place of doing business, and the Registrant's ownership structure, including the ultimate parent entity if the Registrant is a subsidiary or affiliate of another entity; (3) the name, title, mailing address, e-mail address, and telephone number of a corporate officer or employee of the Registrant to whom inquiries may be directed; and (4) within 30 days of execution, a copy of any long-term contracts not previously filed with DOE, described in Ordering Paragraph F of this Order.

Any change in the registration materials—including changes in company name, contact information, length of the long-term contract, termination of the long-term contract, or other relevant modification—shall be filed with DOE within 30 days of such change(s).

H. CCL, or others for whom CCL acts as agent, shall include the following provision in any agreement or other contract for the sale or transfer of LNG exported pursuant to this Order:

Customer or purchaser acknowledges and agrees that it will resell or transfer LNG purchased hereunder for delivery only to countries identified in Ordering Paragraph B of DOE/HGEO Order No. 5391, issued February 26, 2026, in Docket No. 23-46-LNG, and/or to purchasers that have agreed in writing to limit their direct or indirect resale or transfer of such LNG to such countries. Customer or purchaser further commits to cause a report to be

provided to Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC that identifies the country (or countries) into which the LNG was actually delivered, and to include in any resale contract for such LNG the necessary conditions to ensure that Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC are made aware of all such actual destination countries.

I. Within two weeks after the first export authorized in Ordering Paragraph A occurs, CCL shall provide written notification of the date of first export to DOE.

J. CCL shall file with the Office of Global Energy Security, on a semi-annual basis, written reports describing the status of the Project. The reports shall be filed on or by April 1 and October 1 of each year, and shall include information on the status of the Project, the date the Project is expected to commence first exports of LNG, and the status of any associated long-term supply and export contracts.

K. With respect to any change in control of the authorization holder, CCL must comply with DOE's Procedures for Change in Control Affecting Applications and Authorizations to Import or Export Natural Gas.³³²

L. Monthly Reports: With respect to the exports authorized by this Order, CCL shall file with the Office of Global Energy Security, within 30 days following the last day of each calendar month, a report on Form FE-746R indicating whether exports have been made. The first monthly report required by this Order is due not later than the 30th day of the month following the month of first export. In subsequent months, if exports have not occurred, a report of "no activity" for that month must be filed. If exports have occurred, the report must provide the information specified for each applicable activity and mode of transportation, as set forth in the Guidelines for Filing Monthly Reports. These Guidelines are available at <https://www.energy.gov/hgeo/guidelines-filing-monthly-reports>.

³³² See 79 Fed. Reg. at 65,541-42.

(Approved by the Office of Management and Budget under OMB Control No. 1901-0294)

M. All monthly report filings on Form FE-746R shall be made to the Office of Global Energy Security according to the methods of submission listed on the Form FE-746R reporting instructions available at <https://www.energy.gov/hgeo/regulation>.

N. The motions to intervene submitted by Public Citizen and Sierra Club are deemed granted.³³³

Issued in Corpus Christi, Texas, on February 26, 2026.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Chris Wright". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Chris Wright
U.S. Secretary of Energy

³³³ 10 C.F.R. § 590.303(g).

**APPENDIX: LONG-TERM EXPORT AUTHORIZATIONS
FOR THE CORPUS CHRISTI LNG TERMINAL**

The long-term export authorizations issued by DOE to Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; Cheniere Marketing, LLC; and/or CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC are identified in the following tables:

Table 1: Orders Issued by DOE for the Long-Term Export of LNG from the Corpus Christi LNG Terminal to FTA Countries (through Dec. 31, 2050)

Docket No.	Order No. (as Amended)	Date Originally Issued	Authorization Holder(s)	LNG Facilities at the Terminal	Volume (Bcf/yr)
12-99-LNG	3164-B	Oct. 16, 2012, as amended	Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC	Liquefaction Project (Large-Scale Trains 1-3)	767
18-78-LNG	4277-B	Nov. 9, 2018, as amended	Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC	Stage 3 Project (Midscale Trains 1-7)	582.14
19-124-LNG	4519-A	Apr. 14, 2020, as amended	Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC	Liquefaction Project (Large-Scale Trains 1-3)	108.16
23-46-LNG	5019	July 19, 2023	Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC	Corpus Christi Liquefaction Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project (Midscale Trains 8-9)	170
Total FTA Volume					1627.3

Table 2: Orders Issued by DOE for the Long-Term Export of Domestic LNG from the Corpus Christi LNG Terminal to Non-FTA Countries (through Dec. 31, 2050)

Docket No.	Order No. (as Amended)	Date Originally Issued	Authorization Holder(s)	LNG Facilities at the Terminal	Volume (Bcf/yr)
12-97-LNG	3638-B	May 12, 2015, as amended	Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC	Liquefaction Project (Large-Scale Trains 1-3)	767
18-78-LNG	4490-B	Feb. 10, 2020, as amended	Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC	Stage 3 Project (Midscale Trains 1-7)	582.14
19-124-LNG	4799	Mar. 16, 2022	Cheniere Marketing, LLC and Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC	Liquefaction Project (Large-Scale Trains 1-3)	108.16
23-46-LNG	5391	Feb. 26, 2026	Corpus Christi Liquefaction, LLC; CCL Midscale 8-9, LLC; and Cheniere Marketing, LLC	Corpus Christi Liquefaction Midscale Trains 8 & 9 Project (Midscale Trains 8-9)	170
Total Non-FTA Volume					1627.3