

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory  
Commission**

[Project Nos. 11437-016]

**Hydro Matrix Limited Partnership;  
Notice of Availability of Environment  
Assessment**

March 30, 2007.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's regulations, the Office of Energy Projects has reviewed the Hydro Matrix Limited Partnership's (licensee) application requesting the Commission's authorization to amend its license for the Jordan Dam Hydroelectric Project. The licensee proposes to install two generating units rated at 2200 kW, rather than the authorized eighty 100 kW units. This would reduce the generating capacity of the project from 8.0 MW to 4.4 MW, and reduce the hydraulic capacity of the project from 2320 cubic feet per second (cfs) to 1200 cfs. The unconstructed project is located at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) B. Everett Jordan Dam on the Haw River, in Chatham County, North Carolina. An environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared.

In the EA, the Commission's staff concludes that approval of the licensee's application would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. No ground disturbing activities are involved with the licensee's proposal.

A copy of the EA is attached to a Commission order titled "Order Amending License and Revising Annual Charges," issued March 30, 2007, and is available at the Commission's Public Reference Room. A copy of the EA may also be viewed on the Commission's Web site at <http://www.ferc.gov> using the "elibrary" link. Enter the docket number (P-11437) in the docket field to access the document. For assistance, call (202) 502-8222 or (202) 502-8659 (for TTY).

**Philis J. Posey,***Acting Secretary.*

[FR Doc. E7-6324 Filed 4-4-07; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

**DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY****Federal Energy Regulatory  
Commission**

[Docket Nos. CP06-470-000; CP06-471-000; CP06-472-000; CP06-473-000; CP06-474-000]

**Southern LNG Inc.; Elba Express  
Company, L.L.C.; Southern Natural  
Gas Company; Notice of Availability of  
the Draft Environmental Impact  
Statement for the Elba III Project**

March 30, 2007.

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) has prepared a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Elba III Project, proposed by Southern LNG Inc. (Southern LNG), Elba Express Company, L.L.C. (EEC), and their parent company Southern Natural Gas Company (Southern), a subsidiary of El Paso Corporation. As described in the above-referenced dockets, this project would consist of the following components:

- Southern LNG's expansion of the existing Elba Island Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) Import Terminal near Savannah in Chatham County, Georgia;
- EEC's construction and operation of natural gas pipeline and compression facilities (Elba Express Pipeline) extending between existing facilities owned by Southern in Chatham County and those of Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation (Transco) in Hart County, Georgia and Anderson County, South Carolina; and
- Southern's abandonment by sale to EEC of an undivided interest in its pipeline facilities that extend between the LNG import terminal and the existing Port Wentworth Meter Station (where the Elba Express Pipeline would begin), and purchase of an undivided interest in the first 10 miles of the Elba Express Pipeline.

The draft EIS was prepared to satisfy the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), and was completed with the cooperation of the U.S. Coast Guard (Coast Guard), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries). A cooperating agency has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to potential environmental impacts associated with the proposal, and participates in the NEPA analysis.

The Coast Guard is responsible for determining the suitability of a waterway for LNG marine traffic; in this instance, the determination would be

issued as a Letter of Recommendation with conditions. The Captain of the Port Savannah is the point of contact for this action. The COE would need to evaluate the project and issue Section 404 Permits for wetland impacts associated with expansion of the terminal and pipeline construction, easements where the pipeline would cross COE-managed lands, modifications to existing COE Mitigation Lands, and an approval for a large fuel-carrying pipeline to cross federal property. NOAA Fisheries has responsibilities for evaluating potential impacts on essential fish habitat and threatened or endangered aquatic species.

The FERC staff has concluded that if the project is constructed and operated in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, each project sponsor's proposed mitigation, and the staff's additional mitigation recommendations, it would have limited adverse environmental impact and would be an environmentally acceptable action.

The draft EIS addresses the potential environmental effects of construction and operation of the following LNG terminal and natural gas pipeline facilities:

**Elba Terminal Expansion**

The proposed expansion of the existing LNG import terminal would: (a) More than double the site's LNG storage capacity by adding 405,000 cubic meters (m<sup>3</sup>) of new storage; (b) substantially increase the facility's existing vaporization capacity; (c) upgrade the terminal's send-out meter station to increase the natural gas send-out capacity of the facility by an additional 900 million cubic feet per day (MMcfd); and (d) modify the terminal's LNG tanker berthing and unloading facilities to accommodate larger tankers and provide for simultaneous unloading of two LNG tankers. All of the planned facilities would be located entirely within the existing 190-acre facility site on Elba Island.

The LNG terminal expansion would be constructed in two phases, A and B. Southern LNG anticipates completing Phase A as early as January 2010. Phase A would include the following facilities:

- a. One new 200,000-m<sup>3</sup> (1.25 million barrels [bbls]) LNG storage tank, one associated boil-off gas condenser, and three boil-off gas compressors;
- b. three submerged combustion vaporizers, each with a peak capacity of 180 MMcfd (providing a total peak send-out capacity of 1,755 MMcfd for the full facility at the completion of phase A); and
- c. modifications to the unloading docks to accommodate larger LNG