

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The staff of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC or Commission) prepared this final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess the potential environmental effects that may occur as a result of the proposed construction and operation of a liquefied natural gas (LNG) import terminal and associated natural gas pipeline in San Patricio and Nueces Counties, Texas (collectively referred to as the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project or Project). The FERC will use the EIS in its decision-making process to determine whether or not to authorize the Project.

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

On October 25, 2004, Ingleside Energy Center, LLC filed an application with the FERC, in Docket No. CP05-13-000, under Section 3(a) of the Natural Gas Act (NGA) and part 153 of the Commission's regulations. Also on October 25, 2004, San Patricio Pipeline, LLC filed an application in Docket Nos. CP05-11-000, CP05-12-000, and CP05-14-000 under Section 7(c) of the NGA and parts 157 and 284 of the Commission's regulations. These applications were noticed in the *Federal Register* (FR) on November 10, 2004. Both Ingleside Energy Center, LLC and San Patricio Pipeline, LLC are affiliates of Occidental Energy Venture Corporation (hereafter collectively referred to as Ingleside San Patricio).¹

In Docket No. CP05-13-000, Ingleside San Patricio proposes to import, store, and vaporize on average about 1.0 billion cubic feet per day (bcfd) of LNG at a terminal facility to be built next to the Occidental Chemical Company (Occidental Chemical) manufacturing complex on the northeast shoreline of Corpus Christi Bay, west of Ingleside, Texas. Ingleside San Patricio requests Commission authorization to construct and operate:

- a new marine terminal basin connected to the La Quinta Channel that would include a ship maneuvering area and one protected berth to unload up to 140 LNG ships per year with a ship capacity ranging from 71,500 cubic meters (m³) to 250,000 m³ of LNG;
- four 16-inch-diameter stainless steel unloading arms of which two would be dedicated to LNG transfer from the berth facilities to the LNG storage tanks, one would be dedicated to vapor return service to balance the LNG ship, and one could be used for both LNG transfer or vapor return service;
- two double containment LNG storage tanks each with a nominal working volume of approximately 160,000 m³ (1,006,000 barrels equivalent);
- three in-tank pumps per LNG storage tank, each capable of discharging 4,756 gallons per minute (gpm);
- six sendout pumps, each capable of discharging 1,950 gpm;
- eight shell and tube vaporizers (STV) that would be heated with a 30 percent by weight ethylene glycol/water mixture, as well as other associated vaporization equipment;
- a boil-off gas (BOG) and vapor removal system comprised of two vapor return blowers, one BOG compressor, and one BOG condenser;

¹ Occidental Energy Ventures Corporation is a subsidiary of Occidental Petroleum Corporation. The corporations are headquartered in Houston, Texas and Los Angeles, California, respectively.

-
- two flare systems that would include a ground and elevated flare; and
 - various support buildings and piping structures at the LNG terminal site including a control building, main firewater pump house, backup firewater pump shelter, jetty control building, compressor enclosure, substation building, and structural pipe racks.

In Docket Nos. CP05-11-000, CP05-12-000, and CP05-14-000, Ingleside San Patricio requests Commission authorization to construct and operate a pipeline extending from the LNG terminal to north of Sinton, Texas, capable of transporting up to about 1.0 bcfd of imported natural gas to markets throughout the United States (U.S.), via interconnections with a number of existing intrastate and interstate pipeline systems. Ingleside San Patricio’s proposed pipeline facilities would consist of:

- 26.4 miles of 26-inch-diameter natural gas pipeline;
- eight metering stations/delivery points and nine pipeline interconnections with the following existing natural gas pipeline systems: Texas Eastern Transmission Company, Channel Pipeline Company, GulfTerra Pipeline Company collocated with CrossTex Pipeline Company, Kinder Morgan Texas Pipeline Company-Tejas Pipeline, Gulf South Pipeline Company, Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America, Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corporation, and Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company; and
- a pig launcher facility and tie-in valves at the LNG terminal, a mainline valve (MLV) near the middle of the pipeline, and a pig receiver facility and a metering and regulating station at the northern pipeline terminus.

Figure 1-1 shows the general location of the proposed facilities.

1.1 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project is to provide facilities necessary to import, store, and vaporize LNG and to:

- introduce a competitive supply of natural gas to Ingleside San Patricio affiliates (Occidental Chemical and Ingleside Cogeneration Partners LP [ICLP]²) and other large energy-consuming industries in the Corpus Christi area; and
- deliver natural gas into existing interstate and intrastate natural gas pipelines in the Corpus Christi area.

Ingleside San Patricio states that it would integrate its LNG terminal with the adjacent Occidental Chemical manufacturing complex in order for the two facilities to offset the other’s respective heating and cooling needs thereby reducing project operating costs and minimizing impacts on the environment. The Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project would provide an option for natural gas liquids (NGL) recovery should there be a gas quality and market demand. The Project would also contribute to the diversification of the nation’s energy resources, and help ameliorate the projected future natural gas shortage in the United States.

² Occidental Energy Ventures Corporation owns 50 percent of Ingleside Cogeneration Partners LP.

Non-Internet Public

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
PROPOSED INGLESIDE ENERGY CENTER LNG TERMINAL
AND PIPELINE PROJECT
Docket Nos. CP05-11-000, et al.

Page 1-3
Figure 1-1
General Project Location Map

Public access for the above information is available only through the Public Reference Room, or
by e-mail at public.referenceroom@ferc.gov.

At the public scoping meeting for this Project, an Ingleside San Patricio representative stated that the proximity of the Occidental Chemical manufacturing complex influenced the location of its proposed LNG terminal. A significant feature of this location includes Ingleside San Patricio's use of heated wastewater from Occidental Chemical's and/or ICLP cooling water system as a source of vaporization heat for the LNG. Water that would be cooled during the vaporization process would be returned to these facilities for reuse. This process would conserve or avoid the release of about 300 tons of regulated air emissions per year and conserve about two million gallons of water per day. Other beneficial features of the Project location include the presence of a deep-water port, and access to both the interstate and intrastate natural gas pipeline grid. In addition, other industries in the region and Mexico are potential markets for natural gas.

Ingleside San Patricio has not yet filed any precedent agreements from shippers for the imported LNG. Under the FERC's regulations for Section 3 applications, Ingleside San Patricio is not required to reveal market data about its LNG import terminal. Ingleside San Patricio's pipeline application (CP05-11-000, *et al.*) indicated that it announced an open season beginning on September 24, 2004 to obtain binding commitments for firm transportation capacity. On March 23, 2005, Ingleside San Patricio executed a precedent agreement with Occidental Energy Marketing, Inc. for 1,070,000 dekatherms (dth) per day.

1.1.1 Projected Domestic Supplies and Demand for Natural Gas

Speaking at a conference in April 2004, U.S. Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan pointed out that use of natural gas has increased over time while its availability has recently stagnated. Domestic natural gas prices are on the rise because of supply and demand issues. Chairman Greenspan stated that the U.S. needs to import more natural gas, including the expansion of LNG import terminals (Schneider, 2004).

The Energy Information Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy (EIA) predicted that U.S. natural gas supplies would rise from about 19 trillion cubic feet (tcf) produced in 2002 to almost 24 tcf by 2025. However, during that same timeframe, domestic consumption of natural gas is projected to increase from a total of about 22 tcf in 2002 to about 31 tcf in 2025. To make up the difference between future domestic supplies and demand, the U.S. would have to increase imports of natural gas. The EIA indicated that in 2002, the U.S. imported about 3.5 tcf of natural gas, combining imports from Canada, Mexico, and LNG. In 2025, imports are predicted to increase to about 7 tcf, with LNG's portion growing from almost 0.2 tcf in 2002 to about 4.8 tcf in 2025 (EIA, 2004).

1.1.2 Potential of LNG Imports

LNG is natural gas that has been cooled to about -260 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) for shipment and storage as a liquid. LNG is more compact than the gaseous equivalent, with a volumetric difference of approximately 610 to 1. LNG can be transported long distances across oceans using specially designed ships. There are currently five onshore LNG import terminals in the U.S. (at Everett, Massachusetts; Cove Point, Maryland; Elba Island, Georgia; and Lake Charles, Louisiana), built between 1971 and 1982. In March 2005, a fifth LNG import terminal began operations off the coast of Louisiana. In 2001, LNG imports into the U.S. totaled about 238 billion cubic feet (bcf). A number of factors are contributing to interest in increasing the

level of U.S. imports of LNG, including higher domestic natural gas costs; the leveling-off of domestic gas supplies; and technological advances in liquefying, shipping, storing, and regasification, which have reduced the cost of transporting and importing LNG (Gaul and Young, 2003).

There are currently 12 LNG exporting countries, which combined represent 28 percent of the world's natural gas reserves. The EIA estimated there is up to 3,350 tcf of stranded natural gas worldwide that is seeking markets. To address projected future domestic natural gas demands, up to 40 new LNG import facilities in North America are in the planning stages (Dismukes *et al.*, 2004). Some of these proposed facilities are discussed in the Alternatives section of this EIS. The EIA predicts that at least four new LNG import terminals would be built on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts between 2007 and 2010 to meet the 58 percent projected increase in LNG imports over that timeframe. By 2010, those new terminals may be importing up to 812 bcf of LNG annually. By that date, LNG could account for about 39 percent of all natural gas imported into the U.S. (EIA, 2003).

1.2 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

The FERC is the federal agency responsible for authorizing applications to construct and operate onshore LNG import and interstate natural gas transmission facilities. As such, the FERC is the lead federal agency for the preparation of this EIS in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations for implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508), and the FERC's regulations for implementing the NEPA (18 CFR 380). The FERC will use the EIS as an element in its review of Ingleside San Patricio's applications to determine whether to authorize the Project. The Commission will consider the environmental issues, including our³ recommended mitigation measures, as well as non-environmental issues. Final authorization will be granted only if the Commission finds that the proposed Project is in the public interest. The environmental impact assessment and mitigation discussed in this EIS are important factors in this final determination.

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

A draft EIS was prepared and issued for public review and comment on February 24, 2005. This document is a final EIS that has been prepared to respond to comments received on the draft EIS. The distribution list for the final EIS is provided in Appendix A. Our principal purposes in preparing this EIS are to:

- identify and assess potential impacts on the human environment that would result from the implementation of the proposed action;

³ "We," "us," and "our" refer to the environmental staff of the FERC's Office of Energy Projects.

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

Our analysis in this EIS focuses on facilities that are under the FERC's jurisdiction (*i.e.*, the proposed LNG terminal and 26.4 miles of pipeline as proposed by Ingleside San Patricio). Four nonjurisdictional facilities would also be relocated and/or constructed in association with the Project (see section 2.10 of this EIS).

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

Currently, there are two other proposals to build LNG import facilities along the La Quinta Channel in the Corpus Christi Bay area. These projects are the Cheniere Corpus Christi LNG Project (Cheniere Corpus Christi) (FERC Docket Nos. CP04-37-000, CP04-44-000, CP04-45-000, and CP04-46-000) and the Vista del Sol LNG Terminal Project (Vista del Sol) (FERC Docket Nos. CP04-395-000 and CP04-405-000). Although these three LNG projects are on similar schedules, the FERC is preparing separate EISs for each of the projects. The Commission does not consider these proposed facilities mutually exclusive alternatives to the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project; rather as new sources that could help satisfy the increasing regional and national demand for natural gas (see section 3.2). In addition, the FERC has a regulatory responsibility to act on each of the projects that are filed with it in a timely manner. Linking the environmental analyses of all LNG projects along the La Quinta Channel into a single EIS could result in delaying action on one or more of the projects based on insufficient data or unresolved issues associated with just one of the projects. The potential cumulative environmental effects of the three LNG projects, as well as other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects and activities are addressed in this EIS (see section 4.13) and in the EISs prepared for the other two projects.

1.3 PERMITS, APPROVALS, AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

As the lead federal agency for the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project, the FERC is required to comply with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, and Section 307 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972. Each of these statutes has been taken into account in the preparation of this document.

Endangered Species Act (ESA)

Section 7 of the ESA, as amended, states that any project authorized, funded, or conducted by any federal agency (*e.g.*, FERC) should not “...jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species which is determined...to be critical...” (16 United States Code [USC] Section 1536(a)(2)(1988)). The FERC, or Ingleside San Patricio as a non-federal party, is required to consult with the FWS and NOAA Fisheries to determine whether any federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat occur in the vicinity of the proposed Project. If, upon review of existing data or data provided by the applicant, the FERC determines that these species or habitats may be affected by the proposed Project, the FERC is required to prepare a biological assessment (BA) to identify the nature and extent of adverse impact, and to recommend measures that would avoid the habitat and/or species, or that would reduce potential impacts to acceptable levels. If, however, the FERC determines that no federally listed or proposed endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat would be affected by the proposed Project, no further action is necessary under the ESA. See section 4.6 of this EIS for the status of this review.

Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act (MSA)

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

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA)

Section 106 of the NHPA, as amended in 1992, requires the FERC to take into account the effects of its undertakings on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including prehistoric or historic sites, and districts, buildings, structures, objects, or properties of traditional religious or cultural importance. The NHPA also requires the FERC to afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment. In accordance with the ACHP’s regulations for implementing Section 106, found at 36 CFR 800, the FERC is using the services of the applicant, Ingleside San Patricio, and its consultants to prepare information, analyses, and recommendations to assist in meeting our obligations to comply with the NHPA. See section 4.10 of this EIS for the status of this review.

Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)

The CZMA calls for the “effective management, beneficial use, protection, and development” of the nation’s coastal zone and promotes active state involvement in achieving those goals. As a means to reach those goals, the CZMA requires participating states to develop management programs that demonstrate how these states will meet their obligations and responsibilities in managing their coastal areas. In the state of Texas, the Railroad Commission of Texas (TRRC) is the agency responsible for administering its Coastal Zone Management Program (CZMP). Because Section 307 of the CZMA requires federal agency activities to be consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of a management program, the FERC has requested that Ingleside San Patricio seek a determination of consistency with Texas’s CZMP. See section 4.7.5 of this EIS for additional discussion of the Texas CZMP.

Other Permits, Approvals, and Consultations

At the federal level, required permits and approval authority outside of FERC’s jurisdiction include compliance with the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Rivers and Harbor Act, and the Clean Air Act (CAA). Several Texas state agencies have delegated responsibilities under the CWA, CAA, and CZMA. The Coast Guard has responsibilities relating to LNG waterfront facilities.

The Coast Guard exercises regulatory authority over LNG facilities which affect the safety and security of port areas and navigable waterways under Executive Order 10173, the MSA (50 USC Section 191), the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1972 as amended (33 USC Section 1221, et seq.), and the Maritimes Transportation Security Act of 2002 (46 USC Section 701). The Coast Guard is responsible for matters related to navigation safety, vessel engineering and safety standards, and all matters pertaining to the safety of facilities or equipment located in or adjacent to navigable waters up to the last valve immediately before the receiving tanks. The Coast Guard also has the authority for LNG facility security plan review, approval, and compliance verification as provided in 33 CFR 105, and siting as it pertains to the management of vessel traffic in and around the LNG facility. See section 4.12.5 of this EIS for additional discussion of marine safety.

Major permits, approvals, and consultations required for the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project are identified in table 1.3-1. The FERC encourages cooperation between applicants and state and local authorities, but this does not mean that state and local agencies, through applications of state and local laws, may prohibit or unreasonably delay the construction or operation of facilities approved by the FERC. Any state or local permits issued with respect to jurisdictional facilities must be consistent with the conditions of any authorization issued by the FERC.⁴

⁴ See, e.g., *Schneidewind v. ANR Pipeline Co.*, 485 U.S. 293 (1988); *National Fuel Gas Supply v. Public Service Commission*, 894 F.2d 571 (2d Cir. 1990); and *Iroquois Gas Transmission System, L.P., et al.*, 52 FERC 61,091 (1990) and 59 FERC 61,094 (1992).

TABLE 1.3-1

Major Permits, Approvals, and Consultations for the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project

Agency and Regulation/Permit/Approval	Agency Actions	Anticipated Application Filing/Consultation Date
FEDERAL		
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Authorization under sections 3 and 7 of the Natural Gas Act.	Ingleside San Patricio filed applications on October 25, 2004.
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	Opportunity to comment on the Project under section 106 of the NHPA.	If no historic properties would be affected, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation would not need to be consulted.
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service - Farmland Protection Policy Act	Determine that construction of the pipeline would not be a permanent conversion of Important Farmland.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation for the LNG terminal and pipeline during October 2004.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Authorization for activities that will occupy, fill, or grade land in a floodplain, streambed, or channel of a stream or other waters of the U.S. under section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.	Permit application submitted on November 9, 2004.
	Authorization to discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. under section 404 of the Clean Water Act.	Ingleside San Patricio submitted a wetland delineation report for LNG terminal during July 2004 and June 2004 for the pipeline. The COE's jurisdictional determination is pending.
U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service - Section 7 of the ESA; Section 305 of the MSA; Marine Mammal Protection Act	Consultation on threatened and endangered aquatic species and EFH Conservation Recommendations.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation during April 2004.
U.S. Coast Guard - 33 CFR 127	Issue Letter of Recommendation, Waterfront Facilities Handling LNG and Liquefied Hazardous Gas.	Ingleside San Patricio submitted a Letter of Intent to Coast Guard on November 1, 2004. A Letter of Recommendation was issued by the Coast Guard on February 1, 2005.
U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service - Section 7, ESA	Consultation regarding effects on threatened and endangered species.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation for the LNG terminal and the pipeline on June 3, 2004 and November 19, 2004.
U.S. Department of Transportation - 49 CFR 192; 49 CFR 193	Evaluate compliance with federal safety standards; encroachment permits for crossing of federal highways.	Ingleside San Patricio to initiate consultation during 2005.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Section 402 of the CWA; 44 CFR 9; CAA	Issue National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit; review of construction within floodplain; review of air quality permit application.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation during June 2004.

TABLE 1.3-1 (cont'd)

Major Permits, Approvals, and Consultations for the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project

Agency and Regulation/Permit/Approval	Agency Actions	Anticipated Application Filing/Consultation Date
STATE		
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality - Texas Clean Air Act; CAA; 40 CFR 50-99	Acceptance of air permit for LNG terminal.	Ingleside San Patricio filed its permit application on November 2, 2004. Air permit issued April 15, 2005.
Railroad Commission of Texas - Section 307 of the CZMA	Determine coastal zone management consistency.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation for the LNG terminal and submitted documentation on CZMA with its COE application on November 9, 2004.
State Historic Preservation Office - Section 106 of the NHPA	Consultation regarding NRHP eligibility and project effects.	In letters dated September 2 and October 4, 2004, the SHPO indicated that no historic properties would be affected within the areas surveyed.
Texas Parks and Wildlife Department – Consultation	Review of biological survey reports. Review of Section 10 and Section 404 permits through the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation on February 6, 2004 for LNG terminal and the pipeline.
Railroad Commission of Texas - TAC Title 16 Part 1 Chapter 3	Issue NPDES storm water permit and pipeline construction permit.	Ingleside San Patricio submitted documentation with its COE application on November 9, 2004.
Texas Department of Transportation	Issue permit for crossing state highways.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation during 2005.
LOCAL		
San Patricio County Floodplain Mgmt Program - 44 CFR 60	Conduct permit review for construction in a floodplain.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation during 2005.
San Patricio Highway Department	Issue permit to cross county roads.	Ingleside San Patricio initiated consultation during 2005.

1.4 PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

On May 13, 2004, the FERC issued a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the Proposed Vista del Sol LNG Terminal Project and the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Terminal and Pipeline Project, Request for Comments on Environmental Issues, and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting (NOI). The NOI was sent to 698 interested parties including federal, state, and local officials; agency representatives; conservation organizations; local libraries and newspapers; residents within 0.5 mile of the proposed LNG terminals; and property owners along the proposed pipeline routes.

On June 9, 2004, the FERC conducted a joint public scoping meeting in Portland, Texas to provide an opportunity for the public to learn more about the proposed Vista del Sol LNG Terminal (Vista del Sol) Project and the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project and to provide comments on environmental issues to be addressed in the EIS. Twenty-nine people spoke at the meeting, and 13 agencies and individuals submitted written comments in lieu of oral comments. A transcript of the scoping meeting and all written comments provided at the meeting have been

entered into the public record for the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project. On June 9, 2004, the FERC also conducted a site visit, open to the public, of Ingleside San Patricio's LNG terminal site and the pipeline route.

Issuance of the NOI opened the public comment period and established a closing date of June 18, 2004, for receiving written comments. In total, 13 letters were received in response to the NOI. Issues identified and comments received are summarized in table 1.4-1.

TABLE 1.4-1		
Written Comments Received in Response to the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project NOI		
Party	Date Comments Filed	Issues Raised/Comment
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service	June 1, 2004	Pipeline would not permanently convert Important Farmland to another use.
Texas Department of Transportation	June 7, 2004	Increase minimum depth of pipeline under state highways. No state highways crossed may be open cut, all must be bored.
Andrew T. Boggless	June 9, 2004	Supports the Project.
U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA, National Marine Fisheries	June 10, 2004	FERC should consult with NOAA Fisheries and prepare an essential fish habitat assessment.
Soloman P. Ortiz, Member of Congress	June 15, 2004	Supports the Project.
Aransas – Corpus Christi Pilots	June 15, 2004	Pilots can continue to perform duties in a safe and expeditious manner with minimal traffic impacts.
Georgia Neblett, Mayor, City of Port Aransas	June 18, 2004	Supports the Project. Concerned about potential impacts on the ferry system operation and erosion of the ship channel within City limits.
U.S. Department of the Army, COE, Galveston District	June 21, 2004	EIS should address purpose and need, alternatives, cumulative impacts, and information on the replacement dock, LNG vessel/marine terminal, LNG storage facility, and pipeline.
Naismith Engineering, Inc.	June 22, 2004	Coordinate with the San Patricio County Drainage District regarding drainage and flood control structures within the county.
U.S. Fish Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Corpus Christi	June 23, 2004	Agrees to be a cooperating agency.
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6	June 24, 2004	EIS should address alternatives, environmental justice, water quality, and potential effects on coastal wetlands, air quality, pesticide use, prime agricultural land, endangered species, cultural resource, and cumulative impacts.
Portland Chamber of Commerce	June 26, 2004	Supports the Project.
Texas Commission o Environmental Quality	July 27, 2004	Prevent surface and groundwater contamination.

In addition to the public notice and scoping process discussed above, the FERC conducted agency consultations and participated in interagency meetings to identify issues that should be addressed in this EIS. This included an interagency meeting in Galveston, Texas on May 18, 2004 to discuss the Project and the environmental review process with other key federal and state agencies. These agencies included the COE, Coast Guard, NOAA Fisheries, FWS, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), DOT, TRRC, Texas General Land Office (TGLO), Coastal Management Program; and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD).

The FERC staff also met with the Coast Guard, Port of Corpus Christi, and a representative of the Aransas - Corpus Christi Pilots on June 9, 2004.

In response to the FERC's Notice of Application for this Project, a total of seven parties submitted motions to intervene. Intervenors receive all documentation filed in a proceeding and have the right to seek rehearing of the Commission's decision. The intervening parties and issues raised are listed on table 1.4-2. No protests were filed in this proceeding.

TABLE 1.4-2		
Intervenors in the Ingleside Energy Center LNG Project		
Intervening Party	Date Intervention Was Filed	Basis for Seeking Intervenor Status
Exxon Mobil Gas Marketing Company	November 5, 2004	Producer and marketer of natural gas, and subsidiary of sponsor of a proposed LNG terminal also to be sited in Corpus Christi Bay area.
Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corporation	November 16, 2004	Company would interconnect with the San Patricio Pipeline.
Sempra Energy LNG	November 23, 2004	Developer of LNG facilities in North America.
Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America (a subsidiary of Kinder Morgan, Inc.)	November 24, 2004	Company would interconnect with the San Patricio Pipeline.
Kinder Morgan Tejas Pipeline, L.P.	December 6, 2004	Company would interconnect with the San Patricio Pipeline.
Gulf Coast LNG Partners, L.P.	February 3, 2005	Developer of a LNG facility in the Gulf Coast region of Texas.
Project Technical Liaison Associates, Inc.	February 17, 2005	Technical advisor to the LNG industry.

The FERC issued a Notice of Availability for the draft EIS on February 24, 2005. The draft EIS was filed with the EPA, and a formal notice indicating that the draft EIS was available was published in the FR on March 2, 2005. The draft EIS was mailed to approximately 698 individuals and organizations on the mailing list prepared for the Project, including local newspapers and public libraries in Corpus Christi, Portland, Gregory, Taft, Sinton, and Ingleside, Texas. In accordance with the CEQ regulations implementing the NEPA, the public had the opportunity to submit written comments on the draft EIS up through April 18, 2005. In addition, a public meeting for commenting on the draft EIS was held in Portland, Texas, on March 30, 2005. Fifteen people offered comments at this public meeting. A transcript of the public meeting has been entered into the public record for the Ingleside Energy LNG Project. All timely comments and letters received on the draft EIS are addressed in this final EIS (see appendix H).