

Pat King, Tucson, AZ.
April 14, 2014

Kimberly D Bose, Secretary
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
888 First Street NE, Room 1 A
Washington, DC 20426

Re: Docket Nos CP13-73-000 and CP13-74-000

Dear Ms. Bose and Commission Members:

I remain frustrated as plans move forward on the Sierrita Pipeline. Our concerns, those of us who live here and will be affected by this pipeline, are unheard and unaddressed.

In going through the Final EIS report I was amazed to see in the section of Alternatives the eastern route is not even listed. Going down the Altar Valley, the pipeline had two routes for consideration. The eastern route followed the highway-a utility corridor-along the floor of the valley all the way to the border. The western route veered west way upslope to the foot of the mountains to avoid the Buenos Aries Wildlife Refuge (BANWR).

The eastern route crossed the BANWR and BANWR officials determined the crossing was not compatible.

This western route as we have reminded everyone time and time again is not good for many reasons.

1. Security for the people who live in the valley; ranch homes in this valley are located in the foothills, miles from Highway 286. This pipeline track will create a thoroughfare for traffickers in drugs and humans which is an ongoing problem.
2. The environment; the western route is steeper, has 10 times the washes to cross, erosion and habitat destruction are a major concern.
3. Cultural destruction; many prehistoric sites are located at the base of the mountains where historically water was available.

What makes the BANWR or any other federal land more important than private land? We are not talking about traipsing across undeveloped land as the west route does, but to hold to the utility corridor with the highway, power, and telephone lines as that eastern route recommended. If the installation of this pipeline is important enough that the Federal Government will give a private business authorization to condemn someone's private land, how can it hold its own land federal land above that authorization? At least work out some arrangement as they do to the private land owner?

I attended a lecture where there was a discussion of philosophy. I thought how Cicero's words still are true today looking at this issue. Cicero said, "In nature there is a standard to tell if a law is good." When you look at the numbered points above, to go to the western route is a lose/lose all around. Bad law.

We all would rather the pipeline not be here but, since it probably will, would it not be the better idea to do the least amount of damage?

Reading the final EIS, all agree the utility corridor would be less destructive (that eastern route). Since the BANWR is all about environment too, why not, as was requested before, have Kinder Morgan purchase that corridor which does not comply with the mission of the Refuge either and deed it over to the state or maintain ownership, whatever, place the pipeline in the corridor and turn this into a win/win for everyone? Kinder Morgan is purchasing other rights of way. 500 feet wide, which would include the highway, power and telephone, X approximately 22 miles = 1340 acres.

I find it curious the BANWR finds maintaining the utility corridor in an undeveloped valley "not compatible" but has no problem with Kinder Morgan using BANWR roads to get way off the highway into undeveloped steeper land, this somehow does become compatible.

My land is not included in this east/west conflict. Kinder Morgan will cross my land to either route. And really, this is not a "not in my backyard" issue but, Altar Valley is my valley, my home, with my friends. My family has lived in this valley 120 years and we stand with our neighbors. Why is it so difficult to see the harm being done?

People in government are always speaking of the environment and open space. I am asking that this be considered. Do you really mean all that politically correct talk and are you willing to walk the walk?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John King Patricia King
King's Anvil Ranch
Tucson, Arizona

Document Content(s)

21782.TXT.....1-2