

2

FILE

ORIGINAL

May 14, 2008

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

2008 MAY 20 P 08

REGULATORY COMMISSION

PUCO

2008 MAY 30 AM 8:16

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

Re: Docket CP07-208-000 Rockies Express, LLC—East

Dear Secretary:

I'm a landowner in Franklin County, Indiana, whose family farm lies in the path of the REX East pipeline. In a letter submitted in the public comment period following the draft EIS, I expressed our concern about the project route's crossing the wooded watershed of our pond, a pond that supplies our drinking water.

Following the posting of my letter on the FERC docket, REX surveyors staked out a re-route of the pipeline that avoided our watershed by about 200 feet. In addition, the new route was slightly downhill from the crest of our five acre wooded watershed, which lessened considerably the chances of contamination from spills during pipeline construction. My husband and I assumed these changes were in response to the concerns raised in my letter.

When the final EIS came out, we were surprised to see that FERC had not accepted the re-route and had instead recommended a slight alteration of the original route. According to the EIS, this variation was made to avoid the watershed. However, the FERC variation, shown in figure J-7 of the EIS, does not do anything to remedy the watershed problem. The variation still has the pipeline and attendant construction traveling along the crest of the hill that forms our watershed.

Last night, my husband and I were visited by two REX right-of-way agents who told us that REX was required to follow FERC's alternative route rather than their own re-route. All of us walked up the hill to look at the two routes. The two agents, Bruce Olson and Mike Garner, agreed that the REX re-route avoided the watershed while the FERC alteration did not. In fact, they pointed out that since the pipeline made a turn at the crest of the hill, more work space than usual would be needed. They suggested that in an effort to spare the watershed, we consult with the project environmentalist when he visits the site in the near future. They thought the environmentalist could possibly intercede with FERC for us. We intend to do that.

But the end of the comment period is looming, so we're asking FERC right now to take another look at the Yane Route Variation, 3.5.7 in the EIS, which crosses our watershed, and the REX re-route, which avoids it. I should note that the re-route does not cross our property line at all. However, our intent is not to push the pipeline onto our neighbors' land but to keep it away from our watershed. Perhaps a third route can be laid out that will do this.

I've enclosed an aerial photo and a drawing of the area in question, which I hope you'll look at. You can also see the REX re-route on their latest map. We've lived here 35 years and have

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician _____ Date Processed 5-30-08

always prized our water supply. Because the watershed is small and forested, the water that ends up in our pond is clear, high-quality water. Wells in our neighborhood typically run dry in the summer and people pay to have water hauled, something we've never had to do. Losing our water source would be a major setback for us, so we would appreciate your giving this a second look.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Monica Yane".

Monica Yane