

Bill Leppala

RECEIVED

Crescent Valley, Nevada Public Meeting

0039

OCT 10 2001

11 MR. LEPPALA: My name is Bill Leppala. I guess
12 one of my first comments is we've attended the meetings
13 and attended and given public comments and heard others
14 give comments and as near as I can tell we have received
15 no feedback on the other public comments either for us to
16 agree or disagree, yeah or nay, or reinforce our
17 arguments.

18 It goes in some big vacuum out there and we keep
19 coming to things and talking about the same things over
20 and over without getting any answers back.

21 I don't know what will happen with that but I
22 would like to see that some how it is done.

23 On my list which was hurriedly done, I'm
24 concerned with the aquifers. We seem to have a tendency

0040

1 to do the greatest good for the greatest number. I would
2 be very fearful of a nuclear shipment or nuclear train or
3 nuclear corridor passing over some of the aquifers in the
4 state of Nevada, being stored above some of the aquifers
5 and then the omnipotent powers saying because the water is
6 possibly or can be contaminated they shall not be used.
7 It's an entire possibility. This goes beyond the fact of

8 in case it does become contaminated then we have other
9 issues to face. We can never clean them up. That's my
10 concern with the aquifers especially in the Crescent
11 Valley area we have a large aquifer, 150 feet or so. It's
12 very precious to us.

13 At some point in time somebody could decide for
14 our own good we can no longer use it and there goes the
15 lifestyle because of a potential problem and not an actual
16 problem.

17 The next item, is land use. How would we limit
18 access to land use due to rail lines? Present concerns of
19 security, what would be the safe setback from the rail
20 lines, what kinds of gates, what kind of fences, what kind
21 of corridors would be fenced off to protect the rail lines
22 which would happen.

23 We have limited access because of rail lines?
24 We limit the way people move? Limit the way people go?

0041

1 We would be unable to access mining claims. We would be
2 unable to access grazing allotments. We would be unable
3 to access mill site areas and I guess the miners and the
4 ranchers would be greatly affected along with the
5 recreational people with limited access for the land use.

6 Recreation, we run again into the same kind of
7 land restrictions.

8 These land restrictions by the very nature of
9 the railroad corridor would remove a fair amount of roads
10 from our maps, from public usages. They would interrupt
11 these roads, not remove them, but by the very nature of
12 interpreting them, there would be no way to get from point
13 A to point B not no way to get here from there.

14 And it would affect the ranchers also. There
15 would be severe limited access with hunting and fishing
16 and other outdoor activities, off-road usage, because of
17 these restrictions, rail corridor moving primarily through
18 the outdoor recreation.

19 The next thing I would like to speak on is
20 economics. I would hate to see what this will do to
21 property values after a certain period of time. They
22 would be removed from the tax rolls. Property values
23 could go down and a tremendous amount of property would be
24 ceded over to public land and receive a minor amount of

0042

1 tax money to the county because we all know what in lieu
2 of means. Means damn near nothing when it comes to paying
3 taxes to the government instead of private lands.

4 We would also have increased taxes to the people
5 that are left on devalued property because of the
6 increased need for local emergency services.

7 We can say the federal government will fund us
8 and the federal government will do this, that and the
9 other things. By god if they did, the local fire
10 department, EMTs, et cetera, wouldn't have to have bake
11 sales or car washes or have to do these things to raise a
12 few bucks for their materials, and their possessions and
13 tools and clothing and the various things that aren't
14 provided.

15 Another thing that we would have for this
16 county, a loss of permanent residents which also further
17 erodes the tax base due to the simple fear of a nuclear
18 accident and the proximity to the corridor.

19 Then we have the environment, some of the
20 environmental impacts and possible nuclear contamination
21 either due to accidents, acts of war or acts of stupidity.

22 I separate accidents from stupidity because they
23 are simply separable.

24 Traffic noise, there are people back east I

0043

1 would think would give their left arm to live in a place

2 like this, noise and pollution free as this. I don't

3 think they appreciate that.

4 Then there is the other item we have when we

5 build the rail line through here, we have a tremendous

6 potential for other toxic waste contamination not related

7 to the nuclear: The damned oil, the grease, diesel fuel,

8 spillage, the creosote from the ties, the other various

9 types of garbage that are generated from the rail lines.

10 If you want to see it drive down the corridor and look at

11 the railroads. If you want to see it, just drive around

12 the corridor, tremendous amounts.

13 Increased highway traffic out here on our little

14 peaceful highway. It will increase the amount of traffic

15 on our highway because people will come out and look, all

16 kinds of other traffic and also increase the cost of which

17 a very minimal amount of the highway belongs to the state,

18 most belong to the county.

19 Another tax increase to maintain the damned

20 roads.

21 Then we have another very great issue that I've

22 never seen brought up, specifically, generalities yes and

23 I probably just did it in generalities too, the possible

24 contamination of our Humboldt River. Believe it or not, I

0044

1 think it's our only navigable river in the state of

2 Nevada, is that true?

3 MS. DANN: I think part of the Truckee River and

4 Carson River.

5 MR. LEPPALA: Are they navigable?

6 MS. DANN: Yes, I think right now the rivers

7 aren't even navigable.

8 MR. LEPPALA: Little of both. It's our largest

9 and navigable river.

10 Then as far as addressing the safety issues.

11 The shipping containers, all this shipping container

12 propaganda is great but, you know, the testing here is

13 wonderful and does all these make do, feel good fuzzy

14 things but I wonder what happens if they caved in Yucca

15 Mountain and the container would squash like a tube of

16 catsup. I don't see any of that up here. I see dropping,

17 falling, rolling, fire, but nothing like a squashing like

18 a tube of toothpaste.

19 Container life expectancy. I think it's pretty

20 ludicrous to design something for a much longer time than

21 we can even read about in history. I find that very, very

22 ludicrous and very presumptuous. I think our scientists

23 need some ego adjustments because they can't just design

24 something to last twice longer than recorded history. I

0045

1 don't believe that.

2 Transportation methods. Is there really going

3 to be a rail, use trucks? Lord knows we've seen enough

4 rail accidents lately in the last eight months, year.

5 Keeping close tabs on those since our meeting here I think

6 December of last year? Two years ago.

7 A LADY: 1999.

8 MR. LEPPALA: 1999, seems like every place I

9 look I read about a derailment. We had one between here

10 and Battle Mountain, massive derailment. There is still a

11 car sitting out there because of the toxic waste in it

12 railroad waiting for somebody to decide what the hell to

13 do with it. It was a perfectly good rail line. That's

14 the same rail line that will haul the nuclear waste in

15 from that direction?

16 There is not a wit of difference between the

17 rail line west of Crescent Valley and Beowawe than they

18 are to the east of Crescent Valley. They are all the

19 same.

20 We just had the Amtrak that got rear ended by

21 the coal train for crying out loud. There wasn't even
22 enough moxie there to get out of the way and they had an
23 accident.

24 We'll be smarter with the nuclear trains? No, I

0046

1 don't think so.

2 Security. Are we going to secure ourselves to
3 death on this nuclear waste corridor? Are we going to
4 move our setbacks on the access to the corridor for a
5 couple of hundred feet? Will it have a large economic
6 impact? Are we going to move our ability to set the
7 tracks back by a half a mile or a quarter mile, 300-yards?
8 What are we going to do here? I don't understand.

9 A lot of these questions I just posed and the
10 things I just said are things that have been said two
11 years ago and we have no answers for. Personally I think
12 it's pretty damned presumptuous to ask us to say the same
13 things again that we said two years ago. We haven't had
14 any answers. We aren't prepared to answer what we said in
15 case they differ or prepared to reinstitute or reinforce
16 any new arguments in the event they are needed. I would
17 really appreciate some feed back. Thank you.