JON HUSTON: Thank you for this opportunity. I'm a 12-year resident of Las Vegas and with my wife own property in Caliente. I just wanted to add three items to the discussion here today. And Mr. Kelly, I am a

geologist. I'm also an attorney, which is probably a negative to the geology side, that's for sure.

1 But I in an earlier life opened a short-line railroad in Colorado. So I've had an opportunity to review the Caliente route both from sort of a geologic background and, also, as the owner/operator of a railroad. I wouldn't build this railroad. I certainly wouldn't start it in Caliente.

The first main reason is the route through Caliente, Caliente is in a canyon. And that 60 miles or so of canyon is the most difficult portion of railroad that the Union Pacific owns. That railroad has been washed out by flood when it was originally built in 1904. It lasted two years, and then it lasted a handful of years after that, rebuilt and flooded out.

It's been flooded out in the '60s. And in January of 2005, Union Pacific Railroad lost 22 miles of railroad down that canyon and a load of cars and trains that went into the creek. To take materials, any materials down that canyon and then back out of that canyon in Caliente is a silly thing to do, especially given the potential alternatives for railroad access.

So if I were going to build, own, and operate

a railroad to Yucca Mountain, I would not start in what amounts to Clover and Rainbow Canyons at Caliente and then try to do 330 miles to get there.

Secondly, from a geologic standpoint, the preferred route through Caliente begins at the confluence of the two largest drainages in the whole region. Most of the flood water gets right there. And it's -- Caliente is located on a former volcano caldera. And there's the hot springs there.

And so it's a very geologically active area, and it's a difficult place to build a heavy railroad, especially one that would take 120-ton cars, that sort of thing. So it's kind of like trying to build a railroad in a swamp. If you don't have to go there, you wouldn't. So this particular design and route seems to be born of other things other than choosing a good place to build a railroad.

2 The third point is this suddenly has become a shared use railroad, like I heard some comment about, gosh, we could have tourism. I've heard people talk about how we could haul cows on it and that type of thing.

These particular documents, EIS documents talk about two or three trains a day for nuclear materials, but up to 16 trains a day for shared use proposal. There are very few people going from Caliente to Tonopah or Beatty or Amargosa Junction every day. There's certainly not 13 trains a day going that route.

There are not 13 trainloads of cows or

anything that goes that route, unless there's some other freight that's going to travel this railroad. And what could that be? I don't really know. I can only speculate. It sounds like a military railroad. It could access the Test Site a number of places. I don't know who else you can share a railroad with in terms of those kind of train loads.

Certainly there's been some statement with regard to the kind of materials that would need to be moved into the Test Site. But it simply doesn't make sense if there's something else going on here that's undisclosed that's improper. In any event, for those reasons, my suggestion that both these EIS's with regard to the railroads are faultily flawed.] Thank you.