



YPT press release sucks
 Sunny091929
 to:
 Jere Johnson, David Seter
 11/16/2011 11:18 AM
 Hide Details
 From: Sunny091929@aol.com

To: Jere Johnson/R9/USEPA/US@EPA, David Seter/R9/USEPA/US@EPA

History: This message has been replied to and forwarded.

Jere and David,

As you will see by the comments that follow. I am very, very upset by this latest backstabbing press release that contains so many mis-statements or misleading statements that it is unfair, slanted and reprehensible.

Here we go again. Yet another outlandish press release. This time from the Yerington Paiute Tribe in a story appearing in the Gardnerville Record-Courier and also submitted to the Mason Valley News which hopefully will ask for comments from the other side before publishing such a damning report. I am forwarding that release for your review.

The two environmental wizards at the YPT apparently now figure they know more than the federal EPA, NDEP or anyone else involved in the old Anaconda mine site feasibility study as to what is best for cleanup of that area. So the tribe reviewed the feasibility study and drew its own conclusions -- slanted toward their perspective of course.

1. The re-mining option was not included in the EPA study as it stated in the release. In fact, one of the purposes of the last public meeting in Yerington was to seek public comment and the deadline was extended to October 31. The MVEC and others did submit comments after that meeting and urged that re-mining be included in the final feasibility study. Apparently the YPT already knows that request has been denied. If your read their release, that is certainly indicated. Is that true? If so, why have we not been notified?

2. There has never been, to my knowledge, any public discussion of any \$60-million capping project that will satisfy all the concerns. And the MVEC and others have continued to oppose any NPL listing for the site and our stance has not changed. Has the EPA moved in that direction without telling us?

3. Who the hell is the tribe and its consultant to "determine" that capping the site is the "only appropriate measure"? I always thought the EPA and the public were working together on a solution. Am I wrong?

4. The indication that the capping project would add to the economy of Mason Valley is whose conclusion? The state it as fact when we all know that is not the case. The MVEC has always opposed the NPL listing for exactly the opposite concern. Are you willing to trade economic development using EPA projects to clean up the site vs. the economic damage such a listing will do -- ever the perspective -- to our major existing economic engine -- agriculture? Kill us off while the cleanup is being done? Don't be ridiculous.

5. Have the EPA and Singatse determined, as the release states, that "the material found at this second of the Anaconda Mine Site has already been processed twice by two different mine operators and this particular area only represents a small portion of the site". Or is that, once again, the tribe's opinion. Has a decision been made that re-mining won't work? If so, why have we not been told?
6. The "toxix environmental legacy of mining in our community" as the release stated Justin Whiteside as saying would seem to taint all mining activity in the area with the same broad brush. Does the EPA feel that way? What about Nevada Copper's proposal for the Pumpkin Hollow site? This broad statement really is not factual and ARC, Anaconda, Entree Gold, Singatsee, Quatterra, and every other mining operation should be up in arms over that single comment.
7. The mine site at Weed Heights was operated from 1952 to 1978 and that is a fact. Then the release goes on to state that the mine has "been the subject of an investigation due to its mining wastes and continued negative environmental impact". That mine was a huge economic benefit during its operation and that was positive. The cleanup is another issue entirely and stands to damage our economy even more if the wrong procedures are utilizede.
8. The entire piece contains so many negative adjectives designed for only one reason -- to slant the entire article in a way as to reflect negatively on everyone involved in what I always thought was public process being guided by knowlegeable people at the EPA, NDEP, ARC, etc. Now I guess the tribe has set itself up as the only real "expert" on the issues and will serve as judged and jury on the project. Just look at the negative wording and phrasing in the press release.
9. "The tribe strongly supports an immediate start to the proposed cleanup to protect their community but Singatse Peak Services is requesting continued delay." Talk about pointing a finger!!!!
10. The MVEC, the City and Lyon County have tried to work with the EPA, NDEP, ARC, Singatse, YCAG and the YPT in an open and above-board manner, realizing we will not always agree. But if this the new tactic that is going to be taken by the tribe (most likely with YCAG's approval), thene we can get down and dirty as well. We can take shots in the media just like they have and perhaps we should be considering just that. We will not just sit idly by and turn the other cheek.

That's not the way I like to handle things. Please tell me that is not the way this business is supposed to be run. If you agree, just what does the EPA plan to do about such outlandish public media releases?

I Look forward to your responses.

Jim Sanford, President
Mason Valley Environmental Committee
sunny091929@aol.com

From: tdhvaquero@tele-net.net
To: sunny091929@aol.com
Sent: 11/12/2011 5:45:28 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
Subj: fyi

<http://www.recordcourier.com/article/20111110/NEWS/111109838/1062&ParentProfile=1049>