August 19, 2019

Nevada County Planning Commissioners
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

RE: Recirculated Draft EIR Proposed Negative Declaration for New Conditional Use Permit (U10-118)
Expanding the Boca Quarry (U06-012)
Final Environmental Impact Report
By: Coleen Shade, Senior Planner

Dear Planning Commissioners,

We in the Hirschdale Community have shared many presentations of this Conditional Use Permit. We have gone from having 400 trucks through our neighborhood to an Alternative Route with Bridge Removal to now Bridge replacement and a new access road for the Teichert mine via Stampede Meadows Road/West Hinton Road.

The County Planning Commission will consider whether to recommend approval of the Final EIR, Amended Use Permit, 2011 Reclamation Plan, and the Development Agreement to the Board of Supervisors (Board) as complete and in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines.

The Planning Commission's recommendation to the Board and the Board's determination will consider written findings of fact for each significant environmental impact identified in the EIR, and a statement of overriding considerations for the unavoidable environmental impact of the project. Public input is allowed during the public hearings with the Planning Commission and the Board.

The findings of fact considers the following for each significant impact of the project: (1) determine if the proposed project has been changed to avoid or substantially lessen the magnitude of the impact; (2) find that changes to the proposed project are within another agency's jurisdiction, and such changes have been or should be adopted; and (3) find that specific economic, social, or other considerations make mitigation measures or proposed project alternatives infeasible. The findings of fact must be based on substantial evidence in the administrative record and the conclusions required by CEQA. The statement of overriding considerations provides a written explanation for why the Lead Agency determines that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable environmental impact of the project.

If the Final EIR is approved, a Notice of Determination will be filed by the County with the County Clerk. The County will submit the four separate items to the Director of the State Department of Conservation (Division of Mine Reclamation) for their final review.

The Hirschdale Community responded to the Boca Quarry Expansion Project Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report by letter dated June 5, 2019 with several comments. These comments were addressed in the Final EIR document. Those comments and responses are attached for your review and additional further comment. It is up to you to decide if these comments and concerns were adequately addressed.

REDUCED ALTERNATIVE

We as you can see below feel the "Reduced alternative is the adequate alternative for this permit for numerous reasons addressed below. It is stated in the Staff Report "reducing the maximum annual production of the quarry would extend the life of the mine when compared with the proposed project because the aggregate reserve would be removed at a slower rate. Reducing the annual and daily production could also reduce the daily hours of operations and could avoid the need for nighttime operations.

(Page 99 of Staff Report) The daily production would be limited to approximately 2,520 tons per day 0.25 of the maximum daily production of 10,080 tons under the proposed project. Annual production Would be limited to 250,000 tons per year, approximately 0.25 of the maximum annual production of the proposed project. 2,520 tons per day would result in approximately 280 daily one-way truck trips compared to 1,120 one-way trips generated by the proposed project.

TRAFFIC AN CIRCULATION UNDER THE REDUCTED PLAN

It is stated on page 100 of Staff Report The reduction in truck traffic from limiting production would decrease truck traffic on the local roadway system. Overall, this alternative would result in reduced impacts to the traffic and circulation in the area when compared to the proposed project. (RDEIR, pp 6-8 to 6-9)

NOISE

It is stated on page 100 This alternative would result in reduced noise impacts compared to the proposed project. This would allow for shorter duration each day due to the potentially shorter shifts and lower likelihood of nighttime activities. The potential for nighttime loads out would be minimized under this alternative.

AIR QUALITY

Page 101 of Staff Report

All pollutant emissions for the Reduced Daily Production Alternative would be below the NSAQMD threshold and would be less than significant impact.

It is stated the Truckee River RV Park visitors will be temporarily exposed to DPM from passing haul trucks utilizing Stampede Meadows Road and the Interstate -80 interchange with the Hirschdale Road. Therefore, due to the short-term nature of recreational visits and the temporary exposure from passing Haul trucks, impacts to recreational reservoir users and Truckee River RV Park users are less than significant. At the same time, the full-time residents including young children and owners of the Truckee RV River Park will be exposed during the full months of operations to these pollutants.

STAFF REPORT

Staff report page 53 states "The maximum annual mining rate of the proposed project is on million tons; thus, the project could result in a maximum of 55,556 truck trips removing aggregate in such a year, plus a maximum of 13,900 truck trips delivering clean backfill. The estimated maximum number of trips that can be processed per day is 560; or 15,120 trucks per month. With an additional 15 round trips per day for employees and one for maintenance truck for a total of 576 vehicle round trips (maximum) per day, equating to 15,552 per month maximum for all uses. (RDEIR, p 3-8.) This permit is for a 30-year time period. This obviously would diminish the life of the quarry as stated on page 54 of Staff report "Thus if annual production averaged in excess of 570,000 tons per year, the life of the quarry would decrease

accordingly. (RDEIR, p. 3-8) This is on a May 1 until October 31, six days per week total of 158 operating days minis any holidays. This is also considering the hours of operation to be 6:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m. Monday thru Friday and 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on Saturdays. This is also considering extended hours of Operating from 5:00 a.m. and ending as late as 9:00 p.m. and considering nighttime operations Load out could be 24 hours per day and up to seven days per week to service projects which is not specific to emergency.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES (Page 94 Staff Report)

Market Position. Maintain current company position and market share as a leading regional provider. Staff is recommending the Board rejects this alternative as infeasible because it does not meet Project Objectives, even though it clearly shows this Alternative is overall best when you consider health, welfare and safety.

REGIONAL DEMAND

It is clear this is a mine for the use of regional demand. (Regional Map attached) The regional map clearly shows the region that this mine would supply with the eastern side of Truckee dealing with these truck traffic volumes. Our little town of Truckee is being indadated with traffic from all directions as the Town of Truckee continues to grow.

The exits off the freeway to this mine are two lane exits both directions to and from the mine with short lanes for traffic off these ramps. Another issue is train delays to consider with this volume of truck traffic going both directions.

DUST CONTROL

The current conditional use permit requires a dust control measure of watering trucks before they leave the facility, the new conditional use permit only speaks of watering the roadway once a day for dust control. It is also stated they have one water truck and this water truck is to water the roads and is available for fire suppression. Mitigation Measure on permit U06-012 requires trucks to be sprayed with water for dust control. Watering twice daily for adequate dust control. Mitigation Measures 5C, 5D, 5E, 5F, 5H all are for dust control and should be implemented in this current permit. This permit expires 2027 will this permit stay in force until this time or does the current permit being approved then become the current permit that is enforceable?

WILDFIRE CONCERNS

We have had multiple fires in our small little area of Hirschdale. Hirschdale is in a bowl. Fire is an extreme concern for many. We addressed this issue with the Board of Supervisors this last meeting for the Hirschdale bridges that we would like a secondary route to exit Hirschdale. We discussed the use of Hinton to Stampede Meadows road if necessary. I have provided pictures of the Boca fire near the grave site. Having an escape route established for both the mine and the Hirschdale community would be something to consider.

It is stated on page 187 as draft Conditional Use Permit Part B Building Department
#2 Emergency ingress and egress to be constructed? Where is this emergency ingress egress being constructed?

PUBLIC SERVICES

How can this amount of truck traffic not have an impact on Fire, Ambulance response with only two-lane roadways? How would this amount of traffic starting at 7:00 am not affect school buses entering Glenshire/Hirschdale?

WATER TANKS FOR WATER SUPPRESSION

We had asked if as a condition Teichert would be required to have water tanks as they move from phase to phase for fire suppression and that was mitigated as not necessary. We would like the Commissioners and the Board of Supervisors to take this into consideration. We are aware that Al Pombo at his Hobart Mills plant has a very large water tank for dust control and fire suppression. The permit states a water control of 12% for dust control. The Spring on the property is located to the further south side of the parcel. The West Pit is to the North.

UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

It is clearly stated in Final EIR and Staff Report that Aesthetics, Transportation and Circulation, Air Quality, Visual Character, Conflicts with Bicyclists, will Exceed Threshold for NOX and PM10 established by the Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District will all be unavoidable impacts. Aesthetics, Transportation and Air Quality impacts are also identified as cumulatively considerably significant and unavoidable. Page 34 Staff Report

HAUL ROUTE

Mitigation Measure Trans-3

The authorized haul route for the operation of the quarry is along Stampede Meadows Road and West Hinton Road. The Applicant shall not alter the haul route without prior authorization from the Nevada County Board of Supervisors. It has been stated numerous times that the haul route for operations of this mine is that of Stampede Meadows Road and West Hinton. Why does this state "shall not alter the haul route without prior authorization of the County Board of Supervisors"? This haul route should not at any time be altered.

Mitigation Measure Trans-2 states To assure the use of West Hinton Road is the main access to the quarry and the only haul route, the applicant shall maintain the Special Use Permit for the road use across the USFS land with the USFS for the duration of operation of the quarry. Documentation of the USFS permit shall be provided to the County prior to operation of the West Pit and then thereafter with the Development Agreement annual review. Seems Trans-3 could be illuminated and the signage portion could be added at the end of this mitigation.

TWO TRUCK PER HOUR LIMITATION

CURRENT PERMIT MITIGATION MEASURE 8a WHICH THE HIRSCHDALE COMMUNITY AND PLANNING COMMISSIONERS ESTABLISHED TO PROTECT THE HIRSCHDALE COMMUNITY FROM HEAVY TRUCK TRAFFIC FOR THE LIFETIME OF THIS PERMIT.

IT READS: IN THE EVENT THAT ALTERNATIVE ACCESS IS UNAVAILABLE (STAMPEDE MEADOWS/WEST HINTON) THEN THE USE OF HIRSCHDALE ROAD SHALL BE LIMITIED (AS THE SOLE ACCESS TO THIS SITE) TO TWO LOADED GRAVEL TRUCKS PER HOUR. THE HOURS OF OPERATION SHALL BE RESTRICTED TO 9:00 A.M. TO 5:00 P.M. ON WEEKDAYS ONLY. NO WEEKEND GRAVEL HAULING IS PERMITTED DURING PERIODS WHEN HIRSCHDALE ROAD IS THE ONLY ACESS TO THIS SITE.

WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE THIS ADDED TO THE CURRENT PERMIT TO PROTECT THE COMMUNITY OF HIRSCHDALE FROM HAVING HEAVY TRUCK TRAFFIC

HOURS OF OPERATION

Hours of operation should be determined after a decision has been made as to the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations and if the Reduced Alternative is decided as this could change the hours of operations and not necessitate night-time operations. The current permit has hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Saturday.

EMERGENCIES

The current permit as a Condition of Approval has 6c stating "Emergency use shall be defined as periods when weather related acts of nature require the aggregate material to protect property or public resources, and when such emergencies occur. Any such emergencies shall only be declared by a State, County, or local public agency, and the Office of Emergency Services.

We would like to see this same Mitigation Measure implemented in the new permit.

A22 The correct operating schedule is presented in Table 3-1 and is summarized here: Typical Operating Schedule: May 1 through October 31, Monday - Friday: 6:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m., Saturday: 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Blasting: Up to two times per week, Monday - Saturday: 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Occasional Extended **Operating Schedule: 5 a.m. - 9 p.m. in response to customer demand and/or operational considerations. 24-hour load out may occur in response to demand by a government agency (typically road improvement projects or emergencies).** The incorrect time presented in Section 3.3.1 of the Recirculated Draft EIR is corrected from 9 a.m. to 7 a.m. The operational and blasting hours are to provide operational flexibility while prohibiting blasting during evening and nighttime hours. The noise impact analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR notes that maximum noise levels due to blasting would be approximately 48 to 63 dB Lmax. The noise levels would be below the maximum daytime noise levels and because no blasting would occur during the evening and nighttime hours (evening hours are 7 p.m. to 10 p.m., and nighttime hours are 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.), no significant impact would occur. The commenter has noted that the blasting schedule should be included as mitigation to prevent noise impacts from blasting occurring outside of the authorized timeframes. Because no significant impact would occur, no mitigation is necessary.

We ask that you take all of this into consideration before recommending adoption of the Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations. Theses impacts not only affect our community, but also the Town of Truckee.

Why would you allow a permit of such volumes, when it is clearly stated the Reduced Alternative would reduce multiple environmental impacts. Response comments are below to the concerns we addressed. We would hope that the Planning Commissioners along with the Board will take these comments into consideration when making this decision to permit such volumes of extraction in our area.

Comment from 2012 response:

Comment: *A median alternative presented would seem reasonable. The alternatives presented are "No project alternative" and a "Reduced Annual Production Alternative" A median alternative would give other options available for consideration. If this permit is approved, it is based on one of the two of these options there is no median presentation for approval. The studies are specific to the maximum figures and nothing in between. Obviously if the volumes were lessened so would many of the issues of environmental impacts overall.*
Studies at the level predicted, would give a clearer picture of actual environmental impacts.

Final EIR Response: A4- CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives which would feasibly attain the objectives of the project but that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and which will foster informed decision making and public participation. The EIR does not need to consider every conceivable alternative to the project. **The Reduced Daily Production Alternative was analyzed because it would allow the maximum lifetime extraction from the mine while reducing significant and unavoidable air quality impacts to less than significant.** While a median alternative would incrementally reduce impacts associated with the Reduced Daily Production Alternative, the Reduced Daily Production Alternative has met the requirements of CEQA for an alternatives analysis.

The Hirschdale Community would like to see the Commissioners consider the "Reduced Daily Production Alternative". As stated, this alternative would allow maximum lifetime extraction from the mine while reducing significant and unavoidable air quality impacts to less than significant.

COMMENT: JUNE 2019. The Recirculated Draft EIR only gives two alternatives. The "No Project Alternative" and "Reduced Daily Production Alternative."
It is stated in the EIR that the Reduced Alternative would reduce many environmental impacts.
We once again support the Reduced Daily Production Alternative.

Concerns of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Public Service such as ambulance, school buses, Fire Protection, Noise, Air Quality, Traffic and Circulation still remain a concern with the EIR proposed traffic volume for this mining operation. This is three times the volume of traffic compared to the current permit, which raises many concerns.

Final EIR Response A6- The effects of the increase in traffic volumes generated from operation of the mine and all associated impacts were evaluated in each of the noted issue areas. In accordance with CEQA, the worst-case scenario was analyzed which assumed maximum annual allowable production during operation of the mine (1 million tons of material, not to exceed 17 million tons over the life of the project). While this scenario may **occasionally occur** during operation of the mine, the most common scenario during operation of the mine is anticipated to be much lower (**historically, the mine has averaged approximately 250,000 tons of material per year). Therefore, while the traffic volumes presented in the Recirculated Draft EIR may occasionally occur, they are not likely to be the usual scenario.** Even assuming the worst case scenario of maximum traffic volumes associated with operation of the mine, impacts to greenhouse gas emissions and public services access and intersection delays (ambulance, fire protection, school bus access) would be less than significant (refer to Section 4.8 for an analysis of project-related greenhouse gases impacts; Section 4.5 for an analysis of project related impacts on level of service which could affect emergency response and school bus times; and Section

4.10 for an analysis of project-related impacts on emergency routes). The Recirculated Draft EIR was circulated to all departments in the County, including the Office of Emergency Services, with no comments received. Truck traffic noise at all existing noise-sensitive receptors (Receptors 11 - 14 are at currently undeveloped properties along the haul route) would be less than significant, and the truck traffic would result in less than significant impacts to level of service at the study intersections. The project's impacts on the noted areas have been evaluated in the Recirculated Draft EIR and no additional analysis is required under CEQA. Delays (ambulance, fire protection, school bus access) would be less than significant (refer to Section 4.8 for an analysis of project-related greenhouse gases impacts; Section 4.5 for an analysis of project-related impacts on level of service which could affect emergency response and school bus times; and Section 4.10 for an analysis of project-related impacts on emergency routes). The Recirculated Draft EIR was circulated to all departments in the County, including the Office of Emergency Services, with no comments received. Truck traffic noise at all existing noise-sensitive receptors (Receptors 11 - 14 are at currently undeveloped properties along the haul route) would be less than significant, and the truck traffic would result in less than significant impacts to level of service at the study intersections. The project's impacts on the noted areas have been evaluated in the Recirculated Draft EIR and no additional analysis is required under CEQA.

Response to this A6 response. If it is only on occasion that this larger supply of material would be necessary, why would you as County Commissioners agree to a 30-year permit of these volumes if historically these volumes are not typical.

If a median alternative would have been evaluated this may have given a better alternative. Public Services, (Wildfire), Fire Protection, Recreation were not included in this study and it was stated there were no significant impacts. No mitigation measures were proposed. This is another reason why the Reduced Daily Alternative is supported.

Final EIR Response A8 - See response to A-4 in regard to the median alternative. Because a median alternative would be reduced from the proposed project, the median alternative would also not result in significant impacts to Public Services, Fire Protection (Wildfire), and Recreation. **The commenter has expressed support for the Reduced Daily Alternative.**

Public Services are of concern with the volumes of truck traffic proposed. Fire Protection is of concern. We had the Martis Fire just over canyon from this mining operation. There are issues of Fire Suppression stated throughout this response.

Final EIR Response A9 -Public services potentially affected by the increase in truck traffic as a result of the project include emergency vehicles and school bus access and delays. Truck traffic from operation of the mine would result in less than significant impacts to level of service at the study intersections (see Section 4.5) and would not impact emergency routes (see Section 4.10). In addition, the project includes roadway improvements to improve driver sight distance at the intersection of Stampede Meadows Road with West Hinton Road, and to widen the segment of Stampede Meadows Road in the off-site roadway improvement area to achieve a 32-foot-wide paved roadway, where feasible, and to provide designated pull-outs. These improvements would be expected to benefit others using the roadway by allowing more space for emergency or other public vehicles using the roadway segment to navigate the roadway, as well as providing improved visibility for drivers approaching the Stampede Meadows Road with West Hinton Road intersection. The project would not result in a significant increase in demand on public

services nor would it result in the need for expanded public service facilities (see Section 9.5). Please also refer to response to comment A-6.

Response to A-9: The improvements proposed are for that of Stampede Meadows Road. Coming off the Hirschdale Exit and proceeding onto the exit toward Hirschdale/Truckee is where the issues are. The roadways off these off ramps are two lane roadways. There has not been any mention of traffic being stopped because of a train going over the railroad tracks. This would back up traffic. This back up with large trucks could cause an issue on roadways. It seems the impacts studied were more for that of bicycle traffic rather than regular vehicle traffic. There are many whom enter this freeway for commuting to work from Glenshire and Hirschdale to Reno and Truckee. Emergency response, school bus services, the normal on my way to work commute traffic could be compromised.

It is stated the Reduced Daily Production Alternative would not fulfill the project objectives for Market Position because of regional demand, but in turn would diminish, air quality impacts, less traffic impacts, public service impacts, noise, fire protection, traffic circulation, as the Hirschdale exit would not be impacted with this volume of truck traffic. The alternative providers would use the freeway, which would be less of an impact. They would not be exiting and circulating at this volume at our interchange. The product would be processed at a lesser volume reducing many impacts.

Final EIR Response A10 the commenter has provided a summary and interpretation of the findings of the impact analysis for the Reduced Daily Production Alternative and has stated "The alternative providers would use the freeway, which would be less of an impact." It should be noted that while the Reduced Daily Production Alternative would reduce the number of daily truck trips on the local roadway, as described in Section 6.4.2 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the alternative would not avoid or lessen potentially significant traffic impacts regionally or cumulatively due to the increase in truck trips elsewhere, and an increase in vehicle miles traveled to transport the materials from other sources would also result in an increase in emissions of criteria pollutants in the region, as well as greenhouse gas emissions.

Comment: Public Services still remains as a concern with this volume of truck traffic anticipated. Emergency response, Ambulance and Fire Trucks in the event of emergency with this volume of traffic seems would compromise access into Hirschdale and out of Hirschdale as this exit will be used both directions for this volume of truck traffic. Even though the traffic study states it will remain at LOS it is questionable. The only way of knowing how this traffic will affect this community is by having this actual traffic to make this determination. This exit services Glenshire, Tahoe Forest Church, Dog Kennel, residents of Hirschdale, Proposed developments, recreational users of the Truckee River. This includes fisherman, rafters, people walking their dog along with those just enjoying the river.

Final EIR Response A12- See response to A-9. The cumulative condition traffic analysis considered the average annual growth rate for the region, which is added to the 2017 traffic volumes, and specifically added traffic volumes generated by the Canyon Springs Project, Tahoe Forest Church (discussion of Trip Generation in Section 4.5.5). Because the Boca Dam Reservoir Road was closed while the existing condition (2017) traffic volumes were being determined, the 2017 traffic volumes were increased to reflect traffic conditions with Boca Dam Reservoir Open (see page 4.5-2 of the Recirculated Draft EIR and page 6 of the Traffic Impact Analysis, Appendix J-1 of the Recirculated Draft EIR). The traffic impact analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR considered a worst-case traffic scenario with the addition of the maximum number of trucks that could occur during peak operation of the mine. Even under this

scenario, the project would result in less than significant impacts to level of service at the study intersections. No additional analysis is needed to determine level of service with the project.

Recreation also seems like it should have been included in impact study as there are many issues with traffic and bicyclists addressed in this study. Bicyclists seem they would be considered under "Recreation" category.

Final EIR Response A13 The CEQA analysis of impacts on recreation focuses on an increase in demand on existing facilities or the need to construct additional recreational facilities that would result in an impact on the environment. As described in Section 9.6 the project would not result in an increase in use on existing facilities and does not include recreational facilities. The project's impact on recreation is an aggravation of an existing hazard to bicyclists (not facilities) due to the increase in truck traffic on Stampede Meadows Road. Because it is a traffic-related impact, the analysis of impacts is included in the traffic section of the EIR. The discussion of recreation in Section 9.6 does refer the reader to the discussion of project-related hazards on bicyclists in Section 4.5.5. The extent of potentially significant impacts associated with the project on bicyclists is appropriately analyzed and disclosed in the Recirculated Draft EIR, with mitigation identified. No revision is necessary.

Comment from 2012
The quarry has been idle since the 2008 operating year based on reduced aggregate demand due to the downturn in the economy.

This comment was from 2012 Community Response:
Comment: *As stated above, since the Quarry has been in idle status the Hirschdale Community, the Town of Truckee as a whole and adjacent unincorporated areas of the County of Nevada have not been subjected to the mining operations potential impacts. The proposed mining permit daily truck trips are significantly increased from that of the current operational permit. Is there a plan established to review the approved mining operations once? the proposed 30-year permit is approved. Concerns regarding cumulative environmental impacts could be addressed once the mining operations are at a normal level of operation with periodic reviews of these impacts. This would be a means of monitoring this permit of 30 years to ensure these cumulative impacts have been properly addressed throughout the lifetime of this permit*

2012 Answer on Recirculated EIR in regard to above comment:
G-2 County response to this comment
The baseline of the environmental analysis was determined using the permitted condition of the site, even though the mine is currently in an idle status under the terms of the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA). The Recirculated Draft EIR identifies significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project and specifies a series of measures designed to mitigate potentially adverse impacts to the environment, including cumulative impacts. In addition to the EIR itself the purpose of the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is to describe the procedures the applicant will use to implement the mitigation measures adopted in connection with approval of the project, as well as the methods of monitoring and reporting on these actions. The Recirculated Draft EIR includes an analysis of the increased number of truck trips. As identified in Section 3.3.3, the maximum number of trips that could be processed in a day is based on the capacity of the facility and would not change regardless of whether the East

Pit or the West Pit are in operation. The impacts of the maximum number of trips is analyzed as a worst-case scenario for the project and is considered in the analysis contained in Section 4.5, Traffic and Circulation, Section 4.6, Noise, Section 4.7, Air Quality, Section 4.8, GHG, Section 4.9 Energy. In addition, Section 5.0 includes an analysis of cumulative impacts.

COMMENT: This states the baseline of environmental review was determined using the permitted condition of the site. Even though the mine is in idle status. This baseline goes back to 2008 the time this mine went into idle status.

Final EIR Response A14 Excerpt from Comments G-1 and G-2 and response to comment in Appendix A-2 of the Recirculated Draft EIR. This comment is in response to the response provided on the noted comments which states "The baseline of the environmental analysis was determine using the permitted condition of the site." The commenter has pointed out that the baseline goes back to 2008, the time the mine went into idle status. The baseline condition analyzed in the Recirculated Draft EIR is of the conditions of the site at the time the Recirculated Draft EIR was prepared which included the permitted East Pit, the existing facilities which may become operational at any time, and the disturbed habitat within the East Pit. This is consistent with the description of environmental setting in Section 15125 of the State CEQA Guidelines. The baseline condition that was evaluated was the worst-case scenario for each of the resources being evaluated. As described on page 4.5-4 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, and the Traffic Impact Analysis (Appendix J-1 of the Recirculated Draft EIR), the existing East Pit was not operating at the time the traffic counts were taken. However, the maximum number of trips that could be processed in a day is based on the capacity of the facility and would not change regardless of whether the East Pit or the West Pit is in operation. Therefore, the analysis looked at a worst-case scenario that included all trips generated by operation of the mine.

For the air quality analysis (Section 4.7 of the Recirculated Draft EIR), the emissions were compared against a zero baseline (i.e., emissions associated with the permitted East Pit operations were not subtracted from the project emissions). The analysis of aesthetics (Section 3.9 of the Recirculated Draft EIR) evaluates impacts associated with night lighting in the context of the currently permitted operations which include existing lighting on the site. Existing lighting is associated with the office building and scale, processing and ancillary equipment in the East Pit (see page 3-9 of the Recirculated Draft EIR). Therefore, while the mine has not been operational, the existing lighting may be used at any time should the mine become operational. Similar to the currently permitted nighttime operations, limited lighting may be required during occasional nighttime load-out operations, but the existing lighting would be used for this purpose. The proposed project does not propose new lighting; therefore, the impacts are less than significant. Page 4.4-11 has been revised to clarify that the existing lighting in the East Pit may be relocated to the West Pit for nighttime operations there. Even with this clarification, the findings would remain less than significant because the use of the existing lighting does not constitute as a new source of light or glare. Further, as noted on page 4.4-1, there is the potential for significant impacts to biological resources due to the potential for a change in conditions on the project site from when the East Pit was last in operation. The proposed mitigation (Mitigation Measure BIO-4) would also further reduce the less than significant impacts from light at the off-site sensitive viewers.

1.1.2 Boca Quarry Expansion

In June of 2006, the project applicant applied for an Amended Use Permit (U06-012) and Amended

Reclamation Plan (RP06-001), which proposed to bring the quarry into conformance with the existing Conditional Use Permit (U83-036) and Reclamation Plan, and to expand the quarry from a 15-acre extraction area to a 105-acre extraction area (plus the processing area). The proposal generated a number of concerns that were primarily in regard to the associated truck traffic because the proposed haul route to the south of the site, which relied upon old bridges on Hirschdale Road for access also passed through the Hirschdale Community. During this same time period, the project applicant was utilizing the rock from the Boca Quarry (rather than from their Martis Valley Quarry and Asphalt Plant) and **the associated truck traffic significantly increased well beyond any historical use.**

Due to the number of substantial issues raised by the Hirschdale Community in response to the proposal, the project applicant and members of the Hirschdale Community coordinated to identify a feasible alternative route and to address the concerns of the Community. Through further investigation, an alternate route to I-80 was identified which would bypass the Hirschdale Community by using West Hinton Road northwest of the site, and which would provide access to I-80 via Stampede Meadows Road.

The project applicant subsequently revised the project application based on to address the number of substantial issues raised by the June 2006 proposal. The revisions focused on bringing the operation back into conformance with the quarry's Use Permit and SMARA, as well as restricting the quarry limits to the basic footprint of the current pit (40 acres). **The revised Use Permit application also included the revised access route which would bypass the Hirschdale Community.** Use of the route required improving an existing logging road through a property northwest of the site that is also owned by a subsidiary of the applicant to connect to West Hinton Road. West Hinton Road passes to the quarry almost entirely through U.S. Forest Service Road (USFS) lands**. On July 26, 2007, the Planning Commission approved the Amended Use Permit (U06-012) and associated Reclamation Plan (RP06-001; 2007 Reclamation Plan). The approved permit included mitigation requiring development of the revised access route to bypass the Hirschdale Community, and that if the identified route was found to be infeasible, another route to I-80 would be identified and a cap on the volume of truck trips would be required.** Pursuant to the conditions of the permit, use of the route through the Hirschdale Community by the quarry was limited to employee use, limited off-season use, and emergency use. The applicant obtained a Road Use Permit from the USFS for the use of West Hinton Road through USFS lands, and the following spring (2008), work began on the West Hinton Road access route.

Upon completion of the new haul route, the prior haul route over the two bridges south of the project site and through the Hirschdale Community was no longer available for use by haul trucks pursuant to U06-012 Use Permit Condition of Approval A6b.

This condition was as follows:
After completion of the new haul road, the interim period shall cease. The hours of operation for the quarry extraction and truck hauling shad then be limited to 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday. During this period, the use of Hirschdale Road access shall be limited to employee use (personal and corporate vehicles), off-season property access, and emergency use. (Spring water collection trucks are encouraged to use the new access, but are not limited to that access)

COMMENT: This should still remain as a condition of this new permit.
Appendix C did not include a copy of the current use permit U06-012 and conditions in the exhibit. Many exhibits were not included in this EIR for review. This Appendix C was incomplete.

This is Conditional Use Permit is now provided on website. I have attached this to this response

A total of six comment letters were received during public circulation, and two verbal comments were received during the public hearing on the Draft EIR. The comments were in regard to evaluation of a timber harvest plan, water supply, air quality, noise, water supply, transportation and circulation, and the local mule deer herd were received. The commenting agencies, organizations, and individuals and the comments received are summarized and provided in Appendix A.

A Final EIR was prepared and submitted to the County for an internal review in February 2013, and the Final EIR was scheduled for approval by the Planning Commission. Late comments were received which included concerns in regard to potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists using Stampede Meadows Road with the addition of quarry truck trips for the expanded mine and in regard to the Stampede Meadows Road crossing over the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) tracks. In addition, a number of comments were received by the Hirschdale Community in response to the revisions in the Final EIR (see Table A-1 in Appendix A). **Due to the scope of comments received and newly identified potentially significant impacts, the Final EIR needed to be revised.** The County and applicant elected to revise the previously circulated Draft EIR to address the newly identified potentially significant impacts. In addition, the project applicant was considering a Development Agreement with the County for the project.

This Recirculated Draft EIR is being recirculated in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. Amended Use Permit (U11-008) and 2011 Reclamation Plan (RP11-001) are the proposed project analyzed in this Recirculated Draft EIR. Refer to Figure 1-1 for a timeline summarizing the Boca Quarry expansion. The 2011 Reclamation Plan is included in Appendix B.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The preparation, review, and certification process for the EIR involves the following steps:

1.4.1 Notice of Preparation

In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the County posted a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the project on February 8, 2012. The County was identified as the Lead Agency, and the notice was distributed to the public, potentially interested local, state, and federal agencies including the responsible and trustee agencies, and the State Clearinghouse to solicit comments on the proposed project. Four comment letters were received by the County in response to the NOP. A scoping meeting was held on March 6, 2012 at the Truckee Town Hall in the Town of Truckee to inform the public about the project and collect written comments. As previously mentioned in Section 1.1.2, due to substantial comments received on the previously circulated 2012 Draft EIR, this Recirculated Draft EIR is being recirculated pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

A copy of the NOP, list of NOP recipients, and the response letters are contained in Appendix A of this EIR.

1.4.2 Draft EIR

This document constitutes the Recirculated Draft EIR and it has been prepared consistent with Section 15084 of the State CEQA Guidelines. This EIR contains a description of the project and its environmental setting, potential impacts as a result of the project, prescribed measures to reduce or mitigate for impacts found to be significant, and an analysis of reasonable alternatives to the project.

This Recirculated Draft EIR has been prepared to address substantive comments received on the Draft EIR previously circulated for the project in September 2012. Refer to Table A-1 in Appendix A for a summary of the comments received. Once the Recirculated Draft EIR is complete, the County will file the Notice of Completion with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research to begin a 45-day public review period.

The 2011 Reclamation Plan analyzed in this EIR is included in Appendix B, and the proposed Development Agreement between the County and the applicant is included in Appendix C.

1.4.3 Public Notice/Public Review

The principal objectives of CEQA are that: (1) the environmental review process provides for public participation; and (2) the EIR serves as an informational document to inform members of the general public, responsible and trustee agencies, and the decision-makers of the physical impacts associated with a proposed project. This EIR is being circulated for public review, in accordance with Section 15087 of the State CEQA Guidelines. Prior commenters will need to submit new comments. The document will be subject to review and comment by the public and interested jurisdictions, agencies, and organizations for a period of 45 days.
Any substantive written comments received from the State Department of Conservation would be addressed by County staff in the report it presents to the Planning Commission.

1.4.4 Final EIR and Public Hearing Process

Following the public review period, the Final EIR will be prepared. The document will address public comments received via email, U.S. Postal Service or in-person oral comments provided at the public hearing during the 45-day circulation period. The Final EIR, Amended Use Permit, 2011 Reclamation Plan, and the Development Agreement will each be presented to the Planning Commission. Based on public comment and information in the project record, the Planning Commission will forward their recommendations on the four separate items to the Board of Supervisors for their final actions.

Next, the Board of Supervisors will schedule and hold a public hearing. At the close of the public hearing and based on the information in the record, the Board of Supervisors will vote on the final determination on the adequacy of the Final EIR and whether to approve the Conditional Use Permit, the Reclamation Plan and the Development Agreement.

Following County approval of the four separate items, the County will submit them to the State Department of Conservation for their final review.

Prior to certification of the EIR, the Lead Agency is required to prepare written findings of fact for each significant environmental impact identified in the EIR. For each significant impact, the Lead Agency must: (1) determine if the proposed project has been changed to avoid or substantially lessen the magnitude of the impact; (2) find that changes to the proposed project are within another agency's jurisdiction, and such changes have been or should be adopted; and (3) find that specific economic, social, or other considerations make mitigation measures or proposed project alternatives infeasible. The findings of fact must be based on substantial evidence in the administrative record and the conclusions required by CEQA.

If the Lead Agency elects to proceed with the proposed project and the project would result in significant impacts, a "statement of overriding considerations" must be prepared. A statement of

overriding considerations explains why the Lead Agency determines that the benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable environmental impact of the project.

1.4.5 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

CEQA requires that when a public agency makes findings based on an EIR, then the public agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring plan for those measures which it has adopted or made a condition of the project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment (Sections 21081.6 and 21081.7 of the State CEQA Guidelines). The reporting or monitoring plan must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for this project is bound into the back of this EIR.

1.5 SCOPE AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

Sections 15120 through 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines present the required content for Draft and Final EIRs. A Draft EIR must include a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences, a description of the proposed project, a description of the environmental setting, an environmental impact analysis, mitigation measures proposed to minimize the significant effects, alternatives to the proposed project, significant irreversible environmental changes, limitations on the discussion of the impact, effects found not to be significant, organizations and persons consulted, and cumulative impacts.

In accordance with CEQA, this Recirculated Draft EIR: (1) identifies the potential significant effects of the proposed project on the environment and indicates the manner in which those significant effects can be mitigated or avoided; (2) identifies any unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated; and (3) analyzes reasonable alternatives to the project. Although the EIR does not control the final decision on the project, the Lead Agency must consider the information in the EIR and respond to each significant effect identified in the EIR.

Comprehensive updates to the State CEQA Guidelines went into effect on December 28, 2018. The updates included reorganization and clarification the analysis of a number of environmental issue areas. The structure of analysis of this EIR closely follows the Environmental Checklist in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Updates to the checklist included**: narrowing the scope of aesthetic impacts to focus on impacts at public viewpoints (as opposed to private),** moving the analysis of impacts to paleontological resources from the cultural resources section to the geology section; **creating a separate section for analysis of wildfire-related impacts;** combining airport safety and noise into one question and remove analysis of impacts to private airstrips; clarifying the scope of impacts to water and utilities; clarifying that land use conflicts must relate to a physical impact; and clarifying the scope of impacts related to population growth. Guideline revisions in the analysis of transportation impacts establish vehicle miles traveled as the appropriate measure of transportation impacts, rather than level of service. Lead agencies will be required to comply with guideline revisions in regard to VMT starting July 1, 2020, but may elect to start immediately. The County does not currently have any adopted guidelines in regard to VMT, but it is analyzed in Section 4.5, Traffic and Circulation.

The update to the State CEQA Guidelines were reviewed in preparation of this Recirculated Draft EIR. The organization of this EIR has not been updated to more closely match the organization of the revised Environmental Checklist in Appendix G of the Guidelines because while the organization differs slightly, the analyses contained in this EIR are consistent with State CEQA Guidelines and rigor. In addition, this

document has been in preparation for a number of years and maintaining the prior organization of the document provides those who have followed the project the ability to more easily compare the 2012 Draft EIR with the current Recirculated Draft EIR. The scope of this Recirculated Draft EIR is based, in part, on the 2012 NOPs prepared for the proposed project as well as the public comments received in response to the NOPs and comments received on the previously circulated 2012 Draft EIR. In addition, per the current State CEQA Guidelines, energy is analyzed in this EIR, and wildfire is addressed separately from the hazards and hazardous materials analysis. As the Lead Agency, the County identified potentially significant impacts associated with the following issues, which are analyzed in detail in this EIR:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural and Tribal Resources (includes analysis of impacts to paleontological resources)
- Energy (not analyzed in the 2012 Draft EIR)
- Geology/Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Traffic and Circulation (includes an analysis of VMT)

It has been determined that the proposed project would not affect the following environmental factors: agriculture and forestry resources; land use/planning, mineral resources; population and housing; public services; recreation; utilities and service systems; and **wildfire**. These environmental factors are not discussed in detail in this EIR for the reasons presented in Section 9.0, Effects Found Not to be Significant.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND SETTING

2.2 REGIONAL SETTING

The project site is located in the Sierra Nevada. The area is characterized by ranges of rugged hillsides and mountain peaks with valleys containing rivers, their tributaries, and reservoirs. Nearby peaks include Boca Hill, approximately 2.2 miles west of the project site, with an elevation of 6,669 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Higher peaks with more rugged topography occur further from the site. Parcels directly north and east of the project site are within Tahoe National Forest, managed by the USFS. A privately-owned parcel is located approximately 0.5 mile east of the project site, at elevations of approximately 6,200 to 6,760 feet amsl (McGinity property, APN 48-090-15). Parcels to the west and south is privately owned and public right-of-way for I-80 – the parcel directly west of the project site is owned by a subsidiary of the applicant, and the parcel directly south of the project site is owned by Sierra Pacific Power Company. Residential communities in the Town of Truckee are approximately 1 to 1.5 miles southwest of the project site, at elevations of approximately 5,970 feet amsl. See Figure 2-2 for the regional setting, including public lands and roadways.

The project site is located directly north of I-80, the Truckee River, and the UPRR tracks, and approximately 1.6 miles southeast of the Boca Reservoir at its confluence with the Truckee River. The reservoir is one of several in the area that provides irrigation water, flood control, wildlife habitat, and recreation opportunities including fishing, boating, and camping. I-80 provides the primary regional travel route to and from the project area.

The project site is accessed from the north via West Hinton Road. From I-80, the project site can be reached by traveling north on Stampede Meadow Road (County Road 89Aa1) to West Hinton Road, and traveling east on West Hinton Road to the project site.

County Road 894Aa1 (Stampede Meadows Road) is a paved, County-maintained road that generally follows north/south along the eastern side of Boca Reservoir. The segment of road north of the UPRR corridor is located entirely within Tahoe National Forest (USFS lands) but has been granted to the County maintenance record pursuant to Board of Supervisors Resolution 74-24. To the south, Stampede Meadows Road crosses the UPRR at an at-grade crossing, and over the Truckee River via a two-lane bridge with a pedestrian walkway. The segment of roadway crossing the UPRR corridor at the at-grade crossing is under jurisdiction of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC; letter received from UPRC dated January 3, 2013 included in Appendix A). An approximately 0.5-mile long segment of Stampede Meadows Road (from the UPRR corridor to the I-80 interchange) passes through the Town of Truckee. The roadway transitions to Hirschdale Road at the road's interchange with I-80, approximately 0.5 mile west of the project site and near the southern terminus of the off-site roadway improvement area. South of I-80, Hirschdale Road is a generally northwest/southeast County road that follows the western side of the Truckee River for approximately 1.2 miles, where it passes through the Community of Hirschdale before crossing the river and UPRR corridor. The road follows along the north side of the river and railroad for approximately 1.1 miles, where it terminates. The County plans to rehabilitate the existing bridges along Hirschdale Road over the Truckee River (Capital Improvement Project [CIP] No. 19-03) and Union Pacific Railroad (CIP #19-04), with both projects scheduled for construction beginning in spring of 2019 (Nevada County 2018a).

West Hinton Road is a generally east/west road that provides access to the site from the north. It intersects Stampede Meadows Road approximately 1.1 miles north of the I-80 interchange with Stampede Meadows Road/Hirschdale Road. West Hinton Road passes to the project site almost entirely through USFS lands. The project applicant has a Road Use Permit from the USFS for the use of West Hinton Road through USFS lands. The permit is renewed annually.

Hinton Road is a generally north/south road that accesses the project site from the south and is a paved County-maintained road that intersects Hirschdale Road approximately 0.5 mile south of the project site. **The Hinton Road access to the project site – which accesses from the south and intersects Hirschdale Road – would not be used as a haul route for the proposed project.**

The project site is located within the northern high Sierra Nevada floristic province subregion which is vegetationally complex and is characterized by forests of ponderosa pine, white fir, and giant sequoia in lower montane areas, forests of red fir, Jeffrey pine, and lodgepole pine at the higher elevations, and forests of mountain hemlock and whitebark pine at the subalpine areas, with treeless alpine areas at the highest elevations (Baldwin et al. 2012).

Potential for WILDFIRE

2.3 EXISTING PROJECT SITE CHARACTERISTICS

The project site is located in the west and southwest facing slopes of a hillside in the Truckee River Valley. Elevations range from approximately 5,700 feet amsl at the southern edge of the site to approximately 6,250 feet amsl at the northern most site boundary. West Hinton Road traverses the

project site from northwest to the southeast and intersects Hinton Road in the eastern portion of the site. The project applicant is currently authorized to mine, process and transport rock from the Boca Quarry to off-site markets. The currently permitted operations (East Pit) includes an excavated slope and quarry floor, an aggregate processing area, truck scale, and office surrounded by relatively steep topography. As previously described, the East Pit has been idle since 2008; however, because the East Pit is permitted and operations may resume at any time, the baseline conditions analyzed in this EIR assume the site is operational. Refer to Figure 2-3 for an aerial map of the project site. The map shows the location of the proposed West Pit in relation to the East Pit.

A spring (Dobbas Spring) and associated water catchment pond are located in the southern portion of the project site, outside the footprint of the proposed expansion (ultimate disturbed area). The spring features existing improvements that allow for economic use of the water and was formerly utilized by the property owner for a commercial water bottling operation, as well as for dust control in associated with the permitted mining operation in the East Pit. A cellular antenna is in the northern portion of the site, between the two pits. An existing caretaker residence with an associated domestic well is located in the southern portion of the site, west of Hinton Road. At the time of a site visit in October 2017, the home appeared to be occupied.

Comment: Water trucks are currently processing water from the spring via Hirschdale Road through Hirschdale.

The East Pit has been idle since 2008; however, the East Pit is currently permitted to operate pursuant to Use Permit (U06-012) and is subject to the conditions and mitigation measures contained in Use Permit (U06-012) which was approved on July 26, 2007, until its expiration on July 26, 2027. Pursuant to the Development Agreement, the aggregate material mined from the West Pit and sold by the applicant would be subject to the conditions and mitigation measures contained in the currently proposed Use Permit (U11-008). Upon expiration of Use Permit (U06-012), any remaining mining in the East Pit would
be subject to the conditions and mitigation provided in the currently proposed Use Permit (U11-008). Reclamation of the East Pit would be subject to Reclamation Plan (RP06-001) which was approved on July 26, 2007 and reclamation of the West Pit would be subject to the currently proposed 2011 Reclamation Plan (RP11-001).

COMMENT: This permit U11-008 would take place over U06-012 when this permit expires? A copy of permit U06-012 was not included in Appendix C. It seems as a reference a copy of this permit with Mitigation Measures/Conditions would be helpful.
Attached is a copy of U06-012 for reference.

This was not attached to our response but will be attached to this response and is available as an Appendix.

A20 Mining in the East Pit is subject to the current Use Permit (U06-12). Upon the expiration of Use Permit U06-12, the currently proposed Use Permit (U11-008) would apply to any reserves left in the East Pit after expiration of Use Permit U06-12. Any mining in the West Pit would be subject to Use Permit U11-008 regardless of whether Use Permit U0612 is still in effect. The Development Agreement contained in Appendix C of the Recirculated Draft EIR outlines the timing. The current Use Permit (U06-

12) has been posted on the project webpage: https://www. mynevadacounty.com/639/Boca-Quarry-Mine.

Operating Schedule and Workforce
Typical Operating Schedules
May 1 through October 31
Monday – Friday: 6:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Saturday: 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Blasting Up to two times per week
Monday – Saturday: 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

COMMENT: Hours of operation vary from section to section They are not implemented as mitigation measure nor is the Hours for blasting. This should be included in the mitigation measurement section.

Response from 2012
Comment: It is stated above *the Applicant anticipates blasting no more than twice a week. Will there be limitations stipulated stating hours a day for this blasting activity along with how many days a week. Mine operation hours are from 6:00 am to 6:00 pm. Blasting would not seem feasible* at 6:00 am considering the surrounding recreational areas and neighboring communities.

G-14 response on EIR states blasting hours as 9:00 am to 4:00 pm no more than two times per week during allowable operating days Mon – Sat.
It is also stated the 24-hour operation would only be in the event of an emergency. This should be stipulated in hours of operation mitigation measure.

Emergency should be declared by State, County, or local public agency, and the Office of Emergency Services.

Condition A 8...
In the event that the alternative access is unavailable, then the use of Hirschdale Road shall be limited (as the sole access to this site) to two loaded gravel trucks per hour. The hours of hauling operation shall be restricted to 9:00 am to 5:00 pm on weekdays only. No weekend gravel hauling is permitted during periods when Hirschdale Road is the only access to this site.

This condition was in correlation with the 1983 permit and the Hirschdale Community wanted a cop limitation if the bridges were ever needed for use. It is clearly written in this proposal that Hirschale Road will not be used for trucking activity. Having a back up condition to this permit would assure There could never be unreasonable truck traffic through the Community of Hirschdale ever in the future.

Final EIR Response A22 The correct operating schedule is presented in Table 3-1 and is summarized here: Typical Operating Schedule: May 1 through October 31, Monday - Friday: 6:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m., Saturday: 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Blasting: Up to two times per week, Monday - Saturday: 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Occasional Extended **Operating Schedule: 5 a.m. - 9 p.m. in response to customer demand and/or operational considerations. 24-hour load out may occur in response to demand by a government agency (typically road improvement projects or emergencies).** The incorrect time presented in Section 3.3.1 of the Recirculated Draft EIR is corrected from 9 a.m. to 7 a.m. The operational and blasting hours are to provide operational flexibility while prohibiting blasting during evening and nighttime hours. The

noise impact analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR notes that maximum noise levels due to blasting would be approximately 48 to 63 dB Lmax. The noise levels would be below the maximum daytime noise levels and because no blasting would occur during the evening and nighttime hours (evening hours are 7 p.m. to 10 p.m., and nighttime hours are 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.), no significant impact would occur. The commenter has noted that the blasting schedule should be included as mitigation to prevent noise impacts from blasting occurring outside of the authorized timeframes. Because no significant impact would occur, no mitigation is necessary.

COMMENT: Slash and brush will be burned on topsoil piles. The map shows the Spring water at the furthers southern portion of the project area. How will water be brought to the mining operations area in the event fire suppression is necessary. Will water tanks be required on the site for fire suppression?

Final EIR Response A24 Refer to Section 4.10.4 which includes an analysis of risk of wildfire as a result of the project. The risk of fire associated with the pile burning would be reduced with implementation of HAZ-3 which requires proper management of combustible materials on the site. The pile burning is associated with the removal of vegetation on the site which would have a beneficial effect associated with fire hazards. As described in Section 3.3.5, if needed, water for fire suppression would be provided by Dobbas Spring and the catchment pond. Water trucks would be present on the site for dust suppression and could be used to control a fire on the project site. In addition, Boca Reservoir and Stampede Reservoir are in the area and could be used by fire fighters in the event of a wildfire. With the proposed mitigation, impacts associated with wildfire risk are reduced to less than significant and water tanks would not be required.

Comment: Fire Suppression again is a concern as to the water supply in the event of fire produced from Blasting. Again, having a water tank at processing plant seems would be a mitigation measure that should be considered.

Final EIR Response A26 as described in Section 4.10.4, other than the brief period of ground clearing, the majority of project operations would occur in the quarry pit where combustible fuel would not likely be present. Implementation of HAZ-3 would be implemented which requires proper management of combustible materials on the site. See response to A-24 in regard to the water supply for fire suppression.

Blasting hours should be implemented as a mitigation measure.

G-14 response on EIR states blasting hours as 9:00 am to 4:00 pm no more than two times per week during allowable operating days Mon – Sat.
It is also stated The Nevada County Sheriff's Department will be given 24-hour notice prior to each blast.

Final EIR Response **A27 Refer to response to comment A-22**
A22 The correct operating schedule is presented in Table 3-1 and is summarized here: Typical Operating Schedule: May 1 through October 31, Monday - Friday: 6:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m., Saturday: 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Blasting: Up to two times per week, Monday - Saturday: 7:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m. Occasional Extended Operating Schedule: 5 a.m. - 9 p.m. in response to customer demand and/or operational considerations. 24-hour load out may occur in response to demand by a government agency (typically road

improvement projects or emergencies). The incorrect time presented in Section 3.3.1 of the Recirculated Draft EIR is corrected from 9 a.m. to 7 a.m. The operational and blasting hours are to provide operational flexibility while prohibiting blasting during evening and nighttime hours. The noise impact analysis in the Recirculated Draft EIR notes that maximum noise levels due to blasting would be approximately 48 to 63 dB Lmax. The noise levels would be below the maximum daytime noise levels and because no blasting would occur during the evening and nighttime hours (evening hours are 7 p.m. to 10 p.m., and nighttime hours are 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.), no significant impact would occur. The commenter has noted that the blasting schedule should be included as mitigation to prevent noise impacts from blasting occurring outside of the authorized timeframes. Because no significant impact would occur, no mitigation is necessary.

3.3.2 Project Reserves, Production and Operating Life

Total aggregate reserves for the quarry (East and West Pits combined) are estimated at over 17 million tons (about 13 million cubic yards, depending on the density of the material). As such, the annual average production volume would be 570,000 tons per year over the estimated 30-year life of the mining operation. **The annual volume to be mined would vary depending on market demand but could reach a maximum of 1 million tons per year in very active construction years.**

Site Access and Haul Route

Ingress and egress to/from the site is via a private haul road which intersects West Hinton Road northwest of the project site. The route proceeds from the quarry along West Hinton Road through USFS lands to Stampede Meadows Road, then south to the Hirschdale Road/I-80 interchange. The project applicant maintains an annual Road Use Permit with the USFS for use of West Hinton Road through USFS lands.

Hinton Road accesses the project site from the south, and the route to I-80 is along Hirschdale Road through the Hirschdale Community. Use of this site entrance for quarry operations is not allowed under the current Use Permit (U06-012) and would not be allowed under the proposed project. Access from the south would be allowable for only emergency situations and occasional use by employees outside of the annual operational timeframe of May 1 through October 31. Use of the Hinton Road access by haul trucks would be prohibited.

Comment: Will this be a condition of this permit? Or a mitigation measure to this permit?

This was not answered.

Final EIR Response A29 Excerpt from Recirculated Draft EIR in bold font and underlined by the commenter. Excerpt is relevant to the com **Materials Transport**

As described in Section 3.3.2, a maximum of 10,080 tons of aggregate material are proposed to be hauled out of the site on a peak day in a peak year. Commercial aggregate would be loaded onto haul trucks in the project operational area and would be sold by weight at the time of loading.

The project applicant does not own or operate the commercial haul trucks that carry aggregate from the mining site to construction sites where the material is used. Based on recent sales information and the size of the average load from the nearby Martis Valley Quarry — which is also in operation by the project applicant — the project applicant estimates the average load of the proposed project to be 18 tons. That is, roughly half of the trucks hauling aggregate from the site are single 12-ton dump trucks,

and half are trucks with other configurations (such as long-bed trucks or ones towing a trailer) with approximately double that capacity.

The daily number of haul truck trips is based on the rate at which trucks can be loaded, weighed, and charged. The estimated maximum number of truck loads that can be processed per day is 560 loads. As each truck load involves an empty truck entering the site and a full truck existing the site, the total number of one-way trips per day generated by aggregate exporting trucks would be 1,120 trips.

Based on the applicant's experience at the Martis Valley Quarry, the maximum amount of backfill to be delivered to the Boca Quarry in any one year would be approximately 250,000 tons, or less in years with lower construction activity. The amount of clean fill delivery correlates generally with aggregate demand, so years of lower aggregate production are also years of lower backfill acceptance**. The backfill trucks are estimated to haul at most one-quarter of the amount hauled by aggregate exporting trucks, or a total of 2,520 tons per day. With an average of 18 tons per truck, this would generate approximately 140 round trips, or 280 one-way trips.**

The actual amount of truck traffic between the Hirschdale Road/I-80 interchange and the site where aggregate is delivered for use in construction or maintenance projects would be determined by regional aggregate demand. This regional aggregate demand and associated local truck traffic would not change regardless of whether aggregate is mined at the project site or at the nearest alternative sources in the Reno/Sparks area, but the truck lengths and vehicle miles traveled would differ.

3.3.4 Support Facilities and Equipment

Buildings and Stationary Equipment
As described in Section 3.3.6, the applicant may relocate hazardous materials used for the mining operations that are currently stored at the Martis Valley Quarry to the project site. Should the hazardous materials storage be relocated to the project site, the location of the storage facility on the project site would be within the ultimate disturbed area, and the site location, transport, and storage would be handled in accordance with all applicable regulations.

Mobile Equipment and Machines
The types of mobile equipment and/or machines that would be used for the proposed expansion area are the same as those that may be used in the currently permitted East Pit. Equipment would include a dozer, self-loading scraper, front-end wheel loader, portable water pump, motor grader, conveyers, haul trucks, and a hydraulic excavator**. A water truck would be used for maintenance of surfaces and dust control. The** type of vehicles would vary somewhat, depending on availability, as well as the introduction of new models to suit changing on-site conditions and meet current emission standards. Short-term reclamation tasks may require the occasional use of specialized equipment which would be imported along the approved haul route (West Hinton Road and Stampede Meadows Road).

Exterior Lighting
Existing outdoor lighting is associated with the existing office building and scale, and processing and ancillary equipment in the East Pit. **No new lighting would be installed as part of the proposed project.** Limited lighting may be required during occasional nighttime operations of loadout material; however, the existing lighting associated with the existing facilities in the East Pit would be used.

Operating Schedule

The quarry would operate, on a single-shift basis from May 1 until October 31, six days per week (total of 158 operating days minus any holidays). Based upon market demand or emergency needs such as urgent response to flood events, the quarry may open earlier or continue operations later than the operating duration stated above but would not exceed 180 operating days per year. As noted in Table 3-1, mining, processing, sales, and truck transport from the site would generally take place between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. on Saturday. From time to time, customer demand and/or operational considerations may dictate periods of extended hours which could involve two shifts and result in operating hours starting at 5 a.m. and ending as late as 9 p.m. Certain public agency projects (such as Caltrans road improvement projects) may operate during nighttime hours to prevent traffic congestion associated with lane closures and heavy vehicle operations, in addition to road repairs made necessary by natural disasters (e.g., flooding) or other unforeseen events. These road improvement or repair projects accordingly require materials to be supplied at night. The only operation allowed after 9 p.m. and before 6 a.m. is material loadout. Loadout could occur 24 hours per day and up to seven days per week for limited periods to serve these projects. The duration of these expanded hours of operation would depend on the duration of the projects being supplied.

Final EIR Response A30 Pages 26-28 of the comment letter contain excerpts from the Recirculated Draft EIR with some text in bold font and/or underlined by the commenter. No response is necessary.

COMMENT: Loadout could occur 24 hours per day and up to seven days per week for limited periods to serve these projects. The duration of these expanded hours of operation would depend on the duration of the projects being supplied. How will this be monitored. This should not be an open-ended 24-hour operation. 24 hours should be emergency only not based on project demand.

Emergencies should be declared by State, County or Emergency agency.
Was this considered as part of this EIR 24 HOUR OPERATION WITH THE MIX OF RECREATIONAL USERS (campground)

Final EIR Response A31 24-hour operations occur when a public agency has requested materials (such as CalTrans for a roadway improvement projects - refer to the discussion of the Operating Schedule on page 3-10 of the Recirculated Draft EIR). The 24-hour operation was considered as the worst-case scenario (noise). The noise analysis assumed a worst-case scenario of 24hour operations at all of the adjacent sensitive receptors and evaluated sleep disturbance from heavy truck traffic in the night. The sensitive receptors included all adjacent noise sensitive land uses, including the campground (Receptor 1 on Figure 4.6-2 of the Recirculated Draft EIR). Noise levels at the existing sensitive receptors would be less than significant during 24-hour operations except at Receptor 7 which would exceed the nighttime noise thresholds in the unlikely event that all operational equipment is operating simultaneously. The truck traffic would not result in noise levels that would exceed County thresholds at any of the existing sensitive receptors, and the evaluation of sleep disturbance was negative at the existing receptors.

During operation of the quarry, water would be used for dust suppression (no water would be needed for the on-site aggregate processing operation). Water used for dust suppression would be provided by the existing Dobbas Spring in the southern portion of the project site (see Figure 3-1 for the location of the spring). The spring is the water source for the currently permitted mining operation in the East Pit and features existing improvements that allow for use of the water; therefore, no additional improvements to the spring would be required under the proposed project. Annual spring

flow is estimated to range from 47 to 335 acre-feet (annualized flow rate of 29 to 207 gpm), with an average value of 142 acre-feet (88 gpm). Operation of the proposed project would require an estimated consumption rate of 25 to 35 gallons per minute (gpm) or 39 to 56 acre-feet per year for the quarry operation. In most years, the flow rate of the spring would be adequate for dust control use.

Potable water for use by employees (e.g., drinking, first aid, emergency eye-wash station, hand washing) would be delivered by a water delivery service or brought to the site by employees. If needed, water for fire suppression would be provided by Dobbas Spring and the catchment pond.
A32 Excerpt from the Project Description of the Recirculated Draft EIR. No response is necessary.

COMMENT: The spring is located very south to the mining operation pits. Considering the fact this mining operation will cover 158 acres, it would seem a mitigation measure having a water tank present at mining pits would be reasonable for fire suppression. The spring seems would be sufficient for watering the roadway as trucks could be filled directly from the spring but having to have a hose to mining areas of the pit seems would not be feasible.

Final EIR Response A33 See response to comment A-24 in regard to the water supply for fire suppression. No revision is necessary.

With blasting and burning occurring along with mining operations it would seem sensible to have a source of water readily available. Is there a fire hydrant near the mining operations?

Final EIR Response A34 See responses to comments A-24 and A-26 in regard to the risk of wildfire from pile burning and blasting, and the water supply for fire suppression. No fire hydrant is on the site, however, there are on-site water sources. No revision is necessary.

3.3.6 Hazardous Materials Transport and Storage

Hazardous materials associated with operation of the quarry include blasting materials, and fuels and oils for vehicles and equipment maintenance and repair. No hazardous materials are currently stored at the project site – they are stored at the Martis Valley Quarry pursuant to a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) and transported to the project site as-needed. Under the proposed project, the applicant may continue to transport hazardous materials stored at the Martis Valley Quarry to the project site as needed or the applicant may relocate hazardous materials storage to the project site. While hazardous materials are stored at the Martis Valley Quarry, blasting materials would be transported to the project site up to two times per week and a truck carrying fuels and oils for vehicle and equipment maintenance and repair would travel to the project site once per day.

Should hazardous materials be stored at the project site, they may be stored in above ground storage tanks or locked storage facilities in their appropriate containers. The blasting materials include ammonium nitrate and fuel oils which are stored in cylinders. Additional materials include propane, fuel, various oils, lubricants and greases, antifreeze, fire suppressants, and oxygen. The location of the hazardous materials storage would be based on the site conditions at the time the relocation occurs. A mining operation. HMBP would be prepared and implemented for the storage and transport of hazardous materials during mining operations.

Final EIR Response A36 Refer to Section 4.10.4 which includes an analysis of risk of wildfire as a result of the project, and transport and handling of hazardous materials. With implementation of the proposed

mitigation, impacts would be less than significant. See response to A-24 in regard to the water supply for fire suppression.

COMMENT: HAZARDOUS MATERIALS ARE ALSO A FIRE HAZARD. FUELS ALONG WITH BLASTING MATERIALS, ARE A CONCERN FOR CAUSE OF FIRE. AGAIN, WATER SUPPLY IS A CONCERN. HAVING WATER TANK FOR FIRE SUPPRESSION WOULD SEEM REASONABLE MITIGATION FOR FIRE SUPPRESSION.

Final EIR Response A36 Refer to Section 4.10.4 which includes an analysis of risk of wildfire as a result of the project, and transport and handling of hazardous materials. With implementation of the proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant. See response to A-24 in regard to the water supply for fire suppression.

3.3.10 Off-site Roadway Improvements

The project includes improvements along an approximately 1.3-mile long segment of Stampede Meadows Road to address concerns regarding bicyclist safety that were expressed by the public during the public review process for the previously circulated Draft EIR (September 2012), and to address existing sight-distance deficiencies at the intersection of Stampede Meadows Road with West Hinton Road. Bicycle safety and sight-distance deficiencies were evaluated in the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) prepared for the project (LSC 2017) and the associated off-site roadway improvements have been incorporated into the project design.

The proposed improvements would extend along Stampede Meadows Road from approximately 500 feet north of West Hinton Road to approximately 1.2 miles south of West Hinton Road. The improvements include: 1) pavement widening and shoulder improvements along the roadway segment; and 2) sight distance improvements at the Stampede Meadows Road and West Hinton Road to provide adequate driver sight distance at this intersection. The off-site roadway improvements would result in ground disturbing activities to approximately 13.2 acres within the approximately 22-acre off-site improvement area and would result in an additional approximately 1 acre of paved surface. Refer to Figure 3-5 and Figure 3-6 for the off-site roadway improvements.

Final EIR Response A37 Excerpt from the Project Description of the Recirculated Draft EIR. No response is necessary

<u>The segment of Stampede Meadows Road in the off-site roadway improvement area includes portions under jurisdiction of the Town of Truckee, CPUC, the County and USFS. As previously mentioned, the UPRR corridor is under jurisdiction of the CPUC. In addition, the segment of road north of the UPRR corridor is located entirely within Tahoe National Forest (USFS lands) but has been granted to the County maintenance record pursuant to Board of Supervisors Resolution 74-24.</u>

COMMENT: DOES THIS MEAN THIS SECTION OF ROADWAY WILL BE PART OF THE COUNTY MAINTAINED MILEAGE SYSTEM.

Final EIR Response A38 the segment of Stampede Meadows Road north of the Union Pacific Railroad which is located within Tahoe National Forest is part of the County maintenance record and is maintained by the County. Depending on the roadway segment, all segments Stampede Meadows Road along the haul route are maintained by either the Town of Truckee or the County and the tonnage fees as described in the Development Agreement will apply.

Pavement Widening and Shoulder Improvements

The proposed widening and shoulder improvements would be constructed along Stampede Meadows Road between the I-80 interchange and West Hinton Road (refer to Figure 3-5 for the conceptual roadway widening design). The design for the roadway widening is conceptual, with areas of potential widening identified based on existing constraints (e.g., guardrails, steep slopes, wetlands, or cultural resources). The improvements would include widening the existing 20- to 24-foot-wide pavement to achieve a 32-foot-wide paved area where feasible, and constructing new shoulders as needed and where feasible to provide 1-foot-wide unpaved shoulders along the entire length. Paved vehicle pull-out areas would be constructed at three locations along the roadway segment. "Share the Road" signs (specifically, sign type W11-1 with supplemental plaque W16-P) would be installed along Stampede Meadows Road between the I-80/Hirschdale Road interchange and West Hinton Road to alert motorists to the presence of cyclists along Stampede Meadows Road. Stampede Meadows Road crosses the existing UPRR corridor at-grade. The shoulder widening improvements would avoid the existing UPRR right-of-way; thereby avoiding impacts to areas under jurisdiction of the CPUC. The pavement widening activities would extend beyond the County easement and into the USFS lands; therefore, an encroachment permit from USFS would be required. Encroachment permits from the County and Town of Truckee would also be required.

Sight Distance Improvements

The sight distance improvements at the Stampede Meadows Road and West Hinton Road intersection include an approximately 14,100 square foot area directly north of West Hinton Road and east of Stampede Meadows Road and an approximately 15,100 square foot area directly south of West Hinton Road and east of Stampede Meadows Road (refer to Figure 3-6 for the conceptual intersection design). These areas would be cleared of vegetation and large trees and graded to remove site obstructions and to allow for an adequate sight distance at the intersection. In addition, the intersection would be designed to ensure that adequate entry radius is provided for right turns made from Stampede Meadows Road onto West Hinton Road, in accordance with County Standards.[1] The improved areas would be revegetated following construction. "Truck Crossing" warning signs would be installed in both directions along Stampede Meadows Road approximately 500 feet in advance of West Hinton Road. Specifically, the signs would include a picture of a truck on it (a "W11-10" vehicular traffic sign) with a supplemental warning plaque (a "W16-2aP" sign) indicating "500 FT" would be placed in each direction along Stampede Meadows Road. The proposed advance warning signs are included in Appendix G of the TIA (LSC 2017, Appendix J).

Construction Equipment

Construction of the off-site roadway improvements would involve heavy equipment for grubbing and clearing, grading and excavation, drainage and utilities installation and subgrading, and paving. Construction activities would also require two water trucks for grubbing and clearing, two water trucks for grading and excavation, one water truck for drainage/utilities/subgrading, and one water truck for paving per day. Refer to Table 4.9-4 for a comprehensive list of the construction equipment and the quantities.

1 The Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the project (LSC 2017) includes an example of the minimum edge-of-traveled-way design is provided in Figure 9-26 of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' (AASHTO) A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets.

Construction Schedule and Workforce

Road improvement construction would likely occur Monday through Saturday from 7:00 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. and would only occur on Sundays in emergency. The construction crew would likely be based

out of Teichert Construction's Lincoln office. Most employees live in the Roseville and Rocklin area (approximately 90 miles from the project area) and although hotels may be provided for workers, it is assumed, as a worst-case scenario, that all employees would commute from the Roseville and Rocklin area. Approximately 22 construction workers and four managers/inspectors would be required on site each day for construction.

3.3.11 Trip Generation

Quarry Operation

Worst-case daily vehicle trips associated with operation of the proposed project would be **1,432 trips per day.** The trip generation is summarized below:

• Timber Harvest: During site preparation, approximately 750 commercially viable trees would be harvested and transported to a lumber mill located in Quincy (approximately 75 miles from the project site). Harvested trees would be transported via heavy duty diesel trucks and would generate a total of 188 one-way trips over the 30-year life of the project. Up to 20 one-way trips per day could occur during the timber harvest. If the timber harvest occurs during operation of the site, these trips would replace aggregate exporting truck trips and would not affect the overall worst case hourly and daily vehicle trips. Also, if the loads are spread out over a single operating season, the timber harvest would result in less than one load per day.

• Aggregate Exporting Trucks: The estimated maximum number of truck loads that can be processed per day is 560 loads. As each truck load involves an empty truck entering the site and a full truck exiting the site, the total number of one-way trips per day generated by aggregate exporting trucks would be 1,120 trips (560 round trips).

• Backfill Importing Trucks: Backfill trucks would generate approximately 280 one-way trips per day (140 round trips).

• Employees and Maintenance Trucks: The project would generate up to 30 one-way trips per day for employees (15 round trips) and two (one round trip) for a maintenance truck to transport fuels and oils for the trucks and equipment. An additional truck would transport blasting materials up to two times per week

Off-site Roadway Improvements

Worst case daily vehicle trips associated with construction of the off-site roadway improvement area would be 118 total trips daily. The trip generation is summarized below:

• Import/export trucks: A maximum of 34 import/export trucks would visit the site per day resulting in 68 one-way trips per day (34 round trips).

• Employees: A maximum of 22 construction workers per day, resulting in 38 one-way trips per day (19 round trips). An additional 12 one-way daily trips (six round trips) are assumed for managers/inspectors.

3.3.12 Overall Schedule

Operation of the East Pit may resume at any time (mining may occur under the existing permit for the East Pit). Construction of the proposed off-site roadway improvements may begin as early as 2020 and are expected to be complete within one month (approximately 22 working days). West Pit mining may commence as early as 2020, after completion of the off-site roadway improvements, and would continue for a duration of 30 years. Reclamation would be complete, including the removal of equipment, five years following completion of operations.

3.3.13 Development Agreement

As part of the proposed project, the applicant plans to enter into a Development Agreement with the County and the property owner which would establish a framework for: (1) how the current Use Permit (U06-012) and Reclamation Plan (U06-012) and the Amended Use Permit (U11-008) and 2011 Reclamation Plan (RP11-001) would apply to the mining and reclamation phasing of the project; and (2) costs and timing for the payment of a cost per ton fee to the County and Town of Truckee for roadway maintenance. The Development Agreement also includes a timeframe for which the County and Town of Truckee would be responsible for conducting roadway maintenance activities and the scope of those activities. The costs are based on two scenarios: (1) a standard maintenance schedule due to full quarry activities (152,250 to one million tons hauled per year); and (2) a maintenance schedule based on limited operation (less than 152,250 tons hauled per year). For Scenario 1 the County and Town of Truckee would be responsible for conducting biannual patching and maintenance work and a full overlay in year seven of operation. For Scenario 2 the County and Town of Truckee would be responsible for conducting chip seal and patch and crack seal during operational years 7 and 14 with a full overlay in year 21 of operation.

The Development Agreement would allow the project applicant to continue operations in the currently permitted East Pit, but would ensure the site reclamation, off-site roadway improvements, and owed fees associated with the proposed expansion are implemented at the appropriate time based on the phased operations. Costs associated with the off-site roadway improvements identified in Section 3.3.10, Off-site Roadway Improvements, are not covered by the maintenance fees identified in the Development Agreement.

As identified in the Development Agreement, mining of the East Pit is subject to Use Permit U06-012 which was approved by the County Planning Commission on July 26, 2007 and expires on July 26, 2027. Reclamation of the East Pit is subject to Reclamation Plan RP06-001, also approved on July 26, 2007. Upon the expiration of Use Permit U06-012, any remaining mining in the East Pit would be subject to the conditions and mitigation provided in U11-008. Reclamation of the East Pit would be subject to Reclamation Plan (RP06-001) and reclamation of the West Pit would be subject to the currently proposed 2011 Reclamation Plan (RP11-001). The term of the Development Agreement would commence upon the effective date, concurrent with the approval of the proposed 2011 Reclamation Plan (RP11-001) and would be in effect for 30 years thereafter, with the opportunity to renew concurrent with the permitted duration of the mining operations on the project site.

Final EIR Response A39 Pages 30-33 of the comment letter contain excerpts from the Recirculated Draft EIR with some text in bold font and/or underlined by the commenter. No response is necessary.

COMMENT: WITH THE U06-012 PERMIT EXPIRING IN 2027, THIS IS ONLY 8 YEARS AWAY. THEN PERMIT U11-008 WOULD BE THE PERMIT IN FORCE WITH SUBJECT CONDITIONS AND MITIATIONS. IT IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT MITIGATIONS AND CONDITIONS ARE IMPLEMENTED AS THIS PERMIT WOULD

THEN SUPERCEDE THE CURRENT PERMIT. THE NEW PERMIT U11-008 WOULD BE PERMITTED FOR A 30 YEAR TIME PERIOD. MITIGATION MEASURES AND CONDITIONS TO THIS PERMIT WILL BE EXTREMELY IMPORTANT FOR FURTURE IMPACTS TO THE COMMUNITY OF NOT JUST HIRSCHDALE BUT THE TOWN OF TRUCKEE.

The commenter has noted the importance of implementing the conditions and mitigation measures as part of this permit.

COMMENT: Burn permit with air quality standards.
The comment is noted. No response is required.

Comment: Water trucks are currently loading at the spring through Hirschdale.
See response to comment A-18.

Comment: Hours of operation are not consistent throughout EIR Hours of operation should be listed as Mitigation Measure along with Blasting hours. We would like these changed to 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. Mon – Friday for considering commuting traffic.

Hours of operation for a Saturday mixed with recreational traffic does not seem reasonable. (75 trucks) We would like to see hours of operation changed to also include No blasting.

Refer to response to comment A-22 for the correct hours of operation. As described in the discussion of Significance Thresholds 1 and 2 in Section 4.5.5, the traffic analysis evaluates the impacts of project trips during peak traffic hours on weekdays and on Saturday. The impacts to level of service during those times would be less than significant, so no reduction in operational hours to mitigate for traffic impacts is required. Blasting is a required operational procedure which would only occur up to two times per week. Noise impacts from blasting during the daytime hours would be less than significant, therefore no mitigation is required (see response to comment A-22). The Saturday hours for blasting is to allow for operational flexibility, while still prohibiting blasting during the evening and nighttime hours. No revisions are necessary

COMMENT: Page 10 of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is stated differently. This should be written to remain unaltered for the duration of operation of the quarry and signs placed permanently to detour traffic from Hirschdale Road.

Final EIR Response A 48 The haul route would not be able to be modified without subsequent analysis to analyze the associated impacts, and without subsequent review and approval by the Nevada County Board of Supervisors. The haul route signs would be temporary in that they would only be required for the duration of operation of the mine. No revisions are necessary.
COMMENT JUNE 5, 2019:
This has always been a concern to the Hirschdale Community that truck traffic would come through our community if the mine was expanded and the bridges replaced. We now have been presented the Hirschdale Bridge Project, which includes replacement and improving these bridges. It is clearly stated these bridges will not be used for this mining operation in this EIR. The Community of Hirschdale appreciates the County officials realizing this was not conducive for our community having truck traffic of this volume through our community. It was a condition of the permit for an alternative route to be established by the Planning Commission. This route was established and is being presented as the only mining route for this project throughout the lifetime of this permit.

Upon completion of the new haul route, the prior haul route over the two bridges south of the project site and through the Hirschdale Community was no longer available for use by haul trucks pursuant to U06-012 Use Permit Condition of Approval A6b.

Our response to the NOP along with responses from 2012/2013 we asked for clarification that Hirschdale Road would not be used for mining operation. It is stated in this EIR that Hirschdale Road will not be used for mining operations.

The applicant shall not alter the haul route without prior authorization from the County.

The comment above in this Mitigation Measure Trans-3 makes it sound as though there could be an agreement of authorization from the County for alterations to the haul route.

One concern is the Appendix C was presented with many blanks and not complete so there is no assurance the County and Teichert would not include usage of Hirschdale Road in the Development Agreement with County. The Development Agreement attached to this EIR is not specific enough to clarify that in the future County would not agree to allow usage of Hirschdale Road and bridges for this mining operation. We ask that the Planning Commissioners specifically state Hirschdale Road cannot be used for mining operations throughout the use of this permit and clarify our community is not conducive for any future use of Hirschdale Road for mining activity and make sure
This is a condition of this permit for the lifetime of this permit.

We would like to see as a condition of this permit U11-008 for the lifetime of permit the following, which has been stated numerous times in this EIR. Implementing this as a Condition of this permit will insure Hirschdale Road will never be used as a haul route in the future. This EIR does not include studies of impact to Hirschdale.

The proposed expanded quarry operation would continue to use the existing haul route for the permitted quarry operations, which includes West Hinton Road from the quarry to Stampede Meadows Road, and Stampede Meadows Road south to I-80 and prohibits haul trucks from using Hirschdale Road through the Hirschdale Community to access the project site.

Final EIR Response A 50 See responses to comments A-16 and A-48. Site access through the Hirschdale Community is prohibited from use as a haul route under the existing permit and will be prohibited from use as a haul route under the proposed project. No revisions to the approved haul route may occur without subsequent environmental review (which includes opportunity for public review and comment) and County approval.

Haul route was mentioned as not interfering with traffic on a Saturday. When the traffic study was completed the access to Stampede Reservoir was not open from the direction of Stampede Meadows Road, as the Stampede Meadows dam was being repaired. Traffic was detoured on Highway 89 via Hobart Mills/Russell Valley route. The recreational traffic was not usual recreational traffic at the time of study. The hours of operation on a Saturday seem to conflict with recreational users. It is stated at times the Quarry can be open 24 hours on a Saturday.

Response letter I Hirschdale Community Page 3 Concern of 24-hour operations

Comment: H-5 – Section 3.0 Project Description lists that the only project operation allowed after 9: 00pm.and before 6:00 am will be material load out. Since this is included in Project Description it will be enforced by Nevada County as part of the project. Storing stockpiles in Cal Trans Right of way are not part of the proposed project. It was suggested rather than 24-hour operation that piles of needed materials for jobs be stored near job sites or Cal Trans storage areas. This is the response to this suggestion. It has been noticed when road improvement jobs are being done materials are stored near the construction area and at times even concrete mixers and equipment have been present. This is why this was being suggested to prepare and prevent 24-hour operations as much as possible. 24 hours operation should be emergency use only and should be a mitigation measure to this permit. This should be declared by State, County or Emergency agency.

Final EIR Response A51
See response to comment A-12 in regard to the recreational traffic which was accounted for in the Traffic Impact Analysis. 24-hour material load out will be occasional and only in response to demand by public agencies where the schedule necessitates 24-hour load out. Stockpiling in CalTrans right-of-way is not analyzed as part of the project because the impacts of stockpiling would need to be analyzed on a case-by-case basis and in consideration of the project footprint in which the stockpile is located. Quantities are based on engineered designs. Because the duration of the mine is for 30 years it is impossible to know what the project locations and quantities would be. Without a project-level of information, an analysis of impacts would be speculative and is not feasible as part of the proposed project. As the commenter has noted, the 24-hour operation is based on need by a public agency. No revisions are necessary.

COMMENT: Response letter of 2012 under Air Quality response to letter G

G-26 states: Please refer to Section 4.7 Air Quality. As outlined in Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the project Applicant shall work with the County and NSAQMD to identify an acceptable location to install an air quality monitoring station. Said station shall be used for the on-site monitoring program that will help establish and monitor the most affective Dust Control Measures and Particulate Matter Emissions Control Measures. The monitoring on-site will provide a maximum reading of emissions that will diminish moving away from source.

There is no mention of a monitoring program or system to be installed in AQ-1 above.
This does seem this would be a great tool for controlling Dust. This should be included as a Mitigation Measure.

Final EIR Response A 53 The response to comment G-26 in Appendix A-2 of the Recirculated Draft EIR is an error and is based on an outdated air quality analysis. As described in Section 4.7.5 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, the annual average operational emissions would remain below the Nevada County General Plan criterion of 25 tons per year for each criteria pollutant and therefore the air quality impacts associated with the annual operational emissions would be considered less than significant and the incorrectly referenced mitigation measure tied to Policy 14.5 of the Nevada County General Plan Air Quality Element would not apply. As also described in Section 4.7.5 of the Recirculated Draft EIR, while the average annual operational emissions would not exceed the NSAQMD annual thresholds, the daily emissions for NOx and PM10 could exceed daily thresholds. Thus, operational emissions of NOx and PM10 are identified in the Recirculated Draft EIR as a potentially significant impact on air quality.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 included in the Recirculated Draft EIR and MMRP would be required, but the emissions would not be able to be reduced to below a level of significance and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Evacuation Routes

The project site can be accessed from two roads, both of which are low traffic volume and are a short distance to I-80. Hinton Road exits the project area to the South, passes under I-80 and intersects with Hirschdale Road which meets Stampede Meadows Road at an on-ramp complex of I-80. West Hinton Road exits the project site to the north and intersects with Stampede Meadows Road which proceeds to the on-ramp complex of I-80. West Hinton Road is used as the haul route for product leaving the site and the roads are not part of an evacuation route for any population centers. The surrounding area is remote and undeveloped with the majority of the development in the area located south of I-80 (GoogleEarth© 2018).

COMMENT: IS THERE A MAP ILLUSTRATION OF THESE EVACTUATION ROUTES?
It is stated there are two roads. Hirschdale is designated as having Glenshire as an escape route.

Wildfire Hazard Severity Zones

California law requires CAL FIRE to identify areas based on the severity of fire hazard likely to occur in a particular area. Factors considered in the rating include fuel (flammable materials), slope and weather conditions. The zones are classified according to the severity of the fire based on the anticipated behavior and likelihood of threats to structures. The project site is located within a State Responsibility Area classified as a Very High Hazard Severity Zone (Nevada County 2018; CAL FIRE 2019).
The majority of the off-site roadway improvement area is located in a Federal Responsibility Area. The USFS has identified the Wildfire Hazard Potential for the off-site roadway improvement area as ranging **from Moderate to Very High (USFS 2019).**

The Nevada County Evacuation Plan has identified Interstate 80 and State Highways 20 and 49 as operational areas to support during an evacuation (Nevada County 2011b). There are no associated maps in the Evacuation Plan. The discussion in Section 4.10.1, page 4.10-2 and Section 4.10.4, page 4.10-11 have been revised to clarify the routes identified in the Nevada County Evacuation Plan.

COMMENT: WILDFIRE RISK IS STATED HERE. HAVING WATER TANKS ON SITE AGAIN WOULD HELP WITH FIRE SUPPRESSION AND SHOULD BE A MITIGATION MEASURE.

COMMENT: THE HIRSCHDALE COMMUNITY SUPPORTS THE REDUCED DAILY PRODUCTION FOR ALL OF THE UNDERLINED REASONS ABOVE. THIS OPTION REDUCES POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS TO NOISE, TRAFFIC AND AIR QUALITY, POLLUTANT EMMISSIONS. THIS OPTION SEEMS BEST TO SERVE THE COMMUNITY ALONG WITH THE TOWN OF TRUCKEE.
The commenter has expressed support for the Reduced Daily Alternative. No response is necessary.

While the Reduced Daily Production Alternative would be the environmentally superior project, it would not fulfill the project objectives for Market Position and Production and Timeframe described in Section 3.2 because it would not allow the project applicant to be a leading regional provider and produce up to 1 million tons of aggregate per year since the annual production would be limited to only 250,000 tons per year. As discussed above, if the demand increases for aggregate material in the

Tahoe/Truckee area beyond the 250,000 tons per year, the remaining supply would likely have to come from out-of-County locations at an increased transportation cost and with the potential to result in site specific air quality effects at those out-of-County locations, as well as an increase in GHG emissions and energy consumption when compared to the proposed project.

COMMENT: ALTHOUGH IT STATED ABOVE THIS ALTERNATIVE WOULD NOT ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO FULFILL MARKET POSITION AND PRODUCTION, TO BE A LEADING REGIONAL PROVIDER, OVERALL, THIS OPTION SEEMS BEST FOR THE HEALTH AND WELFARE AND SAFETY OF THE COMMUNITY AND TOWN OF TRUCKEE BY REDUCING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Final EIR Response A62 the commenter has expressed support for the Reduced Daily Alternative. No response is necessary.

Comment from 2012 response:

Comment: ***Permitting 60 trucks an hour to travel on our roadways would definitely impact safety to our surrounding areas for fire protection, police and schools. Large hauling trucks on each side of the roadway importing and exporting at the volumes proposed, could impact fire protection and emergency response. School buses serving the surrounding residential areas sharing the county roads and I-80 during the same hours of operation, 6:00 am to 6:00 pm., could also be impacted with the proposed volumes of traffic. Both east and west entrances to our community will be used for truck hauling off I-80. With the potential need of a school bus in the Hirschdale community and surrounding subdivisions, transports to High School, Middle School and Elementary school could be impacted, along with fire protection and police protection.***

COMMENT ON EIR G 13 to the above comment
Please refer to the Impact Analysis in Section 4.5, Traffic and Circulation of the recirculated Draft EIR. Day-today public services will not be affected and traffic flows on all roads will remain at a fully functioning Level of Service (LOS). The specific intersections analyzed in the EIR would operate at LOS B or better under existing-plus-project and cumulative-plus-reject conditions.

COMMENT: WITH THE PROPOSED VOLUME OF TRAFFIC EVEN THOUGH IT IS STATED ABOVE THERE IS CONCERN AS TO HOW THIS WOULD AFFECT AMBULANCE, AND FIRE PROTECTION ACCESS ON OUR ONE LANE ROADWAYS. BOTH STAMPEDE MEADOWS ROAD AND HIRSCHDALE ROAD HAVE TWO LANES. THIS VOLUME OF TRUCK TRAFFIC PROPOSED IS A TRUCK EVERY MINUTE IN AND OUT OF QUARRY. THIS IS OF CONCERN IN THE AREA OF PUBLIC SERVICE.

Final EIR Response A6 the effects of the increase in traffic volumes generated from operation of the mine and all associated impacts were evaluated in each of the noted issue areas. In accordance with CEQA, the worst-case scenario was analyzed which assumed maximum annual allowable production during operation of the mine (1 million tons of material, not to exceed 17 million tons over the life of the project). While this scenario may occasionally occur during operation of the mine, the most common scenario during operation of the mine is anticipated to be much lower (**historically, the mine has averaged approximately 250,000 tons of material per year). Therefore, while the traffic volumes presented in the Recirculated Draft EIR may occasionally occur, they are not likely to be the usual scenario.** Even assuming the worst case scenario of maximum traffic volumes associated with operation

of the mine, impacts to greenhouse gas emissions and public services access and intersection delays (ambulance, fire protection, school bus access) would be less than significant (refer to Section 4.8 for an analysis of project-related greenhouse gases impacts; Section 4.5 for an analysis of project related impacts on level of service which could affect emergency response and school bus times; and Section 4.10 for an analysis of project-related impacts on emergency routes). The Recirculated Draft EIR was circulated to all departments in the County, including the Office of Emergency Services, with no comments received. Truck traffic noise at all existing noise-sensitive receptors (Receptors 11 - 14 are at currently undeveloped properties along the haul route) would be less than significant, and the truck traffic would result in less than significant impacts to level of service at the study intersections. The project's impacts on the noted areas have been evaluated in the Recirculated Draft EIR and no additional analysis is required under CEQA. Delays (ambulance, fire protection, school bus access) would be less than significant (refer to Section 4.8 for an analysis of project-related greenhouse gases impacts; Section 4.5 for an analysis of project-related impacts on level of service which could affect emergency response and school bus times; and Section 4.10 for an analysis of project-related impacts on emergency routes). The Recirculated Draft EIR was circulated to all departments in the County, including the Office of Emergency Services, with no comments received. Truck traffic noise at all existing noise-sensitive receptors (Receptors 11 - 14 are at currently undeveloped properties along the haul route) would be less than significant, and the truck traffic would result in less than significant impacts to level of service at the study intersections. The project's impacts on the noted areas have been evaluated in the Recirculated Draft EIR and no additional analysis is required under CEQA.

COMMENT: WE LIVE IN A HIGH DANGER FIRE ZONE. INSURANCES ARE NOT BEING RENEWED DAILY AND INSURANCE IS GETTING HARD TO FIND BECAUSE OF THIS HIGH FIRE DANGER. TAKING ALL THE PRECAUSIONARY MEASURES ONLY MAKES SENSE
FOR NOT ONLY THIS PROPERTY BUT SURROUNDING PROPERTIES ALSO. REQUIRING AS A MITIGATION WATER TANKS ON PROPERTY BECAUSE THE MINE IS SO FAR SOUTH AND THIS IS AREA OF 158 PLUS 40 ACRES BEING PERMITTED THIS ONLY MAKES SENSE FOR OUR ENVIRONMENT.
See response to A-24 in regard to the water supply for fire suppression.

Final EIR Response A24 Refer to Section 4.10.4 which includes an analysis of risk of wildfire as a result of the project. The risk of fire associated with the pile burning would be reduced with implementation of HAZ-3 which requires proper management of combustible materials on the site. The pile burning is associated with the removal of vegetation on the site which would have a beneficial effect associated with fire hazards. As described in Section 3.3.5, if needed, water for fire suppression would be provided by Dobbas Spring and the catchment pond. Water trucks would be present on the site for dust suppression and could be used to control a fire on the project site. In addition, Boca Reservoir and Stampede Reservoir are in the area and could be used by fire fighters in the event of a wildfire. With the proposed mitigation, impacts associated with wildfire risk are reduced to less than significant and water tanks would not be required.

Final EIR Response A26 as described in Section 4.10.4, other than the brief period of ground clearing, the majority of project operations would occur in the quarry pit where combustible fuel would not likely be present. Implementation of HAZ-3 would be implemented which requires proper management of combustible materials on the site.

Operating Schedule and Workforce
Typical Operating Schedules
May 1 through October 31
Monday – Friday: 6:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.
Saturday: 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Blasting Up to two times per week
Monday – Saturday: 7:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

COMMENT: Hours of operation vary from section to section. We would like hours of operation to be reconsidered. Many commute from Glenshire to Reno for work having this volume of truck traffic at this early hour does not seem considerate to others using the roadways. Most business don't open till 7:00 am close latest 6:00 pm. They are not implemented as mitigation measure nor are the hours for blasting. 9:00 – 4:00 This should be included in the mitigation measurement section.

Final EIR Response A 68- Refer to response to comment A-22 for the correct hours of operation. As described in the discussion of Significance Thresholds 1 and 2 in Section 4.5.5, the traffic analysis evaluates the impacts of project trips during peak traffic hours on weekdays and on Saturday. The impacts to level of service during those times would be less than significant, so no reduction in operational hours to mitigate for traffic impacts is required.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to be involved in this decision-making process. The Boca Quarry is in all our backyards here in Hirschdale. We appreciate your taking our concerns in mind when making and deciding on Mitigation Measures and Conditions of this permit.

A permit for 30 years is a long-time permit and taking all concerns into consideration makes for a more working neighborly relationship.

Respectfully,

The Hirschdale Community

Attached
Conditional Use Permit
Map showing location of Spring Water

Final EIR Response A 70-Closing statement and list of attachments. No response is necessary. The attachments provided include a list of signatures in agreement in response to the Mitigated Negative Declaration. It should be noted the environmental review document prepared for the project and which was the subject of public review is an Environmental Impact Report. The Conditional Use Permit was identified as an attached document but was not included in the submittal to the County so was not received as an attachment.

Teichert's attorney letter. Taylor and Wiley

B4- Page 2-2 of Recirculated Draft EIR has been revised to note the existing haul route restrictions of the current use permit (U02-012) for the Boca Quarry. This should also be included in the current proposed Conditional Use Permit.

The commenter agrees with the finding in the Recirculated Draft EIR that the Reduced Daily Production Alternative would not meet project objectives. It would not allow for the project applicant

NOI-4. Once the West Pit is operational, additional noise monitoring may be performed at Receptor 7 at the operator's expense. If this monitoring can confirm, to the satisfaction of the Nevada County Planning Department, that operational noise levels do not exceed the evening and nighttime noise standard of 48 dBA Leq at Receptor 7, then the County may extend the operating timeframe (including excavation and processing) to between 6 a.m. and 9 p.m. If m. the intervening topography and vegetation effectively reduce the operational noise limits to at or below the nighttime 40 dBA LEQ standard, then this mitigation measure shall replace Mitigation Measure NOI-1. If applicable, any operations that extend between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.
shall be limited to truck loading and unloading only. Adherence to this mitigation measure will reduce the project's nighttime noise impacts to less than significant.

A spring (Dobbas Spring) and associated water catchment pond are located in the southern portion of the project site, outside the footprint of the proposed expansion (ultimate disturbed area). The spring features existing improvements that allow for economic use of the water and ~~was formerly utilized~~ may be used by the property owner for a commercial water bottling operation, as well as for dust control in associated with the permitted mining operation in the East Pit.

Blasting would occur only between the daytime hours of ~~9~~7 a.m. and 4 p.m. during the allowable operating days of Monday through Saturday and the operating period of May 1 through October 31. Explosives would be used according to the technical specifications of the manufacturer and records would be kept, as required by the federal Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF). Refer to Section 3.3.6, Hazardous Materials Transport and Storage, for a discussion of the transport and storage of the blasting materials.

As previously described, existing outdoor lighting is associated with the processing and ancillary facilities in the East Pit and no new lighting or facilities would be installed as part of the proposed project. The lighting from existing facilities in the East Pit would be used for the quarry operations under the proposed project and may be relocated to the West Pit for nighttime operations, as needed. In general, currently permitted and proposed operations take place between 6 a.m. and 6 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. on Saturday so during operation of the quarry, on-site lighting associated with vehicle headlights accessing the site is relatively minimal. Currently permitted nighttime operations are limited to occasional night load-out of material (which would remain unchanged under the proposed project), during which time very limited lighting is required when the site is in operation.

While impacts to bicycle safety would remain potentially significant and unavoidable, implementation of the proposed off-site roadway improvements prior to commencement of activities in the West Pit as identified in Mitigation Measure TRANS-4 and in the Development Agreement would improve the conditions for bicyclists over existing conditions

The three production scenarios analyzed for mining operations include: Scenario 1 Peak Daily Production, analyzes peak production based on a typical workday (12 hours per day for approximately 180 working days) production of 4,100 tons per day, yielding approximately 738,000 tons per year. Scenario 1 would generate 571 trips per day and 11,410 [vehicle miles travelled] VMT. If timber operations occur concurrently with operation, the timber harvest truck trips would replace haul truck trips, and the VMT would increase by 1,100 VMT to 12,510. This worse-case scenario was analyzed.

Scenario 2 Worst-Case Daily Production analyzes the worst-case daily production of 10,080 tons per day based on the maximum number of trucks able to be managed on-site. This scenario assumes equipment is operating continuously for 16 hours with load-out occurring up to 24-hours per day, six days a week, yielding a maximum 10,080 tons per day. The maximum annual production of 1,000,000 tons would yield approximately 93 working days under this scenario. Scenario 2 would generate 1,402 trips per day and 28,021 VMT. If timber operations occur concurrently with operation, the timber harvest truck trips would replace haul truck trips, and the VMT would increase by 1,100 VMT to 29,121. This worse-case scenario was analyzed. Scenario 3 Average Daily Production assumes an average production of approximately 3,170 tons per day yielding 570,000 tons per year based on a normal 8 hours per day work shift for approximately 180 working days. Scenario 3 would generate 442 trips per day and 8,827 VMT. If timber operations occur concurrently with operation, the timber harvest truck trips would replace haul truck trips and the VMT could increase by 1,100 VMT to 9,927. This worse-case scenario was analyzed.

As discussed in Section 4.7.1, above, criteria pollutants that would be generated by the proposed project are associated with some form of health risk. Existing models have limited sensitivity to small changes in criteria pollutant concentrations; attempting to correlate the small amount of project-generated criteria pollutants specific health effects or additional days of nonattainment would not yield meaningful results (Longmire 2019, SMAQMD 2019). Consequently, an analysis of impacts on human health associated with project-generated regional ROG, NOX, and PM emissions is not included in this assessment.

The following clarification is made to Section 4.10.1, Existing Conditions, under Evacuation Routes, page 4.10-2: Evacuation Routes the Nevada County Evacuation Plan has identified I-80 and SRs 20 and 49 as operational areas to support during an evacuation (Nevada County 2011b).
The project site can be accessed from two roads, both of which are low traffic volume and are a short distance to I-80. Hinton Road exits the project area to the South, passes under I-80 and intersects with Hirschdale Road which meets Stampede Meadows Road at an on-ramp complex of I-80. West Hinton Road exits the project site to the north and intersects with Stampede Meadows Road which proceeds to the on-ramp complex of I-80. West Hinton Road is used as the haul route for product leaving the site and the roads are not part of an evacuation route for any population centers. The surrounding area is remote and undeveloped with the majority of the development in the area located south of I-80 (GoogleEarth© 2018).

The following clarification is made to Section 4.10.4, Impact Analysis, under Significance Threshold 7 – Interfere with an Emergency Response/Evacuation Plan, page 4.10-11: Significance Threshold 7 – Interfere with an Emergency Response/Evacuation Plan The project would not interfere with the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. In times of emergency or disaster response, the state highways would serve as primary routes, and designated county arterial roadways in the area would serve as secondary routes. The Nevada County Evacuation Plan has identified I-80 as an operational area to support during an evacuation; therefore, The project site is not in an evacuation area – neither Hinton Road or Stampede Meadows Road are evacuation routes identified in the Nevada County or City of Truckee Emergency Plans (Nevada County 2011a, b). Operations at the project site would be in accordance with the safety and evacuation plan prepared for the project and approved by the County.
The proposed project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan, and potential project impacts would be less than significant.

As stated previously we discussed secondary escape route with the Board of Supervisors last week and hope to have a secondary route established for Hirschdale. Photos of the Boca gravesite area are attached.

We thank you for the opportunity to share our concerns and we hope you take full consideration of the Reduced Alternative as your final decision for this project, which seems to overall the best decision while considering the health, safety and welfare of our Community and the Town of Truckee.

Respectfully,

The Hirschdale Community

Attachments:
Regional Map
Fire photos at the Glenshire stop sign from Boca gravesite fire presented to Board of Supervisors to consider a secondary escape route for Hirschdale
The current Conditional Use Permit as a comparison to the one being adopted
Pages from EIR

SIGNATURES OF THE HIRSCHDALE COMMUNITY IN AGREEMENT TO THIS RESPONSE TO THE MND

Steve & Christine Rauch
Maxine Lix
Randy Metzger
Dave Tranquilla
Hirschdale Resident
Justin Andrews
Larry Andresen 10867 Floriston Ave Hirschdale