

From: [Ken Paige](#)
To: [bdofsupervisors](#); [Heidi Hall](#); [Ed Scofield](#); [Dan Miller](#); [Sue Hoek](#); [Hardy Bullock](#); [County Counsel](#); [CEO](#); [Sheriff](#); [Chad Ellis](#); [Kit Elliott](#); [Env Health](#); [Alex Gammelgard](#); [Public Health](#)
Subject: Re: For Public Record BOS Meeting 4/27/21
Date: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 1:42:13 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

For the public record 4/27/21

It is incumbent upon you our Board of Supervisors to rescind the current state of emergency that was signed in March 2020.

It has been over a year and you are well aware that the premise of this emergency is no longer valid. It is no longer factual truth and it is unwarranted

1) The Proclamation of the State of Emergency by Governor Gavin Newsom dated March 4, 2020 waived code section 8625(a) and did not waive section 8625(d), which specifically states YOUR role in this order:

- The governing body shall proclaim the termination of **the local emergency at the earliest possible date that the condition warrants.**
- This emergency is no longer valid for our county! Your personal negligence has allowed these orders to cause serious damage to our families, children, businesses and community. You must rescind this current state of emergency now. It is unwarranted.
- Or are you waiting for permission from the Governor on June 15th?

2) You must rescind Resolution 2c-062 proclaiming a local Emergency for Nevada County dated March 10, 2020 signed by Heidi Hall for the following reasons:

The conditions that existed on March 10, 2020 are no longer applicable today and the emergency order must be rescinded.

- Today our county is not “under a condition of extreme peril beyond the control, capacity and resources on the services, personnel, equipment, and facility of our county”
- Today our county is “able to cope”
- Or are you waiting for permission from the Governor on June 15th?

3) You must rescind The Declaration of Local Health Emergency declaring a local Emergency for Nevada County dated March 3, 2020 signed by Ken Cutler MD. for the following reasons:

The conditions that existed on March 3, 2020 are no longer applicable today and the emergency order must be rescinded.

- In our county there is no longer “an imminent and proximate threat to our community”
- Under Health & Safety code 101080 this declaration “must NOT remain in effect for longer than 7 days” unless reviewed and ratified by the Nevada County Supervisors and “must be reviewed every 30 days UNTIL the local emergency is terminated”
- Or are you waiting for permission from the Governor on June 15th?

On Fri, Apr 9, 2021 at 11:34 AM Ken Paige [REDACTED] > wrote:

Dan, Heidi, Ed, Sue, and Hardy,

Your our legacy has already been written and tarnished. The writing is on the wall. You chose mindlessly to follow the path of a failed Governor with the banner of “saving lives” and allowed during your watch, the most vicious, oppressive, draconian lockdowns in history. By hiding under Newsom and your lack of courage to do your job you destroyed families, businesses, children, schools and the economy you live in. You allowed fear and hopelessness to permeate our communities.

It has been over a year and you still remain negligent of the reality of what is happening. Today, I ask for your sake and for the sake of the community you serve that you seriously consider what is before you. Don't wait another day for permission from a failed governor to do what is right. Are you really going to continue to agree with Newsom's catastrophic emergency policy for another two months? You have before you an opportunity to show the community that you are virtuous people. You owe it to yourselves and those you represent to be bold, take a stand, and uphold the oath you took when elected.

I demand the Nevada County Board of Supervisors immediately:

- Rescind the Governor's State of Emergency: As per section 8625(d)
- Rescind the signed Resolution 2c-062 proclaiming a local Emergency for Nevada County
- Rescind the County Health Officer Declaration of Local Health Emergency declaring a local Emergency for Nevada County

The headlines say that Gavin Newsom is “fully opening” California on June 15. What they should say is he's continuing a catastrophic policy for at least another two months. Newsom's bizarre announcement – the economy might open, schools won't have to, and masks are here to stay – is as unlawful as it is incoherent. He is clearly announcing this position under the pressure of a potential recall election. If he is successful in disallowing enough petition signatures and the recall is rejected, he will go back to his illegal and unconstitutional policies.

The Governor is legally required (**code section 8625**) to end the State of Emergency “at the earliest possible date that conditions warrant.” Well, the conditions do NOT warrant and there is no constitutional authority for a months-long political timetable.

This legal requirement to end the State of Emergency is also upon you. As per section 8625(d)

You, our local governing body must; “at earliest possible date that conditions warrant the governing body shall proclaim the termination of the local emergency, code section 8625(d) at the earliest possible date that the condition warrants”. The conditions under which the declaration was signed are no longer applicable today and must be rescinded.

Today is your opportunity to save face and **rescind the Governors State of Emergency**

order! It was your job to rescind this a long time ago but today is your chance. Newson recently stated “we’re all geniuses in hindsight.”? How much hindsight does it take to see the reality of what is happening? Are you really going to follow your failed leader and allow your legacy to say that you continued to agree with Newson’s catastrophic emergency policy for another two months?

On March 10, 2020 you also signed Resolution 2c-062 proclaiming a local Emergency for Nevada County (signed by Heidi Hall)

Your resolution for our county stated we were “under a condition of extreme peril beyond the control, capacity and resources on the services, personnel, equipment, and facility of our county and unable to cope”

Today is your opportunity to save face and **Rescind the signed Resolution 2c-062 proclaiming a local Emergency for Nevada County!** We are now one year later since it was signed and the truth is in your apparent; our local county is not in a state of emergency! Are you really going to tell the community that we are still “under a condition of extreme peril beyond the control, capacity and resources on the services, personnel, equipment, and facility of our county and unable to cope”? Are you really going to continue to agree with a failed leader’s catastrophic emergency policy for another two months? The conditions under which the resolution was signed are no longer applicable today and it must be rescinded.

On March 3, 2021 the County Health Officer signed The Declaration of Local Health Emergency declaring a local Emergency for Nevada County (signed by Ken Cutler MD)

This emergency order stated under **Health & Safety code 101080**. “this declaration “must NOT remain in effect for longer than 7 days” unless reviewed and ratified by the Nevada County Supervisors and “it must be reviewed every 30 days UNTIL the local emergency is terminated”. The conditions under which the declaration was signed are no longer applicable today and it must be rescinded. It was never publicly shown that it was ever reviewed.

Today is your opportunity to save face by reviewing, ratifying and **Rescinding the County Health Officer Declaration of Local Health Emergency declaring a local Emergency for Nevada County!** Yes, you can! It was and is your responsibility to make sure this local health emergency did not remain in effect for longer than 7 days and you were negligent to not review it every 30 days UNTIL the LOCAL emergency was terminated. We are now one year later and the truth is in your face that our county no longer has “an imminent and proximate threat to our community.

--

Ken R Paige

Eat your food with gladness & drink your wine with a joyful heart (Ecclesiastes 9:7)

Proprietor Friar Tuck's Restaurant & Bar



Nevada City, California 95959

Ken R Paige

Eat your food with gladness & drink your wine with a joyful heart (Ecclesiastes 9:7)

Proprietor

From: [Rebecca Young](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Support for SR 21-0178
Date: Tuesday, April 20, 2021 3:48:50 PM

Dist 3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am a registered voter living in District 3 and I support passage of SR 21-0178 to safely reopen our county based on local data.

Rebecca Young

From: [Amy Young](#)
To: [Sue Hoek](#); [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Oath of Office
Date: Thursday, April 22, 2021 11:37:14 AM

Dist 4

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Nevada County Supervisors:

Per the California Constitution, Article 3, Section XX, you have taken the following oath:

"I, (name) , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties upon which I am about to enter. "

And the penalty for violating your oath is outlined as such:

"3108. Every person who, while taking and subscribing to the oath or affirmation required by this chapter, states as true any material matter which he knows to be false, is guilty of perjury, and is punishable by imprisonment in the state prison not less than one nor more than 14 years."

Here's a link to the above-referenced material:

<https://www.calstate.edu/hradm/Policies/std689.pdf>

REMEMBER YOUR OATH!

Sincerely,
Amy Young
Penn Valley

"A time is coming when men will go mad, and when they see someone who is not mad, they will attack him, saying, 'You are mad; you are not like us.'"

— St. Antony the Great

We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power.

- Orwell, 1984

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

From: [Tom & Liz Walsh](#)
To: [bdofsupervisors](#)
Cc: [Heidi Hall](#); [Sue Hoek](#); [Ed Scofield](#); [Dan Miller](#); [Hardy Bullock](#)
Subject: For public record 4/27/21
Date: Friday, April 23, 2021 6:14:20 AM

Dist 4

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings to our County leaders,

Thanks for your hard work in these times. We are certain your job is not easy. We have lived in this county for 50 years and never regretted that, although the character of this place has changed dramatically and not always for the better. Now is definitely one of those times. Due to BOS decisions about keeping our county closed because of "peril beyond control", many of our local businesses are suffering or have closed, and there is a gloomy atmosphere everywhere. From our perspective, none of this is warranted and has not been for several months. We work locally and see people in that environment daily who have long since stopped believing and living as if there is a "pandemic". They sometimes wear masks to masquerade as compliant citizens, but the underlying dialogue would not make you Sups smile. We encourage you to have a real look at who really has the disease, who really has died from it, and to respond appropriately. It is time to reopen our county, to allow the residents to return to normal life with the protections guaranteed by our Constitution (not power-grabbing state officials), and for our BOS to get back to governance that makes sense for Nevada County!

Thomas and Elizabeth Walsh

From: [Pauli Halstead](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment for April 27th
Date: Friday, April 23, 2021 5:01:31 AM
Attachments: [Totality of Circumstances.doc](#)

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please make sure the Public Comment gets into the Agenda Packet for the Public Record.

Thank you,

Pauli

--

Pauli Halstead



Understanding the Law in Excessive Use of Force: The Totality of Circumstances

It's important for the community to understand that law enforcement has a constitutional duty to protect the rights of an individual especially when confronted with crisis situations where the person is mentally ill, disabled, or under the influence. California Police Officer's Standards and Training (POST) is the gold standard of training in excessive use of force and de-escalation techniques. Since California has updated its requirements, officers must be current on training and hold the necessary certification.

To make a point, the Supreme Court used a failure to train example:

"But it may happen that in light of the duties assigned to specific officers or employees the need for more or different training is so obvious, and the inadequacy so likely to result in the violation of constitutional rights, that the policymakers of the city can reasonably be said to have been deliberately indifferent to the need. In that event, the failure to provide proper training may fairly be said to represent a policy for which the city is responsible, and for which the city may be held liable if it actually causes injury."

In the Gabriel Strickland case dispatch reported a man walking with a gun, but that he "didn't seem like upset or anything". There were no reports to the police that he ever brandished the toy gun, threatened anyone, trespassed onto private property, or acted in any manner threatening to public safety.

Officers arriving on the scene could have used any number of standard de-escalation techniques. Instead, they only inflamed and escalated the situation and made the use of lethal force justifiable in *their own minds*. This is exactly the opposite approach to what is taught in the POST training which defines de-escalation as "... the process of using strategies and techniques intended to *decrease* the intensity of the situation."

Gabriel repeatedly told the GV Officers that he was holding a toy Airsoft* rifle with a "marked" orange tip as required by law. He even tapped the barrel to let them hear it was plastic, not metal. On the video Sheriff Deputy Tripp is heard saying "you could have painted that", thereby acknowledging that the officers saw the orange tip.

It was obvious to anyone watching Gabriel at the scene that he was not in a normal state of mind. A normal person would have simply put the gun on the ground. More importantly, the GV officers knew he was: a homeless man with mental health issues and unable to respond to commands of law enforcement. Instead of speaking to him calmly, the officers just kept screaming commands, and moving closer with guns pointed, which is in direct opposition to de-escalation training.

Sheriff's Deputies and GV Officers never called for any mental health professional or negotiation advice. Law enforcement cannot ignore their obligation, *when there is time*, to de-escalate, communicate calmly, and call for crisis personnel. These peaceful non-lethal approaches are essential to constitutional police work, especially when, as in this case, the victim was known to have mental health issues.

The totality of circumstances, by definition, means the *entire encounter* between the police and the victim, from the dispatch call to the final use of force. Law Enforcement and the DA cannot ignore the "totality" element and focus only on the last few seconds of the incident.

The assumption "if the victim points a gun (or a knife) at an officer, the officer has the absolute right to use lethal force". That is not the law. The Ninth Circuit decided in many cases: "the fact that the 'suspect was armed with a deadly weapon' does not render the officers' response per se *reasonable* under the Fourth Amendment."

It is obvious from watching the video of the Strickland incident that all officers at the scene had no idea what they were doing and had not been properly trained for detaining or arresting a person with mental health issues. Instead the officers followed the only training they received: the full-on use of lethal force.

Given the recent shooting death of Sage Crawford, we must again question the training of the deputies at the scene, the rapid escalation of an incident that could have been handled differently and the failure of dispatch and the officers to call in the newly established Sheriff's Crises Team. It's past time for all Nevada County Law Enforcement officers to get current on training and hold the necessary POST certification on excessive use of force and de-escalation techniques.

*Airsoft guns are replica toy guns used in airsoft sports. They are a special type of low-power smoothbore air guns designed to shoot non-metallic spherical projectiles often referred to as "BB's", which are typically made of plastic or resin materials.

From: [Gary Griffith & Christine Nys](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Public Comment for Board of Supervisors meeting, April 27th, 2021 —
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 8:22:37 AM

Dist 3

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Public Comment for Board of Supervisors meeting, April 27th, 2021 —

My name is Gary Griffith. I live near the top of Gold Hill Drive adjacent to Empire Mine State Historical Park just outside the city of Grass Valley, in District 2.

My question for the board of supervisors and particularly for my supervisor Dan Miller is how diligent they will be in considering the full impact of the upcoming Idaho-Maryland Mine proposal. I am concerned because in my experience government officials often seem to give too little credence to the negative impacts of a project in favor of the hoped-for economic benefits. It's almost as if the EIR process is an inconvenient formality and that jobs and money are the only things that count. So, please disabuse me of this concern by showing me and the county that your board considers the real negative impacts of a large-scale, 80 year long, heavy industrial mining operation at the boundary of the city of Grass Valley and surrounded by numerous residential neighborhoods most seriously. To this end I suggest the following: 1) an extended comment period beyond the required 45 days with multiple public hearings. This is too impactful a project for quick consideration. 2) a rigorous consideration and justification for the re-zoning of the project from light industrial. How does such a move fit into the overall vision for our county's future or how does it not? 3) A linkage of the at this point separate process of cleaning the toxic waste at the Centennial site with an approval of the mining proposal. How can the board seriously approve a project when a large-scale toxic clean-up on one of the sites involved is not first completed? 4) Seriously question the minimization of impacts that any EIR tends to present. EIRs are paid for by the company proposing the project and tend therefore to be biased in favor of the project being approved. Due diligence requires that you rigorously interrogate conclusions of no unavoidable impact. It is your primary duty to assure that any project does not do harm. 5) a full economic analysis linked to consideration of the project. Too often hoped-for or assumed economic benefit does not turn out to be the case. 6) Finally, a detailed enumeration of the ways mine operation will be monitored by the county as regards each impact category in the EIR, including funds and personnel required to do so, and procedures to fine or close operations when necessary or require remediation. Mining is always promised to be very safe until it isn't. Too often communities are left to clean up the mess or are unable to stop unsafe operation after a project has been approved.

Overall, I urge you to earn our trust as supervisors by leaving no consideration regarding the full impact of such a massive proposal unexamined or untouched. Thank you.

Gary Griffith, [REDACTED]

From: [Ralph Mertens](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: against the mine
Date: Sunday, April 25, 2021 12:45:46 PM

Dist 4

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am a resident of district 4 and I don't think the large mining operation fits with our community values. The constant large truck traffic, water depletion problems are not worth the few jobs, There seems to be no guarantee that the company would not go bankrupt and leave a big dangerous mess. The county needs to consider economic risks and the presence of the toxic site that is there.

From: [Cindy Siegfried](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Mining Proposal
Date: Sunday, April 25, 2021 4:36:53 PM

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

My name is Cindy Siegfried and my husband and I have lived for 27 years at [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. We live 1.9 miles down [REDACTED], and we own 1.75 acres, and definitely within the impact area of the proposed mining operation. We oppose the mine for several reasons (air quality, traffic, lighting, noise) but our main concern is OUR WELL. Our well is at a depth of 1,025 feet. Yes, 1,025 feet. Our first well was 500 feet and it stopped producing in 2004. Tanko Well Drilling company drilled another well and we finally reached 5 to 10 gallons per minute at 1,025 feet, at a cost of \$20,000. The Foresthill Bridge, tallest bridge in California, is 730 feet. Our well is about 300 feet deeper! We are EXTREMELY concerned about any impacts the mining operations could have on our water supply. There is no other place on our property for another well. We wrote a letter with several questions regarding protection of our and area wells during the Draft EIR process. We oppose this application. Thank you. Pete and Cindy Siegfried

From: [Amy Young](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: 500,000 attend London Freedom March
Date: Saturday, April 24, 2021 2:00:27 PM

Dist 4

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Supervisors,

The MSM may black out all news about the worldwide revolt against lockdowns, masks, and vaccines, but luckily you have me, your trusty citizen journalist.

This weekend over 500,000 were in glorious non-compliant attendance at a freedom march on London. Please enjoy the pics in this tweet:

https://twitter.com/_Black_Rats/status/1386009169992499200

Maybe, if you act fast enough, you can end up on the right side of history. Because WE are watching you and WE won't forget.

P.S. Heidi Hall, I heard a rumor that you are from the Rockefeller family? If true, that is CRAZY! Wow! A Rockefeller right here in little Nevada County. What a non-honor. Also if true, please give your puppetmasters my most heartfelt MAGA regards!

Sincerely,
Amy Young
Penn Valley

“A time is coming when men will go mad, and when they see someone who is not mad, they will attack him, saying, 'You are mad; you are not like us.’”

— St. Antony the Great

We know that no one ever seizes power with the intention of relinquishing it. Power is not a means, it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power.

- Orwell, 1984

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

From: [Julie Patterson-Hunter](#)
To: [All BOS Board Members](#)
Cc: [Matt Kelley](#); [Brian Foss](#); [Mali LaGoe](#); [Caleb Dardick](#)
Subject: FW: Idaho Maryland Mine project
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 8:15:00 AM

Dist 1

From: Carol Meer [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2021 12:11 AM
To: bdofsupervisors <bdofsupervisors@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Idaho Maryland Mine project

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Board of Supervisors,
We live off Meyer Road off 174. We are against the opening of this mine. The list is obvious as to why we would oppose this. The environmental impact of this to the water, air and land is immense and long term. Just pumping the water into the creek and rivers eventually will be so dangerous. Saying it isn't dangerous is ridiculous and unscientific. Please don't approve this project.
Carol Meer and Ted Wunderlich
[REDACTED]
Thank you for listening

From: [Julie Patterson-Hunter](#)
To: [Kit Elliott](#); [Jeffrey Thorsby](#); [Matt Kelley](#); [Brian Foss](#)
Cc: [Mali LaGoe](#); [Alison Lehman](#)
Subject: FW: Bob Clark: Mine a Pandora's box
Date: Monday, April 26, 2021 8:11:00 AM

Dist 1

From: Susan Frisbie [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2021 7:19 PM
To: Heidi Hall <Heidi.Hall@co.nevada.ca.us>; Ed Scofield <Ed.Scofield@co.nevada.ca.us>; Sue Hoek <Sue.Hoek@co.nevada.ca.us>; bdfosupervisors <bdfosupervisors@co.nevada.ca.us>; BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>; Dan Miller <Dan.Miller@co.nevada.ca.us>; Hardy Bullock <Hardy.Bullock@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Bob Clark: Mine a Pandora's box

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of County of Nevada email system. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Bob Clark: Mine a Pandora's box

I thought the role of county supervisors was to work for the benefits of residents. As I get older I find that I have misunderstood a lot of things. Despite a higher than average IQ, a degree from a major university, and almost 50 years of successful business experience, I am surprised when I find something I have been pretty confident about ends up not being true.

So is the case with the county's consideration of an application by Rise Gold to reopen the Idaho Maryland Mine.

Since I live around the corner from the Brunswick mine site and will be impacted by a reopening, I have tried to educate myself about the possible reopening. One of the first things I did was to contact Matt Kelly in the county's planning department and ask him for a copy of the county's economic impact analysis. (Many of you have found Matt to be a good, responsive resource as I have.) Matt told me that such a study was not required, does not exist, and that none is planned.

Wow.

I'm assuming Rise Gold has considered the costs and benefits to them. For some reason, however, the county hasn't concluded they should do the same for us.

Knowing that the three most important factors in real estate values are location, location, and location, I wondered what the impact might be on my home value if all of a sudden it was close to an operating mine. Knowing that our local real estate agents do all of the Grass Valley real estate transactions and that they are the foremost experts on Grass Valley real estate, I called the person who does the largest volume of transactions and has for years.

When I asked for their professional assessment of what would happen if the mine reopened,

they didn't hesitate.

“Your home value and that of all your neighbors will drop by \$50,000 to \$100,00.”

Still in a bit of shock, I called another high volume agent, and another, and another, and another, and another They all 100% agreed: Property values would decline. I went online to see if I could find any fact-based study of what actually happened in another case where a mine was opened in a residential area.

After much searching, I found a study done by two PhDs at the University of Minnesota. I called them and they sent me a copy of their study. What they found, based on actual property sales over a nine-year period, was that properties within a one-mile radius of the mine site dropped 20%. But wait, they found that values dropped for up to a 7-mile radius, though less so, as the property was further from the mine site.

That's all of Grass Valley. Did the county supervisors just not know? I had to tell them, so I did. Just properties within one mile of the Brunswick site could drop tens of millions of dollars. So what did they say?

“That's just speculation.”

Speculation? This is what our local experts are telling us. Does it matter whether it drops 20%, or 10%, or 5%? Shouldn't any decline be mitigated, or at least considered? Are my neighbors and I just supposed to swallow hard? Are you?

You may not live next to the mine site, but you're crazy if you think it won't impact you.

I know the county is doing an Environmental Impact Report. I also know the Rise-paid “outside experts” will conclude that everything can be mitigated, leaving us to battle them issue by issue. I was told by the county's legal counsel that the supervisors couldn't intervene, as “they have to be the unbiased judge and jury.” Doesn't serving the best interests of residents apply at all?

Shouldn't the economic impact of any project be required whether there is any required procedure to do so or not? Every business does one. Would Supervisor Dan Miller start building a new store without considering the costs and benefit? I don't think Dan is that stupid. Don't most of us consider the cost and impact of a major purchase like buying a car? Of course we do, we're not that stupid or irresponsible.

What is the role of our county supervisors if not to look out for our best interests? Failure for them to do so only leaves three explanations to me: personal interest, total disregard of their duties, or just plain stupid. Take your choice. Any of them makes them unfit to serve the office we have elected them to serve, and we need to get rid of them.

If we all just sit and let it happen, it will. If it does, I guess I'll have to tell my family that good old Dad didn't understand that people don't really care about their pocketbooks and by the way, your inheritance will be \$100,000 or more less than expected.

Are we all that stupid?

Written by: *Bob Clark who lives in Grass Valley.*

NOTE HIS COMMENTS AND OBSERVATION that you all need to GO!!! Gee, this is becoming a reoccurring point of discussion here in Nevada county.....

Susan Frisbie

"The price of Liberty is eternal vigilance." Thomas Jefferson

"Those who would give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty or safety." - Benjamin Franklin

"Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious people. It is wholly inadequate for the government of any other." - John Adams

"We can persuade and reason with the people, but we cannot force them." - Thomas Jefferson

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.