From:	BOS Public Comment
To:	All BOS Board Members
Cc:	Public Health; Alison Lehman; Mali LaGoe
Subject:	FW: COVID_Safety_Protocols_to_the_School_Districts_2021_07_06_21_Signed.pdf
Date:	Monday, July 12, 2021 9:54:00 AM
Attachments:	COVID_Safety_Protocols_to_the_School_Districts_2021_07_06_21_Signed.pdf

Dist 2

From: Alana Fowler [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 9, 2021 1:55 PM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: COVID_Safety_Protocols_to_the_School_Districts_2021_07_06_21_Signed.pdf

Placer County moving in a freedom based direction, lead by science. Maybe Nevada county can as well.

Sent from my iPhone

Before the Board of Supervisors
County of Placer, State of California

In the matter of:
A Resolution Proclaiming Return of Governing Power for School COVID Safety Protocols to the School Districts

Resolution No.: 2021-254

The following Resolution was duly passed by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Placer at a regular meeting held on July 6, 2021, by the following vote:

Ayes: GORE, HOLMES, JONES, GUSTAFSON, WEYGANDT,

Noes: NONE

Absent: NONE

Signed and approved by me after its passage.

Chair, Board of Supervisors

Attest:

Clerk of said Board

WHEREAS, the World Health Organization ("WHO") and UNICEF both state that children 5 years and under should not be required to wear masks, and advise that decisions whether to impose a mask requirement upon children ages 6-11 should be made based on several factors, including the impact of wearing a mask on a child's psychosocial development; and

WHEREAS, the WHO also recommends against children wearing masks during exercise or play, as it accurately recognizes that masks can be harmful because they compromise a child's ability to breathe; and

WHEREAS, recent studies have shown that repeated exposure to mask wearing over longer periods can be measurably harmful; and

WHEREAS, numerous studies have shown that children are less likely to transmit and less likely to get symptomatic COVID-19 than adults; and

WHEREAS, children do not typically spread COVID-19, even without wearing masks and teachers are no more likely to be hospitalized due to Covid-19 than in other occupations; and

WHEREAS, the ability to see, appreciate and communicate through facial expressions is crucial to a child's social development, mental health, physical well-being; and

WHEREAS, compared with 2019, the proportion of mental health reported by the United States Centers for Disease Control beginning in April 2020-related visits for children aged 5-11 and 12-17 years increased approximately 24% and 31%, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the majority of adults and children over 12 years old-including those at high risk of adverse outcomes from COVID-19 have had ample opportunity to get vaccinated; and

WHEREAS, many highly credentialed, well-respected medical professionals have recently and publicly advocated for the universal elimination of mask mandates for children,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE PLACER COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS that the Placer County Board of Supervisors establishes the following goals:

- Assist in the return of governing power for school safety protocols to the School Districts themselves
- Advocate for Parental Choice for masking and vaccinating their children

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Placer County Board of Supervisors continue their commitment to assisting the local school districts in giving students an opportunity to return to normalcy in the classroom, including optional face coverings and removal of discriminatory vaccination status practices.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Placer County Board of Supervisors will seek out the assistance of any and all government agencies involved in the decisions regarding safety protocols in the school, specifically requesting assistance to make masks optional and relinquishing safety protocol decision making power to the school district itself.

From: BOS Public Comment
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Matt Kelley; Brian Foss; Caleb Dardick
Subject: FW: Stop the Idaho Maryland Mine
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 9:51:03 AM

Dist 1

From: Erin Alonso [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 4:20 PM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Stop the Idaho Maryland Mine

Dear Board Members -

My name is Erin Alonso and I was born and raised in Nevada City. I have recently moved back to Nevada City after living in the Bay Area for the past ten years and my husband and I are eagerly waiting to move into our recently purchased dream home off [redacted] in August.

I am writing to you about the Idaho Maryland Mine and to express my absolute shock and displeasure at the notion of allowing this venture to move forward. I have so many concerns about the prospect of this mine moving forward; the environmental impact on our air and water, the community impact of noise pollution, and the economic damage to the tourism industry.

When I lived in the Bay Area, I would often describe Nevada City and end with "Do you watch Hallmark Movies? Well, Nevada City is a real Hallmark Movie town - watch *The Christmas Card*!" I wonder if Hallmark would consider filming such a quaint movie in an industrialized mining town, with the debris of the mining obscuring the natural beauty of the Sierra foothills. Doesn't paint quite the same picture.

Similarly, I told my friends of Victorian Christmas and the Nevada County Fair. Now imagine such fun, small-town traditions being held in the shadow of an operating gold mine. Rise Gold is set to strain our power grid system, pollute our air, and contaminate our water. I remember when I was a little girl, my grandmother (who lived in L.A.) would tell me she saw advertisements in her local paper about our local events. Victorian Christmas brought tourists from all over the state, and the Nevada County Fair is famous for its natural beauty and community spirit. How can our community continue to be a tourist attraction as an industrial mining town? Tourists don't come here to hear current mining ventures, drink contaminated water, and cough on polluted air. They come here to learn about HISTORIC mining, which was rightfully shuttered years ago.

Rise Mine "promises" to produce 300 jobs for our community. What good is this promise when Rise

Gold is a 14-year-old company whose CEO previously polluted tribal water, went bankrupt, and left his former community with the debit to pay? Rise Mine cannot be trusted with our beautiful community. They cannot be trusted to protect the community and history that makes Nevada County so special.

Please, do NOT allow the Idaho Maryland Mine to reopen. Mining is a part of our PAST and needs to remain that way.

Before the Board votes, please require Rise Gold to include an INDEPENDENT economic analysis in the Draft Environmental Impact Report to prove that their productions will not impact the economic draw of Nevada County.

Best,

Erin Alonso

From:	BOS Public Comment
To:	All BOS Board Members
Cc:	Alison Lehman; Mali LaGoe; Trisha Tillotson
Subject:	FW: Hwy 20 Safety improvements?
Date:	Friday, July 9, 2021 8:07:19 AM

Dist 5

From: Kristy Cortright [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, July 8, 2021 9:29 PM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Hwy 20 Safety improvements?

Hello,

It took showing up to help at a fatal crash for me to write this (July 6th). I have helped with a couple non-injury accidents so far this year along 20 between I-80 and GV (my daily commute) and seen evidence of many more.

I just read on the county website that there are plans to widen the asphalt at some problem places. This will only partially help. Are there plans to put those large reflective arrow signs indicating a sharp turn? The following turns are where I see a lot of accidents:

Heading East from GV
1. Just after White Cloud (the site of the fatality July 6th)
2. Lowell Hill (sneaky off-camber, tightening turn). Suggest also decreasing speed limit there to 35mph
3. The very last left hand curve before the road straightens out toward I-80 (the cause of the fatal crash of that young woman in June, and a prius crash the winter before). I don't know why but this turn is a little tricky.

Also, maybe some signs saying there is a fine for slower vehicles with cars behind not using the turn-outs? Trucks/trailers/RVs/slow cars contribute to people taking risks to get around. I have done that myself (not proud) but won't be after July 6th.

I know we can't prevent people from driving under the influence or falling asleep but there are definitely things we can do to make that road safer.

I am happy to help in any way I can. Thanks for your time.

Sincerely,

Kristy

Kristy Cortright, DVM
[redacted]

From: BOS Public Comment
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Matt Kelley; Brian Foss; Caleb Dardick
Subject: FW: COMMENT: Mine
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 3:22:05 PM

Dist 3

From: Shannon Ross [redacted]
Sent: Monday, July 12, 2021 11:28 AM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>; Shannon Ross [redacted]
Subject: COMMENT: Mine

To the Supervisors of Nevada County:

for the reasons listed below, that should be enough for you to say "NO" to destroying our beautiful community with a resurgence of mining. This is a constant that people want to come back to mines to find something for themselves, but destroy a community of beauty and wealth of nature by doing so. I ask you all to vote NO on this atrocity to Nevada County citizens and visitors.

GET THE FACTS

Rise Gold is a 14 year old mining company that has never opened a mine and never made a profit. After purchasing the Mine in 2016, Rise ran afoul of local regulations while doing their initial explorations, but there's a history of violations that runs much deeper than that.

CEO Ben Mossman's last venture before joining Rise Gold, Banks Island Gold, Ltd owned the Yellow Giant Mine in British Columbia, Canada which polluted tribal waters, went bankrupt, and left Canadians with a mess to clean up.

Ben Mossman and another Banks Island executive, had 18 pollution charges filed against them personally. They were initially acquitted of the charges, then it was overturned, and now they're set to go to trial again.

Shannon M. Ross
[redacted]

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Public Health
Subject: FW: Public Comment for Next BOS meeting
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 7:49:32 AM

Dist 1

From: Pauli Halstead [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 6:50 AM
To: Clerk of Board <ClerkofBoard@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Public Comment for Next BOS meeting

Please include in agenda packet

So what has the FDA and Fauci done? They have systematically put pressure on States to disallow early treatment protocols using time tested "off-label" drugs for the early treatment of COVID-19 to prevent folks from having to be hospitalized.
The pharmaceutical companies do not want alternative and "cheap" medications to be used in this pandemic. They only want to sell vaccines and Remdesivir.

Counties do not have to capitulate to this unreasonable directive. The ethical and moral thing to do is to make sure those that do contract COVID have immediate access to medications such as hydroxicloroquine and ivermectin. They can easily and cheaply take these meds at home under guidance from their physician, rid themselves of the virus sooner, and never have to go to the hospital and endure having to deal with a cytokine storm and possibly intubation and death.

Letter to Fauci published in The Desert Review
https://www.thedesertreview.com/opinion/columnists/open-letter-to-dr-anthony-fauci-regarding-the-use-of-hydroxychloroquine-for-treating-covid-19/article_31d37842-dd8f-11ea-80b5-bf80983bc072.html

From State of California Health & Human Services: Dispensing or administration of off-label and investigational use of medications:

https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/Documents/COVID-19/COVID19-Drug-Policy-Revised-HCQ-061820.pdf

Newsweek article by Harvey A. Risch, MD, PHD
https://www.newsweek.com/key-defeating-covid-19-already-exists-we-need-start-using-it-opinion-1519535

American Journal of Epidemiology:
Harvey A. Risch, MD, PHD, professor of Epidemiology, Yale School of Public Health

https://academic.oup.com/aje/article/189/11/1218/5847586

Abstract

More than 1.6 million Americans have been infected with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), and more than 10 times that number carry antibodies to it. High-risk patients with progressing symptomatic disease currently have only hospitalization treatment, with its high mortality, available to them. **An outpatient treatment that prevents hospitalization is desperately needed.** Two candidate medications have been widely discussed: remdesivir and hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) + azithromycin (AZ). **Remdesivir has shown mild effectiveness in hospitalized inpatients, but no trials in outpatients have been registered.**

HCQ + AZ has been widely misrepresented in both clinical reports and public media, and results of outpatient trials are not expected until September. **Early outpatient illness is very different from later florid disease requiring hospitalization, and the treatments differ**. Evidence about use of HCQ alone, or of HCQ + AZ in inpatients, is irrelevant with regard to the efficacy of HCQ + AZ in early high-risk outpatient disease. Five studies, including 2 controlled clinical trials, have demonstrated significant major outpatient treatment efficacy. HCQ + AZ has been used as the standard of care in more than 300,000 older adults with multiple comorbid conditions; the estimated proportion of such patients diagnosed with cardiac arrhythmia attributable to the medications is 47 per 100,000 users, among whom estimated mortality is less than 20% (9/100,000 users), as compared with the 10,000 Americans now dying each week. **These medications need to be made widely available and promoted immediately for physicians to prescribe.**

--

Pauli Halstead

[redacted]

From: Julie Patterson-Hunter
To: All BOS Board Members
Cc: Matt Kelley; Brian Foss; Caleb Dardick
Subject: FW: An economic analysis of the Rise Gold mine definitely needed
Date: Monday, July 12, 2021 7:44:56 AM

Dist 4

From: Reed Hamilton [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, July 11, 2021 10:48 PM
To: bdofsupervisors <bdofsupervisors@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: An economic analysis of the Rise Gold mine definitely needed

Proposed Rise Gold Mine---What's In It For Our Community

I've been following the discussions of the proposed reopening of the Idaho-Maryland mine trying to think about what the project might mean for us here. Previous comments have mentioned the vast amount of water to be pumped and treated in perpetuity, toxic waste, explosion risk, possible dewatering of wells, noise and air pollution and road damage of heavy truck traffic, noise and dust from blasting, devaluation of neighboring homes, enormous energy requirements. The mine general manager has proposed the increased tax revenues and jobs as the credible benefits. He has also suggested some not very creditable ones such as increasing home values and helping the homeless situation. I don't think those are realistic.

Aside from those aspects of the project, comments have pointed out the financial weakness of Rise Gold and its short history, including bankruptcy and abandonment of the toxic waste of another mine.

When I look at the whole picture the question is---what do we get out of this? While we could benefit from more good jobs, will those hires be local or imported? Will the jobs be mostly temporary?

Will tax revenues offset the increased cost of public services and road maintenance from an industrial project? Will the increase in power demand threaten our already vulnerable electrical system?

Will mining activity decrease the value of local businesses and residences and, if so, by how much? Will our tourist industry be damaged by traffic, noise, and pollution from the mine?

Will telecommuters who have been moving here stop coming and reduce the sales revenues that their lucrative jobs produce for local government?

Does Rise Gold have financing for the whole project or are they only hoping they can get it if they get county approval? Assuming that mitigation for the damages can be effective, will Rise Gold stay solvent if the price of gold falls as it has many times? If Rise Gold does go bankrupt will there be adequate bonds to support the mine water treatment forever and elimination of other pollutants?

These are complex questions, but they deserve answers. Without answers, we and the Board of Supervisors are proceeding on assumptions and unsupported claims. It's clear that a thorough economic analysis of the project needs to be completed before any decisions are made.