

From: accesstld.timelinedesigns.com
To: [bdofsupervisors](#)
Subject: Letter to all Supervisors
Date: Sunday, January 1, 2023 5:58:19 PM

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I've become aware of the similarity of the current Cherokee County, NC Crypto Mining case.

I recently wrote an opinion letter to The Union (which has not been printed yet), asking the question, do we really need the income from a gold mine to support growth in the county? In fact, since I've worked in the high tech industry since my arrival in '69, I have seen literally hundreds of businesses move to or take root in our county, generating hundreds of jobs and revenues for the county. Can Rise Gold equal that financial benefit? My opinion, no.

There is more to this story beyond the reports to the county supervisors, the EIR, the Economic Impact Report and other comments from the public.

1. Do the Supervisors recognize the good financial health of the county, with our profitable high tech businesses, and attractive tourism destination? Why on earth would they entertain the thought of pushing the county and the inhabitants back 100 years into a gold mining past?
2. Could there possibly be a driving force pushing the need for the Supervisors toward accepting the Rise Gold proposal? Why isn't the decision a simple slam dunk answer, "No, we don't want the Gold Mine"?
3. One needs to look deeper, follow the money, to answer that. The speculation on my part comes from articles over the past year that suggest that strong money interests in the success of Rise Gold are intertwined with legal interests that suggest that the small County of Nevada can be toppled into the hands of Rise Gold by legal maneuvering to find the County as a whole must accept the Rise Gold offer. This constitutes a forceful takeover of the county. I'm sure our Supervisors have been advised by legal counsel of that risk.

Thus, this is not a simple fight of people with signs on street corners trying to educate the public or through articles in our newspaper. It is a political battle that must be won with a concerted legal front.

Is there precedence for what could happen here? Yes. Search what is happening with crypto mining cherokee county, North Carolina.

1. Question: Do any of the Supervisors know what crypto mining, or cryptocurrency mining is? What are they mining? Is it gold, minerals? No, it's a new way to create money! Sound impossible? It is the newest high tech approach to create a business by "mining" bitcoin for a profit.

The problem is that it is not a "clean" business at all, it tears apart the community, creates noise, ruins people's lives and there is no zoning to prevent the destruction.

What is my source? Other than Google and a good story in the Jan-Feb '23 issue of Popular Mechanics, you won't need more to make the connection to see how big business can destroy life in a quiet community, much like Nevada County. Read the article. Do some research. This is high tech run amuck. Going up against the likes of Rise Gold will pit Nevada County's independence against the legal forces of big business.

Bottom line, the "Mine" you are considering is a legal battle. Do we have the zoning to lock them out? Does that zoning protect or prevent excess noise, trucks, underground blasting, damage to wildlife, medial damage to residents? No, you can't mitigate against this stuff, you can only prevent it before it happens.

The Supervisors need to look deeper to the legality of injuries that will be caused to our people, animals and community. I found it interesting that the concept of Crypto Mining in Cherokee County, NC has such an obvious parallel to what we are looking at in Nevada County.

Sincerely,

Bruce Rayner



RECEIVED

JAN 05 2023

NEVADA COUNTY
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Dist 2

December 30, 2022
Nevada County Board of Supervisors
950 Maidu Ave, Nevada City, CA 95959
cc: letters@theunion.com

Information from: The Union July 20, 2022

"The CEO of Rise Gold Corp is currently on trial in a Canadian court on accusations of discharging waste, effluent and other substances into the environment.

CEO Ben Mossman and Dirk Meckert face 16 offenses under the British Columbia Environmental Management Act, nine under the Fisheries Act of Canada and four under the British Columbia Water Act....

... The (Canadian) mine closed in 2015 after Environment and Climate Change Canada said waste from the mine was found in nearby woods and wetlands, CBC has reported"

The failure to satisfy the above environmental requirements negates anything stated in the EIR, and this failure leaves Rise Gold a Non-Starter in their quest to reopen the Idaho Maryland Mine. Until the above court issues are totally satisfied the Rise Gold efforts cannot be considered in any way. Should any Elected Official support reopening the Mine prior to this, efforts to remove them from Office shall be a primary concern.

Robert L. Zuelsdorf PE, ret.



(Robert Zuelsdorf is author of the Book: Memoirs of a Broadcast Engineer.)

From: [Paul Schwartz](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#); [Planning](#); [bdofsupervisors](#)
Subject: Idaho Maryland Mine Niehaus Economic Impact Report
Date: Friday, January 6, 2023 9:45:03 AM

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Incompatible Use

The economist representing RDN and the Niehaus Economic Impact Report on the proposal to reopen the defunct Idaho Maryland Mine at the 12/15/22 webinar spoke to their research into comparable projects and the impact of introducing industrial mining on real estate values. RDN stated that there were no comparable studies or approvals of mining enterprises as close to residential neighborhoods as the defunct Idaho Maryland Mine is to the 90 homes within .5 miles of the proposed industrial site. They also stated they could find no comparable industrial mining enterprises approved or operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week located as close as .5 miles to residential development. Therefore, they could only speculate on the impact to real estate values.

The obvious question is how many proposed industrial mining projects were rejected by governing municipalities because of the adjacency to residential development?

Excerpts From Exhibit A, Draft Statement of Reasons to Permit Development in a Mineral Resource Zone, City of Auburn

Our neighboring city of Auburn approved the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan that proposed a multi-use residential and commercial development in a Mineral Resource Zone. Within this zone, "the State Geologist has concluded that significant inferred gold resources are believed to exist", however, in spite of potential gold mining tax revenues and jobs, Exhibit A represented that "Mining is Incompatible with adjacent Land Uses". The areas around the Mineral Resource Zone have been developed with low-density residential uses. "Because mining activities would already be incompatible with these developed areas due to noise, dust, traffic and other nuisances, the project site should be developed for non-mining uses." Exhibit A goes on to say that even though mining has been a large part of the past in the area, "mining no longer makes up a substantial portion of industrial activity in the County". Similar to Nevada County, mining in Placer County represents less than .1% of the economy.

Nevada County would be wise to formally acknowledge that industrial gold mining is part of our past and not part of our future. The current and future economy will be built on a diverse mix of clean manufacturing, construction, wholesale & retail trade, healthcare, education, arts and entertainment, recreation & tourism, non-profits, government and government services. Success will draw on the willingness of County, City, non-profits, State and National Forest, utilities, and private sector leadership to collaborate and partner in solutions that lead us to a sustainable and balanced

From: [maryanne.murphy.esq.](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Application to Reopen the Idaho Maryland Mine & application for a permit
Date: Sunday, January 1, 2023 4:10:17 PM

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

I am a lawyer, local real estate broker, and reside in [REDACTED]

The "Independent" economic report on this project brings out a few points that should be considered when deciding whether or not to issue a permit for this Applicant.

1. The fact that there is no other mine in this State and apparently in the Country which permits the mining of gold at 500 feet and below immediately beneath developed neighborhoods, commercial properties, airports and medical facilities.
2. The fact that the report does not complete an analysis of real estate revenue loss that it assumes will exist within 1-5 miles of the mine site.
3. The fact that the report relies solely on the facts as presented by the Applicant. See for your reference and 'please watch a panel of local expert citizens who volunteered in their review of this report at: https://youtu.be/dloojmt4M_).

The application must be reviewed under the existing general plan for the County as well as State policy and regulations. The County plan includes "limited exploration" on "compatible" land. In fact, the County encourages mining in compatible areas before encroachment of conflicting uses. (Chapter 17 of the County General Plan). In addition, as the Board is aware, the State authors general guidelines for plans which includes State policy.

I submit to you, that to authorize a permit to dig for gold that encompasses the development of underground mineral rights for 80 years is not a limited exploration in a compatible area. The conflicts of uses are entrenched in densely populated areas of homes, businesses, and commercial enterprises that is the result of 70 years of planning under the County's general plan. Further, the application is a bid to take over the Brunswick basin for the the sole purpose of gold mining the Motherlode which is not the lands highest and best uses in light of these areas.

The revenue that can be generated from this Plan if successful is already being generated in real estate revenue. Revenue which is certain and one can count on and is growing. This is unlike the revenue asserted by the Applicant to be generated which is uncertain and dependent on variables that may not even take place. It is also wrong to assume that mining

will be uninterrupted. Based on this County's past experiences with gold mining something always goes wrong or mining is interrupted even if just for the exchange of ownership interests. The uncertainty in such a plan is underscored by the fact that mining of the Motherlode has not been done at this mine since the mid 50's. No one knows, despite assertions of mitigation, what will happen. There is a lot to cover that must go right for the Applicant's Plans for revenues to even happen; and it is a certainty that the real estate revenues will fall.

Already, the local real estate market has been impacted by the mere fact of the mine possibly going in. Potential buyers have walked away from an area where heavy industrial underground mining imposes risks to water, air, and land and the quiet enjoyment of their potential property. Once the area becomes known for gold mining, more potential buyers will walk away. That is because marketability is based on risk not as defined under an EIR. Its the risk to the quality of life and health and safety of buyers in buying property that is the question in their minds. Some risk might be acceptable but not from a mine that operates 24/7 hours per week; puts tons of pollution into the air; dewater toxic water; causes homeowners' water wells to be replaced with piped in water; uses up multiple gallons of water from the public per day; assaults the area with noise and traffic that cannot be mitigated; can tear up the land up to 500 ft beneath a residence or business; and holds out jobs for its youth that only bring minimum wages and which non-transferable skills.

Its the risk of being perceived as a community of gold mining values that take precedence over the lives of those who live here and work here. As one potential buyer said to me, " What kind of community would entertain such a development?"; and,as one investor said to Mr. Mossman who was on U-tube promoting the mine, "What are you going to do with all of the houses?".

In sum, the interests of a well-developed community of neighborhoods, businesses, and commercial enterprises that beckons ecotourism cannot be reconciled by underground mining that permanently affects property interests for 80 years. It will permanently throw away, even if it is as successful as a mine the Applicant wrongfully claims, all the progress made from revenue generated by real estate interests because it will redefine the area as a gold mining community. For most who live here, it will irreparably damage the trust in Nevada County government.

Thank you.

Maryanne Z Murphy, Esq. and Real Estate Broker

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: [Kathy Ogburn](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: For 1-6-23 mtg
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 3:08:03 PM

Dist 3

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Attention Board of Supervisors,

Reopening the Idaho-Maryland Mine would be hugely detrimental to our community. The air we breathe, the ground water we drink and grow food with, increased traffic congestion, earth reverberating noise. All of which impact our physical health, mental health, economic health and small town cultural health.

In all due respect, pay attention to the outcry of community objection to permitting Rise Gold (a poor business risk) to re-open the Idaho-Maryland Mine. You are being presented with factual evidence showing serious unmitigable issues by credible science experts, business professionals, medical doctors as well as local common sense tax paying citizens.

At the very least, watch the report by Mine Watch/Community Environmental Advocates (CEA) for solid information.

<https://www.minewatchnc.org/post/minewatch-december-2022-meeting-economic-report-review>

Please deliberate with your head and heart, each of you.
Thank you,
Kathy Ogburn

From: [Yasha Aginsky](#)
To: [BOS Public Comment](#)
Subject: Non-agenda comment for 1/10/23 meeting
Date: Monday, January 9, 2023 1:12:08 PM

Dist 1

CAUTION: This email is from an external sender. If you are not expecting this email or don't recognize the sender, consider deleting.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. If you have more questions search for Cybersecurity Awareness on the County InfoNet.

Dear Nevada County Supervisors,

Are you all aware of the public outcry and opposition to the Rise Gold Grass Valley request for a permit to open the Idaho-Maryland mine? I hope so.

We've read the environmental and economic impact reports submitted on their behalf. They are inadequate and raise concern because they contain many omissions, flaws and assumptions that demand re-examination and rebuttal before even considering their request. Let's discuss it.

Please put this item on your agenda for your next meeting so that you can stop spending our money on this destructive, wasteful and unscrupulous project.

Yasha Aginsky

