

From: [BOS Public Comment](#)
To: [All BOS Board Members](#)
Cc: [Alison Lehman](#); [Matt Kelley](#); [Brian Foss](#); [Caleb Dardick](#)
Subject: FW: Rise Gold Mine
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 8:42:23 AM

Dist 4

From: Deborah Gibbs [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2020 8:49 AM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Rise Gold Mine

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 Supervisors

I oppose this mine. The potential pollution, environmental damage, and energy use are big negatives that far outweigh the possibilities of jobs and tax revenue. We can find better and safer jobs. The mine's location near several residential developments is a problem and could interfere with needed housing.

The days of gold mining should be over. I even regret that our county still showcases its gold mining history when we still dealing with the past environmental consequences. I would far rather celebrate our agriculture achievements. E.g. once a world exporter of pears. Please choose to approve businesses that make us proud of our community and not an extractive industrial enterprise that we don't need.

Debbie Gibbs

[REDACTED]

Nevada City, CA 95959

From: [BOS Public Comment](#)
To: [All BOS Board Members](#)
Cc: [Alison Lehman](#); [Matt Kelley](#); [Brian Foss](#); [Caleb Dardick](#)
Subject: FW: IDMD mine comment, to be read to the BOS 11/17/20
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 8:41:36 AM

Dist 3

From: Trudy Nye [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2020 11:25 AM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: IDMD mine comment, to be read to the BOS 11/17/20

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 read my email/comment out loud below to the BOS at their Nov. 17 board meeting. Thank you, Trudy Nye, 14270 Tim Burr Ln, Grass Valley, CA 95945.

Dear Board of Supervisors

Regarding the possible re opening of the Idaho Maryland mine, I have some questions for you.

1. If this operation was 50 ft from your house, would you want it in your neighborhood? Of course not! (It is about that close to my house and pollution, noise would be a huge concern)
2. Would underground drilling and explosions near your home rattle you and your family? Of course it would!
3. Would pollution caused by mining waste transport to a nearby dumping area, also close to your neighborhood, be intolerable? Yes, Correct again!
4. How about those mining waste trucks running 16 hrs/day, 7 days a week right through your neighborhood? Cough cough, no!

I say NO...and so should YOU! No mine should operate this close to towns and people. Stop the pollution, stop the noise, stop the chemicals leaching into wells, stop the mine and vote no!

Thank you,

Trudy Nye
Greenhorn neighborhood

From: [BOS Public Comment](#)
To: [All BOS Board Members](#)
Cc: [Alison Lehman](#); [Matt Kelley](#); [Brian Foss](#); [Caleb Dardick](#)
Subject: FW: Stop the Idaho Maryland Mine
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 8:40:41 AM

Dist 1

From: Nancy Taylor Rojo [REDACTED] >
Sent: Saturday, November 14, 2020 2:52 PM
To: BOS Public Comment <BOS.PublicComment@co.nevada.ca.us>
Subject: Stop the Idaho Maryland Mine

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 Members,

I am writing to add our dissenting voice to the proposed reopening of the Idaho Maryland Mine. My husband and I have lived at [REDACTED], Grass Valley, CA 95945 since 2004, and built our final retirement home on our property 5 years ago. I can't tell you how much we enjoy the peace and beauty of our home and acreage.

My husband is 87 and I am in my mid 70's. We are well aware of the destruction of our quality of life if the mine were allowed to reopen. We and our neighbors along Greenhorn Road have worked hard to get where we live, and to have our environment destroyed by industrial noise, dust pollution, and sound pollution would be highly unfair to this neighborhood. Our property values would be diminished and our legacy to our children undercut. The worse risk would be to our water upon which our life (and our animal's lives) depend. We have 5 wells on our combined 40 acres and only 3 are in use. I fear the mine's water requirements would dry up or contaminate our existing wells. There is history of that very thing happening in our county.

The history of mining in Nevada County is well known but should be relegated to the past since Grass Valley and it's neighbor towns and areas are now populated by many families, like ourselves, who wish to live our lives peacefully in the great beauty of our region.

Thank you for listening,

Nancy & Fred Rojo

[REDACTED]
Grass Valley, CA [REDACTED]

From: [Mary Menconi](#)
To: [bdofsupervisors](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 11/17 meeting (item not on agenda)
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 7:41:49 AM

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

I am opposed to the Rise Gold project because it is incompatible with the human and natural environments of Grass Valley.

An average of 100 trucks per day, every day, will transport waste rock down Brunswick Road, piling it 50 to 70 ft. deep on a waste site located within ½ mile of downtown Grass Valley

Diesel exhaust and dust will raise air pollution to levels that will increase the mortality rate in the area, especially among the most vulnerable, such as elderly people.

Treated mine water will be pumped into Wolf Creek at a rate of 2500 gal/minute initially, then 850 gal/minute for the next 80 years, disrupting existing aquatic ecosystems.

Blasting explosions will occur in the tunnels 24 hours per day, every day, beneath a large part of Grass Valley.

Mine dewatering could impact hundreds of residential wells.

The Rise Gold project is an enormous heavy-industry venture that will damage our quality of life and provide few benefits to local people

Sincerely

Mary Menconi

[REDACTED]

Grass Valley, CA

[REDACTED]

From: schutt.roger@gmail.com
To: [bdofsupervisors](#)
Cc: [Roger Schutt](#)
Subject: ** Public Comment for Tuesday Re: Idaho-Maryland Mine Proposal **
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 7:42:25 AM

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.

Good Day Nevada County Board of Supervisors!

Thanks in advance for your consideration regarding the Proposed Reopening of the Idaho-Maryland Mine.

I am MOST opposed.

Tuesday August 11, 2020 I sent the following detailed message to the following two (2) parties:

1. Rise Gold Corporation, Grass Valley, CA (Via U.S. Postal Service, and also to the E-mail address indicated on their Website)
2. Mr. Matt Kelley, Nevada County Senior Planner (Via E-mail)

Thank You again for your consideration!

Roger Schutt

[REDACTED]

Grass Valley, CA

E-Mail: [REDACTED]

Tuesday August 11, 2020

Rise Gold Corporation
333 Crown Point Circle (Suite 215)
Grass Valley, California USA 95945

First of all, I find it absurd that I even need to address this silliness, but here goes...

Word has it you're making every effort to turn a rather large area of Western Nevada County, California into a slowly-evolving "Ghost Town."

Re-Working the Idaho-Maryland Mine, eh?

I guess we learn from our past... but only selectively.

Rise Gold, we live quite near your proposed project.
We certainly don't need you to add significantly to our daily anxiety...

Even if this area was NOT threatened annually by massive fire, the current & unwelcome world-wide Virus, an upheaval in our planet's climate / overall health, as well as the currently staggering global economy... and yes, even if we did NOT actually live here... we would still HIGHLY OPPOSE your project.

Folks, you certainly don't meet the definition of "A Good Neighbor."

We'd love it if you would simply leave now and head back over that northern border. We know you will eventually... and if your plans somehow come to fruition, in your wake you'll unfortunately leave those of us still here with all the toxic byproducts of your filthy "money grab."

My friends & neighbors have conducted diligent research into your proposed rape of our area. They previously submitted their suggestions & comments to Nevada County Senior Planner Matt Kelley. I have included their questions & comments below for your review; the list of dangers is quite well-documented. I am also sending a copy of this message to Mr. Kelley, for his edification on this subject.

But I would add this...

You think you've got deep pockets, eh?

Well, just wait 'til all those folks west of us get wind of this. I'm speaking of those living between here and the Pacific Ocean. Especially a certain multitude of urban dwellers nearest the ocean. In fact, anyone & everyone living along the route(s) your contaminated water will be flowing. I don't think you've quite considered them... and I don't assume they'll take too kindly to such pollution. I'd guess their collective "pockets" run a wee bit deeper than yours ever will...

Rise Gold, now is the time to settle up with your current debtors, cut your losses... and head out.

Yes, there's Gold in these hills... but around these parts it's experienced in the form of individual freedoms, and many good friends & neighbors sharing this delightful piece of God's Green Earth.

Please leave us soon... in (relative) Peace.

We wish you well.

Roger Schutt
Grass Valley, California

RE: Idaho-Maryland Mine Proposal

Mr. Matt Kelley, Nevada County Senior Planner,

The history of gold mining in Nevada County has shown us, time and time again, that devastating impacts to the community and environment go hand in hand with this invasive industry.

The current mine reopening proposal violates every tenet associated with a community that desires clean abundant water, air and a healthy sustainable life in our ideal peaceful foothill town. We depend on our home and property investment as a means to see us through our eventual retirement in these beautiful foothills of Nevada County. This proposal is a blatant, outrageous threat to the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of this community.

It is imperative that you order non-biased, independent and comprehensive tests and analysis, for the complex issues of environmental impacts associated with this proposal.

Analysis and Reports necessary:

1. Hydro Geology (underground flow) & Hydrology (above ground flow)

We know there is underground water flow, shown by the need for dewatering and continuous pump out. We must have a comprehensive, before the fact, understanding of all facets of this water flow, including contamination and discharge to the environment.

The report submitted by Rise does not mention that underground water flow is dominated by fractures and faults. An expert report will demonstrate that these cracks are ubiquitous to Nevada County's geology. This is how the entire designated area, and beyond, will suffer the complete loss of all usable water, during mining operations. The dewatering alone, at the rate of 3.6 million gallons per day will drain the aquifer in a time when water is even more precious for the fire safety of the citizens. Hundreds of residential wells will go dry. There is no possible way to mitigate this impact to less than significant. Any proposed extension of NID public water, is highly troublesome. Besides residents facing the loss of their high quality, free, well water, they would be forced to pay for a public service. And, most of the potentially affected homes do not have that public water option, since the infrastructure is not in place.

2. Land Use and Planning - Zoning

The project's proposed rezone does exactly what zoning should not; create a nuisance to incompatible adjacent existing residentially zoned uses. The existing proposed sites are zoned "light" industrial. We do not approve of

changing this, and did not purchase our home adjacent to a potential “heavy” industrial site. The underground operations are also “heavy” industrial and reach into residential areas above. These drilling and blasting impacts cannot be mitigated to less than significant. A plan of 80 years of heavy industrial mining will cause this area to be a wasteland of contaminated grounds and air.

3. Heavy truck/equipment Noise, Blasting Noise and Associated Earth Tremors.

This will be unbearable for residents within several miles of the sites. Noise travels great distances. Wildlife and citizens alike will be impacted to a significant degree. CEQA requires a comprehensive study of the proposed projects impacts; both for construction noise impacts and and operational noise impacts.

Aside from this proposal, there are other construction projects approved and on the drawing board in the vicinity. The cumulative impacts, together with this project, must be comprehensively analyzed.

4. Transportation & Traffic

Ingress and Egress will be severely hampered with the constant truck traffic. With only one route to evacuation, Greenhorn residents will be trapped, should there be a wildfire. Road repair estimates for heavy truck/equipment traffic must be studied. The project appears to present a new impediment for citizens east of the site, to Grass Valley and hwy 49/20, that must be analyzed. Expected levels of service must be presented for the purpose of analyzing impacts, or alternatives.

Traffic Engineers, Cal Trans, and the CHP should be consulted for the purpose of reporting on this.

5. Economic

Our area risks losing high tech companies that will move due to the combined impacts of this mine. The underground boundaries of this proposal reach near or below existing tech companies. Hundreds of residents will move out of the area due to the combined impacts. This must be studied and reported on, in terms of economic consequences in loss of revenue. Additionally, the devalued property will affect the county economically with the loss of property taxes. Real Estate reports must be ordered to assess the potential of lost property values.

6. Air Quality - Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Realistic measurements must be studied to determine the impacts on clean air, from the endless heavy diesel truck and machinery exhaust volume. The release of unhealthy particulate matter into the air, from blasting, drilling and loading of toxic asbestos, chemicals and heavy metals, must be analyzed. A separate study must be done for the release of chemicals into the air, caused by the ammonium nitrate blasting. The carbon emitted into the atmosphere will be in the thousands of tons per year. This must be accurately studied and reported on.

7. Agriculture and Forestry Impact

Valuable natural assets will be devastated by the loss of 3.6 million gallons of water daily. Noise and air pollution will further exacerbate problems. Even at their own admission, the Rise NOP indicates unique, rare or endangered species will be lost. We already have bark Beetles and drought affecting our forests. What can we expect from this operation to exacerbate conditions? Rise has no plan or study for the impact of such massive water loss and pollution.

8. Terrestrial and Aquatic Biological Resources

A study must be done on the impacts to these natural conditions, as well as the potential loss of unique wildlife and species of vegetation. Both extremes exist; loss of water to keep everything alive, and the flood of toxic water on outflows, all the way to the Sacramento Valley and beyond. When a well is run dry and your animals cannot be given water, what are the options?

9. Existing Superfund clean up site

Rise places this secondary, when in fact, it's a primary concern. This needs to be studied and a recommendation proposed for immediate clean up. Another existing Superfund clean up site is Lava Cap Mine. After years of attempting to mitigate the contamination, Lost Lake is still highly toxic. Signs are posted to keep away from the water. Empire Mine has equally toxic areas which remain fenced off to the public, as well as numerous sink holes.

The impacts of these should be considered cumulatively. Before anything is done to open this project, these sites must be cleaned up to a level of impacts that will not invade the environment. Any action ahead of this clean up is blatant negligence.

10. Friable asbestos in serpentine rock

Our foothills are composed of much serpentine rock. This contains large amounts of asbestos, which can be expected to become friable upon processing. A complete expert report must be made in reference to this subject. Rise cannot mitigate releasing this toxic substance into the environment to a less than significant impact. Additionally, what are the long term affects of the paste that is mentioned, which is pumped back into the ground? What will an expert in the future report on this issue? Please explain the methodology for a report like this to be viable for an 80 year project.

11. Water Quality in/outflows

Sacramento Central Valley Water Quality Control Board must be contacted to review the proposed outflows of 3.6 million gallons of contaminated water, daily. An evaluation must be done by this agency before awarding a waste drainage requirements permit. Again, history has shown that highly contaminated outflows of mining operations are full of heavy metals in toxic volumes. This contaminated flow was known to reach the Bay Area during measurements of past mine outflows. A comprehensive analysis of this discharge effluent by downstream users, must assess the impacts to people and

organisms affected by it, the entire distance of travel to the Pacific.

12. Utilities and Energy Use Impact

It's stated that the equivalent energy used by 5000 homes would be required by this project. The overreach of this project cannot be understated. This is an impact of significance on our electrical infrastructure. A study and report must be made as to who will pay for PG & E to upgrade our systems, as well as what strain on existing service will impact residents until those upgrades are done, or not done at all. We're talking about a product that is mere ounces per ton, for the exchange of all this energy and impact.

13. Hazards

Trucks would be transporting explosives into the area. Should any one of these deliveries, or handlings go wrong, we will suffer a forest fire catastrophe on a massive scale. Our school bus routes are all around this area. In fact, the Durham School Bus Transportation yard is on Bennett St., less than a mile from the Centennial site. We should not allow these hazardous materials anywhere near the proposed area. There are also other hazards associated with a mining operation. Chemicals, oil, engine cooling systems compounds..all of which can leak and create an even more toxic environment. A study needs to be done on the potential impacts of these collateral issues.

Additionally, If there is no specific knowledge of the location of fractures and fissures underground, and an explosive charge is detonated, a significant hazard is eminent. How will the surrounding residential areas react beneath and above the ground? This must be studied and explained.

14. Impacts on the Aesthetics of the area must be studied and reported

Would an industrial wasteland fulfill the county's desire for a healthy sustainable, beautiful foothill area, that would benefit existing residents, and inspire tourism?

These required requests for analysis' must be comprehensive. They must contain a reasonable range of feasible alternatives. All reports must demonstrate the methodology and facts supporting it's conclusions. It must seek to explain the adequacy or inadequacy of all mitigation measures, and it must consider all impacts both individually and cumulatively. A reasonable range of feasible alternatives, including "No Project" must be proposed and analyzed.

This proposal is intensely stressful for all of us. The prospect of losing our precious water, and having to endure the impacts to our environment, is already affecting us severely, as we are now having to manage our emotional life in the face of such potential devastation to our homes and lifestyle. In a time of climate change, high fire danger, and drought conditions regionally, the loss of our precious water resource is unacceptable. The real costs of this project will be shouldered by the citizens of this area. Were it properly shouldered by the proponents of this project, there would not be any profit. This Canadian

company will be making it's profit from the monetary and physical hardships of the citizens in the surrounding residential community. This type of project needs to be disclosed to every perspective buyer of property in the area, because they/we will be paying for the disaster that ensues by these mining operations.

Will the Rise company set aside a bond of millions of dollars to guarantee coverage for the draining of wells and loss of property value? How will they be made responsible for health claims from exposure to toxic substances, which has occurred in every other mine, and likely to occur with this one?

There are too many risks to the community to have another toxic mining operation begin the same devastation this industry has known in the past. **Please obtain all new extensive reports from every agency and expert possible. This disaster must not be allowed to cause our beautiful area to become an industrial wasteland.** For the few temporary jobs it might bring, and the gold in the pockets of Canadians, hundreds, if not thousands, of residents will be impacted and likely be leaving the county.

As county government representatives, you have an obligation to protect us, our children, our jobs, our waters, our wildlife, our air and our forests.

In closing, I reference the facts, shared in this documentary of the Siskon Gold mine disaster in North San Juan: <https://vimeo.com/120747168>

This information is direct and factual. There is no way Rise can guarantee they will not devastate our water and community in the same manner. And who will pay for that damage? Rise? Nevada County?

End