

January 18, 2009

City of Grass Valley, IMM Project  
c/o Thomas Last, Planning Director  
125 East Main St.  
Grass Valley, CA 95945-6588

Dear Tom Last:

We appreciate the opportunity to comment upon the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) related to the proposed reopening of the Idaho-Maryland Mine. This letter provides an overview of our critique of the DEIR, followed by line-by-line comments on the below chart of impacts.

Overall, the DEIR downplays risks significantly. For instance, the following impacts are categorized as “less than significant impacts, no mitigation needed” (Class III):

- 4.4-7: “1,200 tons per day of mine development rock, gold mill tailings, and other solid waste would be used as backfill in the underground mine workings” and “groundwater contact with backfilled waste rock and mine tailings could lead to degradation of groundwater quality.”
- 4.6-3: “significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials”

Likewise, many of the impacts that are categorized as “less than significant impacts with mitigation” (Class II) would obviously still have significant impacts, many of them unexamined. For instance:

- 4.5-1: The danger of cave-ins, injuries, and property loss are categorized as having a “less than significant impact with mitigation,” even though the proposed “mitigation” simply involves a future study being done to find out whether and where such problems could occur. This postpones the very point of the EIR—to determine risks and how to mitigate them.

The entire DEIR is flawed with similar illogical classifications and inadequate mitigation measures.

Furthermore, many of the so-called mitigations are measures that should be observed with any project—they won’t mitigate the actual harm that would be caused if this project proceeds. Other proposed mitigations seem to be little more than a wish list of measures to make the project seem benign. For instance:

- 4.2-1d: “Vehicles and/or equipment shall be washed prior to each trip, if necessary.”
- 4.2-1a: “Watering shall occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage, if the surface is not already moist from rain or snow.”

Even if these procedures were agreed to, who would oversee them? What oversight staff is the City prepared to employ? Who would pay for oversight?

Finally, the air quality problems that the DEIR categorizes as “significant and unavoidable, with mitigation” (Class I) pose serious risks to the community, especially to vulnerable populations. What would it mean to reopen the Idaho-Maryland Mine if there are “significant and unavoidable”

negative impact on air quality? How many more of our children would have to start using inhalers? How many more of our high school students would get sick and have coughing bouts when they play sports outside? How many of our elderly would die prematurely? Statistics and studies are available to assess the effects of various air pollutants on vulnerable populations. To make an informed decision about whether or not the mine is good for the community, we need that data.

We have gone line-by-line through the document and have commented throughout. (See below for our specific comments.)

Sincerely,

Guarionex and Sharon Delgado

**Impact# Description, with comments by Guarionex and Sharon Delgado, 11328 Red Dog Road, Nevada City, CA 95959. (530)265-5976**

**4.1 – Aesthetics**

The proposed project has the potential to have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

- 4.1-1 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “substantial adverse effects” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

The proposed project could substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

- 4.1-2 *This document is inadequate because it classifies substantial damage to scenic resources as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

- 4.1-3 Construction of the proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

Operations of the proposed project could substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.

- 4.1-4 *This mitigation is inadequate because it deals only with vegetation. It does not address how negative visual effects and impacts to the site from buildings and equipment will be mitigated.*

Construction, and operation of the proposed project, including implementation of the reclamation plan, has the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.

- 4.1-5 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures.*

**4.2 – Air Quality**

Activities associated with project construction, operation and reclamation would generate criteria pollutant emissions at the project sites and along haul routes.

- 4.2-1 *This draft EIR is inadequate because it does not consider mitigation measures and funding mechanisms for medical treatment of the most vulnerable population, children, nursing mothers, pregnant women, asthmatics, the breathing impaired and the elderly who will be harmed by the worsened air quality. Furthermore, this document is inadequate because it classifies criteria pollutant emissions as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though such emissions would not be altogether eliminated and would still cause illness.. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

The proposed project would generate DPM emissions from on-site mobile sources and TAC emissions from processing operations. These emissions would increase exposure to TAC emissions at nearby receptors.

- 4.2-2 *This draft EIR is inadequate because it does not consider mitigation measures and funding mechanism for medical treatment of the most vulnerable population, children, nursing mothers, pregnant women, asthmatics, the breathing impaired and the elderly who would be harmed by the worsened air quality. Furthermore, this document is inadequate because it classifies “exposure to TAC emissions at nearby receptors” as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though such emissions would not be altogether eliminated and would still cause illness. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

The proposed project would generate localized CO emissions at intersections and roadways in the project vicinity.

4.2-3 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “CO emissions” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose adequate mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

Operational activities associated with project implementation could lead to increases in odorous emissions.

4.2-4 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “increases in odorous emissions” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures, nor does it specify the sources and types of odorous emissions. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

The project could conflict with implementation of State goals for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and thereby have an adverse effect on global climate change.

C4.2-5 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because the stated goal of the Plan is to achieve offsite emission reductions of NOx, ROG, and PM10 equal to a minimum of 10 percent rather than 100% of the project-related emissions remaining after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2-1a through 4.2-1d.. Furthermore, this document is inadequate because it classifies “conflict with implementation of State goals for reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions” as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though the project could still conflict with implementation of State goals for reducing GHG after mitigation.. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion*

The proposed project, together with anticipated cumulative development in the area, would contribute to regional criteria pollutants, and TACs.

C4.2-6 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because the stated goal of the Plan is to achieve offsite emission reductions of NOx, ROG, and PM10 equal to a minimum of 10 percent rather than 100% of the project-related emissions remaining after implementation of Mitigation Measures 4.2-1a through 4.2-1d.. Furthermore, this document is inadequate because it classifies the contribution to regional criteria pollutants and TACs” as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though the project would still contribute to regional criteria pollutants and TACs after mitigation. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

### **4.3 – Biological Resources**

Construction, operation and reclamation of the proposed project could affect potentially jurisdictional wetlands and waters of the U.S. on/in the vicinity of the Idaho-Maryland and New Brunswick sites.

4.3-1 *The proposed mitigation measure 4.3-1a is inadequate because it does not place all wetland areas within the project boundary off limits to disturbance by any and all construction activity. Furthermore, this document is inadequate because it classifies the potential impact on wetlands and waters as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though the project could still affect wetlands and waters on the site/in the vicinity of the Idaho-Maryland and New Brunswick Sites after mitigation. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

Construction, operation and reclamation of the proposed project could potentially result in adverse impacts to aquatic species and/or their habitat (i.e. riparian, streambed and banks) in Wolf Creek and South Fork Wolf Creek.

4.3-2 *The proposed mitigation measure 4.3-2a is inadequate because monitoring of dissolved oxygen should be continuous with reporting to the City of Grass Valley and publication in a local newspaper as public information on a weekly basis. A plan should be provided and submitted for approval to the City of Grass Valley indicating what measures are to taken in the event dissolved oxygen falls below the minimum threshold.*

*The proposed mitigation measure 4.3-2b is inadequate because monitoring of water temperature must have a baseline established prior to pumping and*

temperature should be monitored continuously and reported to the City of Grass Valley with publication in a local newspaper as public information on a weekly basis. A plan should be provided and submitted for approval to the City of Grass Valley indicating what measures are to be taken in the event water temperature exceeds the + or - 5 degree range specified in the mitigation measure.

The proposed mitigation measure 4.3-2d is inadequate because a fish rescue and relocation plan should be provided and submitted for approval to the City of Grass Valley indicating what measures are to be taken and efforts to be made to reduce the risk of aquatic wildlife being stranded within the cofferdam.

This document is inadequate because it classifies “adverse impacts to aquatic species and/or their habitat” as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though the stated mitigation measures would not adequately prevent such adverse impacts. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion

Construction and operation of the proposed project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to the following special-status species: valley elderberry longhorn beetle, California red-legged frog, northwestern pond turtle, California horned lizard, and Pine Hill flannelbush.

- 4.3-3 *The mitigation measures which are proposed are inadequate unless all surveys of endangered species are conducted during their periods of greatest vulnerability and prior to the approval of any permits being issued for the project. Approved biologists should be hired by the City of Grass Valley and paid for in advance by the permit applicant and survey results should be made public without disclosing exact locations to prevent malicious takings.*

Construction and operation of the proposed project could interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

- 4.3-4 *This document is inadequate because it classifies interference “with the movement of native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors” and impeding “the use of native wildlife nursery sites” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose adequate mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

Construction of the proposed project has the potential to result in adverse impacts to native trees, including oaks and ponderosa pine.

- 4.3-5 *The mitigation measures proposed are inadequate unless a long term maintenance plan is submitted along with a funding mechanism to insure all plantings survive and become established and able to survive without further intervention.*

#### **4.4 – Cultural Resources**

Construction, operation and reclamation activities could adversely impact historic resources as defined in §15064.5 on/within the vicinity of the project sites.

- 4.4-1 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless a qualified archeologist is retained by the City of Grass Valley and paid for by the applicant to survey the entire site and identify potential areas of significance prior to issuance of the permit. All areas so identified shall be avoided by the project. In the event a permit is issued, the city of Grass Valley retained archeologist, paid for by the applicant, must be onsite and monitoring all surface ground disturbance activity and shall suspend construction activity until significance of any archeological find has been determined and appropriate protection and preservation measures undertaken. In the event any indigenous archeological or cultural remains or artifacts are encountered, the local Tsi Akim Maidu spokesperson shall be contacted and a representative of the tribe shall be retained by the city of Grass Valley, paid for by the applicant, to work in concert with the city retained archeologist and to insure all such remains and artifacts are cared for respectfully and in accordance with Maidu tradition..*

Construction and operation of the proposed project, including the reclamation plan, could adversely impact significant historical resources, including unique archaeological resources and human remains.

- 4.4-2 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless a qualified archeologist is retained by the City of Grass Valley and paid for by the applicant to survey the entire site and identify potential areas of significance prior to issuance of the permit. All areas so identified shall be avoided by the project. In the event a permit is issued, the city of Grass Valley retained archeologist, paid for by the applicant, must be onsite and monitoring all surface ground disturbance activity*

and shall suspend construction activity until significance of any archeological find has been determined and appropriate protection and preservation measures undertaken. In the event any indigenous archeological or cultural remains or artifacts are encountered, the local Tsi Akim Maidu spokesperson shall be contacted and a representative of the tribe shall be retained by the city of Grass Valley, paid for by the applicant, to work in concert with the city retained archeologist and to insure all such remains and artifacts are cared for respectfully.

Construction, operations, and reclamation activities associated with the proposed project could adversely impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.

- 4.4-3 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless a qualified paleontologist is retained by the City of Grass Valley and paid for by the applicant to survey the entire site and identify potential areas of significance prior to issuance of the permit. The paleontologist must be onsite during ground disturbance work in the areas identified as potentially significant.*

#### **4.5 – Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

Proposed dewatering and mining activity could cause shallow mine workings to cave-in resulting in subsidence at the ground surface at some locations. Subsidence due to collapsed shallow tunnels and mine portals could injure mine workers and the public or result in property loss both at the project site and on adjacent parcels.

- 4.5-1 *This DEIR and this proposed mitigation is inadequate because it postpones the “detailed, third-party evaluation of the existing, shallow mine workings” which would “establish sufficient data to determine whether the particular shallow mine working is susceptible to failure.” This information is necessary to do a complete and thorough DEIR. Furthermore, this document is inadequate because it classifies the danger of cave-ins, injuries, and property loss as having a less than significant impact with mitigation, even though the proposed “mitigation” is inadequate and postpones even evaluating the danger. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

Areas of the project sites contain fill material that is unsuitable to support structural improvements. Soils with low bearing strength or fills that are compressible or can collapse could cause proposed buildings and other structural improvements to settle differentially leading to structural damage, injury to workers, and potential property loss.

- 4.5-2 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “soils with low bearing strength or fills that are compressible or can collapse could cause proposed buildings and other structural improvements to settle differentially leading to structural damage, injury to workers, and potential property loss” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

#### **4.6 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Construction, operations and reclamation activities would require the use of certain materials such as fuels, oils, solvents, and other chemical products that, in large quantities, could pose a potential hazard to the public or the environment if improperly used or inadvertently released.

- 4.6-1 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless routine inspections are conducted by trained city staff, paid for by the applicant, on an unscheduled basis to insure the measures are adhered to.*

Construction and reclamation activities could release previously unidentified hazardous materials into the environment.

- 4.6-2 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless there are qualified inspectors onsite conducting continuous inspection of the materials encountered. The qualified inspectors must serve the public interest and not corporate interest.*

Operations of the proposed project could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- 4.6-3 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of*

*hazardous materials” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

4.6-4 The Idaho-Maryland site, which is listed as a hazardous material site, could result in a hazard to the public or environment.

4.6-5 The proposed project could expose nearby residences to hazardous emissions, including diesel particulate matter (DPM) and toxic air contaminants (TACs).

4.6-6 Construction and reclamation activities could ignite dry vegetation and start a fire.

#### **4.7 – Hydrology and Water Quality**

Contaminants generated during project construction could affect water quality and violate water quality standards if released to Wolf Creek or South Fork Wolf Creek.

4.7-1 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “contaminants generated during project construction” which “could affect water quality and violate water quality standards if released to Wolf Creek or South Fork Wolf Creek” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

4.7-2 Proposed project operation and reclamation activities, including mine dewatering, may violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or could substantially degrade water quality within Wolf Creek and South Fork Wolf Creek.

4.7-3 Mine dewatering activities proposed under the project could reduce groundwater levels or entirely dewater certain high risk domestic groundwater supply wells in the vicinity of the Idaho-Maryland mine site. Well dewatering would lead to a reduction of domestic water supply.

4.7-4 The proposed project would require the discharge of mine water into Wolf Creek (from the Idaho-Maryland site) and South Fork Wolf Creek (from the New Brunswick site). Such an action would alter the natural drainage pattern of the project site, potentially inducing substantial erosion and downstream sedimentation, and/or resulting in a violation of existing water quality standards.

4.7-5 The proposed project would require the discharge of mine water into Wolf Creek (from the Idaho-Maryland site) and South Fork Wolf Creek (from the New Brunswick site). The increased flows could increase the potential for flooding downstream.

The structural integrity of the berm separating the MILCO Property and the Idaho-Maryland site is unknown. In the event of an earthquake or a static failure within the earthen structure, water could be discharged in the pond to the Idaho-Maryland site.

4.7-6 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the risk “of an earthquake or a static failure within the earthen structure,” during which “water could be discharged in the pond to the Idaho-Maryland site” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

The proposed project may generate 1,200 tons per day of mine development rock, gold mill tailings, and other solid waste that would be used as backfill in the underground mine workings. Groundwater contact with backfilled waste rock and mine tailings could lead to degradation of groundwater quality.

4.7-7 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the generation of “1,200 tons per day of mine development rock, gold mill tailings, and other solid waste that would be used as backfill in the underground mine workings” and the fact that “groundwater contact with backfilled waste rock and mine tailings could lead to degradation of groundwater quality” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

#### **4.8 – Land Use and Planning**

The proposed project, including proposed annexation of the Idaho-Maryland site into the City of Grass Valley, proposed General Plan Amendments, proposed zoning changes, and operation of a gold mine would result in a change to land uses at the project sites and could conflict with existing adopted applicable land use plans and policies.

4.8-1 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because the zoning changes adversely affect existing businesses and residential properties in area. There is good reason to believe that property values will be degraded by the intensity of the proposed industrial use and adversely affect existing businesses which have made plans and commitments based on the current zoning.*

#### **4.9 – Noise**

Construction and reclamation activities associated with the proposed project could expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plans or noise ordinances, or applicable standards of other agencies.

4.9-1 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless specific noise standards are delineated and adopted by the City of Grass Valley and the project applicant agrees to adhere to those standards as part of the permitting process. Such standards must be quantitative and measurable and appropriate to the well being of adjacent and affected properties.*

Project operation could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project.

4.9-2 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate unless a study is done of existing ambient noise levels to determine a baseline for comparison. The mitigation measures need to limit project noise to existing baseline measurements taken at the property lines and not allow for increases to the ambient level.*  
Construction and/or operations associated with the proposed project would expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels.

4.9-3 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because they are based on the assumption that blasting techniques can be modified so that there are no adverse effects on vibration sensitive equipment. The mitigations measure are also inadequate because there have been no studies done to determine if the blasting vibrations have an adverse effect on endangered species especially during mating, nesting and developmental periods of the immature of the species.*

#### **4.10 – Population and Housing**



The proposed project could indirectly induce substantial population growth in the City of Grass Valley and surrounding areas.

4.10-1 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “substantial population growth in the City of Grass Valley and surrounding areas” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*  
The proposed project would indirectly displace housing units by changing the land use designation for a portion of the Idaho-Maryland site from Urban Medium Density residential to Manufacturing Industrial to accommodate the proposed mining operation.

4.10-2 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the displacement of “housing units by changing the land use designation for a portion of the Idaho-Maryland site” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

#### **4.11 – Public Services**

4.11-1 The proposed project could affect Grass Valley Fire Department and the Ophir Hill Fire Protection District’s ability to provide adequate fire suppression and emergency services.

4.11-2 Project construction and operation activities, including realignment of public roadways, could potentially affect vehicle access and fire department response times.

4.11-3 Implementation of the proposed project could affect both the City of Grass Valley Police Department’s and Nevada County Sheriff Department’s ability to provide police protection services to the project site and other areas under their jurisdictions.

Implementation of the proposed project could reduce the available capacity of other public services in the area.

4.11-4 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the reduction of “the available capacity of other public services in the area” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

#### **4.12 – Recreation**

4.12-1 The proposed project could increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.

4.12-2 The proposed project would not include the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

#### **4.13 – Transportation and Traffic**

4.13-1 Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections in the project vicinity under Short Range (2013) conditions. (See specific intersection impacts and mitigations under Impacts 4.13-1a through 4.13-1c.)

4.13-1a Idaho Maryland Road/SR 49 NB ramps (Intersection #2): This All-Way- Stop-Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours, under Short Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of Project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

4.13-1b Idaho Maryland Road/Spring Hill Drive (Intersection #4): This Two-Way- Stop controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour under Short Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of Project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

4.13-1c Bennett Street/SR 49 SB off ramp (Intersection #9) This Two-Way-Stop- Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour under Short Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of Project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is not a significant impact because the proposed project would not increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

*This document is inadequate because it classifies “This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measure such as installation of a traffic signal. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

4.13-2 Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect levels of service at local freeway segments in the project vicinity under Short Range (2013) conditions.

*This document is inadequate because it classifies “traffic generated by the proposed project” that “would affect levels of service at local freeway segments in the project vicinity under Short Range conditions” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures.*

Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect levels of service at local freeway ramp junctions in the project vicinity under Short Range (2013) conditions.

4.13-3 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “traffic generated by the proposed project” that “would affect levels of service at local freeway ramp junctions in the project vicinity under Short Range conditions” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

4.13-4 Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect traffic levels of service at local intersections in the project vicinity under Long Range (2030) conditions. (See specific intersection impacts and mitigations under Impacts 4.13-4a through 4.14.4f.)

4.13-4a Idaho Maryland Road/SR 49 NB ramps (Intersection #2): This All-Way- Stop-Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours, under Long Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of proposed project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

4.13-4b Idaho Maryland Road/Spring Hill Drive (Intersection #4): This Two- Way-Stop controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour under Long Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of proposed project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

4.13-4c Bennett Street/SR 49 SB off ramp (Intersection #9) This Two-Way-Stop- Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours under Long Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of proposed project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

4.13-4d Colfax Avenue/SR 49 Frontage Road (Intersection #13): This Two-Way- Stop-Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours, under Long Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of proposed project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.

- 4.13-4e South Auburn Street/SR 49 NB off ramp (Intersection #17) This Two- Way-Stop-Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS F during the AM and PM peak hours under Long Range No Project conditions. The intersection would continue to operate at LOS F with the addition of proposed project traffic. This intersection would meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. This is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.
- 4.13-4f Idaho Maryland Road/Railroad Avenue (Intersection #3): This All-Way- Stop-Controlled intersection is projected to operate at unacceptable LOS D during the AM and PM peak hours, under Long Range With Project conditions. This intersection would not meet the peak hour volume signal warrant criteria. Proposed project generated traffic would cause the intersection to drop from acceptable LOS C to acceptable LOS D operations. However, this is a significant impact because the proposed project would increase the average delay by more than two seconds.
- Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect levels of service at local freeway segments in the project vicinity under Long Range (2030) conditions.
- 4.13-5 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “traffic generated by the proposed project” that “ would affect levels of service at local freeway segments in the project vicinity under Long Range conditions” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*  
Traffic generated by the proposed project would affect levels of service at local freeway ramp junctions in the project vicinity under Long Range (2030) conditions.
- 4.13-6 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “traffic generated by the proposed project” that “would affect levels of service at local freeway ramp junctions in the project vicinity under Long Range conditions” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*  
The proposed project would generate demand for alternative transportation service for the area.
- 4.13-7 *This document is inadequate because it classifies generating “demand for alternative transportation service for the area” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*
- 4.13-8 The proposed project would increase the potential for conflicts among different traffic streams.
- 4.13-9 Proposed project construction would temporarily affect traffic flow and on-site circulation, parking, and pedestrian safety.
- 4.13-10 The proposed project would result in inadequate parking capacity.

4.13-11 The proposed project would contribute to the degradation of pavement on public roads.

#### **4.14 – Utilities and Service Systems**

The proposed project would require additional domestic water service from the Nevada Irrigation District.

4.14-1 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the requirement of additional domestic water service from the Nevada Irrigation District as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

The proposed project would decrease the excess wastewater capacity of the City of Grass Valley WWTP.

4.14-2 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the decreasing of the excess wastewater capacity of the City of Grass Valley WWTP as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures thereby causing the City of Grass Valley to subsidize the project’s wastewater treatment. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

Construction and operation of the proposed project, including implementation of the reclamation plan, would generate solid waste.

4.14-3 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the generation of solid waste as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion. How much solid waste will be generated by construction and operation of the proposed project and where will it be disposed?*

The proposed project operations would result in the generation of sludge.

4.14-4 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the generation of sludge as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion. What chemicals will be contained in the sludge? Will they be toxic? Where will the sludge be disposed of?*

4.14-5 Construction activities could inadvertently contact underground utility lines and/or facilities during excavation and other ground disturbance, possibly leading to short-term utility service interruptions.

#### **4.15 – Energy**

Construction of the proposed project could result in the substantial consumption of energy such that existing supplies would be constrained.

4.15-1 *This document is inadequate because it classifies “substantial consumption of energy such that existing supplies would be constrained” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*

Operation of the proposed project would increase long-term consumption of electricity at the project sites, which could result in the wasteful use of energy resources that are not renewable.

4.15-2 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because they do not address the need for carbon offsets for the project thereby increasing the carbon load on the planet. The mitigation measures do not seriously address the matter of global climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions as a matter of the common good .*

Operation of the proposed project would increase long-term consumption of natural gas, which could result in the wasteful use of energy resources that are not renewable.

4.15-3 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because they do not address the need for carbon offsets for the project thereby increasing the carbon load on the planet. The mitigation measures do not seriously address the matter of global climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions as a matter of the common good .*

Construction, operation, and reclamation of the proposed project would increase long-term consumption of petroleum, which could result in the wasteful use of energy resources that are not renewable.

4.15-4 *The proposed mitigation measures are inadequate because they do not address the need for carbon offsets for the project thereby increasing the carbon load on the planet. The mitigation measures do not seriously address the matter of global climate change and the need to reduce carbon emissions as a matter of the common good .*

Operation of the proposed project could use substantial amounts of electricity and natural gas that could not be adequately served by existing energy infrastructure.

4.15-5 *This document is inadequate because it classifies the need for “substantial amounts of electricity and natural gas that could not be adequately served by existing energy infrastructure” as having a “less than significant impact” and does not propose adequate mitigation measures. Please provide criteria and documentation showing your reasoning for this conclusion.*