

---

# **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---



This Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR; DEIR) was prepared in accordance with and in fulfillment of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines. An environmental impact report (EIR) is described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a) as a public informational document that analyzes the significant environmental effects of a project, identifies ways to minimize the significant impacts, and describes reasonable alternatives to the project. Public agencies are charged with the duty to consider and minimize environmental impacts of proposed development where feasible, and are obligated to balance a variety of public objectives including economic, environmental, and social factors. CEQA requires that an EIR be prepared by the agency with primary responsibility over the project (the lead agency).

### 1.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

CEQA requires the preparation of an EIR prior to approving any project that may have a significant effect on the environment. Therefore, pursuant to CEQA, the County of Nevada (County), acting as the lead agency, has prepared this Draft EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed projects: (1) the Alta Sierra Dollar General project; (2) the Penn Valley Dollar General project; and, (3) the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General project (collectively referred to as the proposed projects or projects). The impacts of each of the projects are considered individually in this EIR and, to the extent that any or all of the projects would combine to result in cumulative impacts, those impacts are disclosed.

For the purposes of CEQA, the term *project* refers to the whole of an action which has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the proposed projects, the County has determined that adoption and implementation of the each of the proposed projects is a separate project within the definition of CEQA.

### 1.2 TRUSTEE AND RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES

For the purposes of CEQA, a trustee agency has jurisdiction by law over natural resources that are held in trust for the people of California (CEQA Guidelines Section 15386). The California Department of Fish and Wildlife is a trustee agency with regard to the state's fish and wildlife and designated rare or endangered native plants. The term *responsible agency* includes all public agencies other than the lead agency that have discretionary approval power over the project or an aspect of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15381). The following agencies are identified as potential responsible agencies:

- Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District (NSAQMD)
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB)
- State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB)
- US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- Nevada County Department of Environmental Health
- US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

### **1.3 TYPE OF DOCUMENT**

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a project EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161. The analysis associated with a project EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would occur as a result of project implementation and examines all phases of the project (i.e., planning, construction, and operation).

Although each Dollar General store represents a separate project under CEQA, the County has determined that all three stores should be analyzed in a single EIR to ensure that the cumulative impacts associated with all three stores are adequately considered.

### **1.4 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR**

This Draft EIR is intended to evaluate the environmental impacts of implementation of the proposed projects. This Draft EIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, should be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate all subsequent planning and permitting actions associated with the project. These actions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Development Permits
- Management Plans

### **1.5 RELATIONSHIP TO THE NEVADA COUNTY GENERAL PLAN**

The Board of Supervisors originally adopted the Nevada County General Plan in 1996. The General Plan is the County's overall guide for the use of the county's resources, expresses the development goals of the community, and is the foundation upon which all land use decisions are made. The General Plan was subsequently amended in 2008 (Safety Element), in 2010 (Circulation Element and Housing Element, 4th Revision), in 2014 (Land Use Element and Housing Element, 5th Revision, and Safety and Noise Elements), and in 2016 (Land Use Element). This EIR uses the most recent version of the General Plan and policies as they relate to the analysis of environmental impacts of the proposed project.

The General Plan EIR analyzed the environmental impacts associated with buildout of the land uses and densities allowed by the General Plan. Where feasible, the County adopted mitigation measures to reduce impacts to a level of insignificance. The Nevada County Board of Supervisors adopted Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Nevada County Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 95530, November 14, 1995) addressing the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the General Plan EIR.

In addition to the Nevada County General Plan, the Penn Valley project site is also subject to the Penn Valley Village Center Area Plan, which was adopted in 2000 for the Penn Valley Village Center.

The Nevada County Land Use and Development Code, Chapter II, Zoning Regulations (Zoning Ordinance), provides specific development and land use standards for the unincorporated areas of the county. The Zoning Ordinance was updated and revised in 2004 to reflect new standards that implement many objectives and policies set forth in the General Plan. Since that time, a number of updates to the General Plan have been adopted. The most recent updates to the Zoning Ordinance were adopted in 2016. This EIR uses the most recent version of the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the analysis of project impacts.

The Alta Sierra project site and the Rough and Ready Highway project site have General Plan land use designations of Neighborhood Commercial, while the Penn Valley project site has a land use designation of Community Commercial. As discussed in greater detail in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, the proposed projects would be consistent with these existing land use designations and the associated zoning districts.

## **1.6 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE**

Sections 15122 through 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines identify the content requirements for Draft and Final EIRs. An EIR must include a description of the environmental setting, an environmental impact analysis, mitigation measures, alternatives, identification of significant irreversible environmental impacts, and growth-inducing and cumulative impacts. The environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR were established through review of environmental documentation developed for the sites, environmental documentation for nearby projects, and responses to the Notice of Preparation. The County determined the scope for this Draft EIR based on these comments, agency consultation, and review of the project application.

This Draft EIR is organized in the following manner:

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This section provides a project narrative and identifies environmental impacts and mitigation measures through a summary matrix consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15123.

### **SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION**

Section 1.0 provides an introduction and overview of the project EIR.

### **SECTION 2.0 – PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This section describes each of the proposed projects in detail, including intended objectives, background information, and physical and technical characteristics.

### **SECTION 3.0 – INTRODUCTION TO THE ANALYSIS**

This section describes the analysis assumptions used in the DEIR to evaluate the impacts of the project including the baseline environmental conditions at each of the project sites. In addition, this section summarizes the structure of the environmental impact analyses provided in Sections 4.0 through 15.0 and the approach to the cumulative analysis in Section 17.0. The effects not found to be significant, and thus not evaluated further in the DEIR, are also summarized.

### **SECTIONS 4.0 THROUGH 15.0 – ENVIRONMENTAL SETTINGS, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

The technical analysis sections of the DEIR contain an analysis of environmental topic areas as identified below. Each section provides a description of the regional setting, regulatory environment, standards of significance, and analysis methodologies that are common to all three of the project sites. This discussion is followed by project-specific subsections which describe the local setting, identify project-related impacts, and recommend mitigation measures. Finally, each section includes a discussion of the cumulative impacts associated with the proposed projects.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

4.0	Aesthetics	8.0	Geology and Soils	12.0	Land Use and Planning
5.0	Air Quality	9.0	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	13.0	Noise
6.0	Biological Resources	10.0	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	14.0	Public Services and Utilities
7.0	Cultural Resources	11.0	Hydrology and Water Quality	15.0	Traffic and Transportation

### SECTION 16.0 – PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and avoid and/or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. This section discusses alternatives to the proposed projects, including the CEQA mandatory “No Project” alternative, that are intended to avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts of the proposed projects.

### SECTION 17.0 – OTHER CEQA ANALYSIS

This section contains discussions and analysis of various topical issues mandated by CEQA. These topics include significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented, as well as growth-inducing impacts.

### SECTION 18.0 – REPORT PREPARATION

This section lists all authors and agencies that assisted in the preparation of the EIR by name, title, and company or agency affiliation.

### APPENDICES

This section includes all notices and other procedural documents pertinent to the EIR, as well as technical material prepared to support the analysis.

## 1.7 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

The review and certification process for the EIR will involve the following procedural steps:

### NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND INITIAL STUDY

In accordance with Section 15082 of the CEQA Guidelines, the County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR for the project on January 6, 2016. The NOP was circulated to the public, local, state, and federal agencies, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the proposed project. A separate scoping meeting was held for each project and a fourth meeting was held before the Planning Commission for all of the projects on the following dates:

- January 19 (Alta Sierra)
- January 25 (Penn Valley)
- January 20 (Rough and Ready Highway)
- January 29 (all projects)

The scoping meetings were held to solicit input from interested agencies and the public. Concerns raised in response to the NOP and at the scoping meeting were considered during preparation of the Draft EIR. The 30-day comment period closed on February 4, 2016. The NOP is presented in **Appendix 1.0-A**, and the comments received from interested parties are presented, by project, in **Appendices 1.0-B** through **1.0-E**.

### DRAFT EIR

This document constitutes the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR contains a description of the projects, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives. Upon completion of the Draft EIR, the County will file the Notice of Completion (NOC) with the State Office of Planning and Research to begin the public review period (Public Resources Code Section 21161).

### PUBLIC NOTICE/PUBLIC REVIEW

Concurrent with the NOC, the County will provide public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for public review and invite comment from the general public, agencies, organizations, and other interested parties. Public comment on the Draft EIR will be accepted in written form via common carrier or via electronic mail (e-mail). Public comment will also be accepted orally at public hearings. Notice of the time and location of the hearing will be published prior to the hearing. All comments or questions regarding the Draft EIR should be addressed to:

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
Planning Department  
Nevada County Community Development Agency  
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959  
Phone: (530) 470-2723  
E-mail: Tyler.Barrington@co.nevada.ca.us

### RESPONSE TO COMMENTS/FINAL EIR

Following the public review period, a Final EIR will be prepared. The Final EIR will respond to written comments received during the public review period and contain any revisions to the Draft EIR.

### CERTIFICATION OF THE EIR/PROJECT CONSIDERATION

The Nevada County Planning Commission will review and consider the Final EIR during the public hearing(s) for the proposed project. If the Planning Commission finds that the Final EIR is "adequate and complete," the Commission may choose to certify the Final EIR. The rule of adequacy generally holds that the EIR can be certified if it shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information and provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the project in contemplation of its environmental consequences.

Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, the Planning Commission may take action to recommend approval, revise, or reject the applications for Development Permits and Management Plans for each project. A decision to approve any or all of the projects would be accompanied by written findings in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091. If applicable, the Commission may approve the project even with significant and unavoidable

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

environmental impacts by making a finding of overriding considerations as outlined in Section 15093. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as described below, would also be adopted for mitigation measures that have been incorporated into or imposed upon the projects to reduce or avoid significant effects on the environment. The MMRP will be designed to ensure that these measures are carried out during implementation of the projects.

### MITIGATION MONITORING

CEQA Section 21081.6(a) requires lead agencies to adopt an MMRP to describe measures that have been adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The specific reporting or monitoring program required by CEQA is not required to be included in the EIR; however, it will be presented to the Planning Commission for adoption. Throughout the EIR, as applicable, mitigation measures have been clearly identified for each of the projects (measure numbers begin with a two-letter abbreviation for the project to which it applies—"AS" refers to the Alta Sierra project; "PV" refers to the Penn Valley project; and "RR" refers to the Rough and Ready Highway project) and are presented in language that will facilitate establishment of an MMRP. Each project will have its own MMRP if approved, and any mitigation measures adopted by the County as conditions for approval of the project will be included in the project MMRP to verify compliance.

### 1.8 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION

A copy of each comment letter on the NOP for the Dollar General Draft EIR received by the County is provided in **Appendices 1.0-B** through **1.0-E** of this DEIR. **Appendix 1.0-B** contains letters received regarding the Alta Sierra project. **Appendix 1.0-C** contains letters received regarding the Penn Valley project. **Appendix 1.0-D** contains letters received regarding the Rough and Ready Highway project. **Appendix 1.0-E** contains letters received regarding all of the proposed projects. In addition, several commenters provided verbal comments at the scoping meeting for the project. Major issues addressed in the project comments are summarized below.

Alta Sierra Project
<u>General</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reliability of studies is questionable because they kept being changed.</li><li>• Sharing of project parcels for septic suggests the EIR should also address that other parcel.</li></ul>
<u>Aesthetics</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tree removal will affect views even more. Clearing and brush removal that has already happened makes existing commercial properties more visible to residents above on Little Valley Road.</li><li>• Rock wall and lighting concerns.</li><li>• Landscape plan isn't adequate – doesn't address views of back sides of commercial.</li><li>• Area will become blighted.</li><li>• Height of retaining wall and building isn't right for location.</li><li>• Other Dollar General stores look junky outside.</li><li>• The building will look like a fortress to residents living on Little Valley Road.</li><li>• Bright lights will be intrusive.</li><li>• Even with façade it still won't fit in architecturally with surroundings.</li></ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General Plan directs aesthetic design of new development to reflect existing character.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Just because 30-foot height meets code doesn't mean impacts are less than significant.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Air Quality</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction emissions will affect residents on Little Valley Road.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smell of diesel fumes from delivery trucks will negatively affect outdoor uses at residences (decks).</li> </ul>
<p><u>Biological Resources</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 100 trees will affect habitat and species.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impacts on landmark oak woodlands.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIR needs to discuss remaining heritage oaks in county and cumulative loss.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plant community description for previous document inaccurate and inadequate, plant surveys not done at right time, should be supplemented with commenter's description and cited (Moran letters).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site has potential nesting habitat for birds, raptors – wildlife surveys need to be done.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of old growth trees is not in best interest of genetic vigor of remaining forests and woodlands.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Cultural Resources</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site survey needed for resources, must also include analysis of historical and cultural significance of native plants and ecosystems, especially black oaks.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Geology and Soils</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alta Sierra subdivision's soils becoming more unstable and project could initiate soil erosion of catastrophic levels.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree removal will have an effect on climate change.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Land Use</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't conform to C1 zoning, should be in C2, size should be reduced to meet C1; doesn't conform to NC either. EIR should address this. NC not intended for a project like Dollar General.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban blight needs to be addressed in EIR.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions in the previous Negative Declaration such as "won't be a major land use incompatibility" need to define "major." This project is incompatible with adjacent residential uses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes no sense to conclude that a big store next to residential is a compatible use just because the parcel allows the type of project proposed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Violates land use code and ordinances pertaining to landmark oaks.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Noise</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Construction truck trips will be noisy, especially a problem if starting in the early morning.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from delivery trucks engines, backup warnings, will negatively affect outdoor uses at residences (decks).</li> </ul>
<p><u>Traffic and Transportation</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little Valley Road is narrow and hazardous – pedestrians, students/school bus stops, residents' safety concern during construction, 700 trucks to remove soil is a lot of traffic. Analysis in previous Negative Declaration was thin, and limiting trips to non-peak and 21 days doesn't make it less than significant given local conditions – 40–50 trucks a day through residential on narrow road. Mitigation should require trucks to use the other entrance, and if that is not feasible, then document should explain why.</li> </ul>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safety hazard of "S" curve not adequately evaluated, doesn't account for incline, has blind spots, sight distance problem, motorists stopping suddenly to make turns into existing driveway is already a problem.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cumulative traffic hazards need to be addressed.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Studies of signal timing and traffic counts don't take into account the "S" curve, driveway impacts, and poor driver habits collectively.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic and pedestrian safety hazard on Alta Sierra already a problem, project will make it worse.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trucks can't make the turns the applicant says they can make; turning templates don't account for the time it will take trucks to do the minor jockeying to get into the site; turning analysis doesn't account for cars trying to enter the parking lot when delivery trucks are present at same time.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Construction worker parking insufficient, will create problems.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• If payment of fees is used for mitigation, then document needs to explain how fee will be used and how it will mitigate.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Negative Declaration mitigation measure MM 16A traffic fee says if there are increased accidents as a result of project, then fee spent to reduce to less than significant, but there is no discussion of how much this fee will be or how it would be spent. No performance criteria was suggested.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EIR needs to identify enforceable mitigation and consequences if compliance it not achieved.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic study makes incorrect assumptions about line of sight and doesn't correctly account for length of trucks, will result in rear-end collisions.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Turning trucks will block traffic, cause accidents, will cause long roadway closures, especially if there is a fuel spill.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Will cause congestion on Alta Sierra Drive, making it harder for residents.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What are Caltrans and County comments on the traffic study? Particularly the SR 49 turn pocket length.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Turn pocket length at SR 49 was identified as inadequate in the Negative Declaration, but no mitigation was proposed; who pays for improvements? (needs to be identified)</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic for store would not be limited to that coming off the highway, people may cut through community to get to store, roads are winding and slow.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Should consider mitigation to develop a second driveway, should consider straightening the "S" curve instead of cutting down weeds and removing shrubs.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• EIR needs to identify enforceable mitigation and consequences if compliance is not achieved.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Topography at top of Alta Sierra Drive at SR 49 is hazardous because cars exiting gas station can't see, aren't careful entering traffic.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Concern with subjective conclusions in EIR.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic caused by project is a concern, especially in a fire situation.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pavement damage on Little Valley Road from construction trucks.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Doesn't provide as many parking spaces as code requires; parking study doesn't consider economics/sales. Just because customers spend less per visit doesn't mean less cars, it means more cars because store would need more customers to make money; therefore, traffic study is underestimating trips.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Commenter (Moran) provided data about number of cars in parking lots at Grass Valley and Marysville stores.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Parking study lacks evidence to support reduced number of spaces – the study says similar stores but not whether 9,100 square feet like project or 7,300 square feet like others. No evidence that stores are in areas similar to Alta Sierra.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Size of trucks is limited by STAA route standards. The Dollar General trucks are longer than allowed for Alta Sierra Drive. Isn't this misuse of roadways and how will that be addressed?</li></ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turning analysis can't assume Alta Sierra Drive is improved to truck route for purposes of worst case when there's no evidence the roadway would even be improved</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size of trucks on roads like Alta Sierra Drive that have tight curves, etc., is dangerous, accidents waiting to happen.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIR needs to show how delivery trucks will be able to legally and safety negotiate the Alta Sierra Drive/SR 49 intersection (Caltrans comment).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIR should show that delivery trucks will be able to legally and safety negotiate the SR 20/Penn Valley Drive, SR 20/Pleasant Valley Road intersections.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Water Supply</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project will worsen drought conditions. Examples provided: loss of trees with deep root systems that funnel water into aquifers and fractures; impervious surfaces; project water use.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Wastewater</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar General septic could limit other property owners' ability to use septic and could cause that business problems like not being able to operate at full potential.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County's OWTS policy implementation reference doesn't allow for transporting sewage to a non-connected parcel.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Septic needs to be reviewed by experts.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIR should consider potential effect on the parcel south of the building site that houses the Alta Sierra Market because that parcel is landlocked and covered with asphalt, and Dollar General will affect its ability to operate.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Storm Drainage</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of vegetation will "decrease watershed" and create more water on Little Valley Road, which has a drainage flow problem.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage on Alta Sierra Drive is already a problem, flows down Alta Sierra Drive, ditches already don't have capacity, need cleaning and maintenance which hasn't been done.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is impact on drainage system and flooding and creek below (Gold Creek) and downstream property owners?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing the trees will cause soil erosion and runoff problems.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Runoff from site will degrade creek and groundwater quality.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of impervious surfaces in combination with project's water use will reduce groundwater recharge which will affect local aquifers.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Project Alternatives</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No project requires evaluation.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make it smaller, reduce disturbance, improve appearance – there are 7,300-square-foot Dollar General stores.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County should reject proposal and make it an oak preserve.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put it somewhere else (Cherry Creek Lane).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document should evaluate alternative that will reduce traffic impacts and hazards.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since a Management Plan was needed to address loss of heritage oaks because they are not avoidable, then there should be an alternative evaluated that shows how the impact to oaks could be avoided.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site should be used for something else.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Socioeconomics</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project will reduce property values.</li> </ul>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence to support store success is lacking.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will cause other local stores to go out of business, resulting in bankruptcies and blight.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type of store isn't needed, no demand for what it sells.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will degrade quality of life.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic analysis doesn't consider that local residents won't actually shop at Dollar General but will shop elsewhere.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will needs of neighboring community be met, enhanced, or impoverished?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will project really add sales revenue to county or rob sales from neighboring businesses and negatively affect them?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When the project goes out of business, it will result in blight, vagrants, homeless, graffiti, rodents, fire risk, and criminal activity at site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Who would be responsible for removing building and cleaning up property when it goes out of business? The property owner, Dollar General, County?</li> </ul>
<b>Penn Valley Project</b>
<u>General</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests a different type of ground cover than what is proposed.</li> </ul>
<u>Biological Resources</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take all reasonable and necessary steps to protect Squirrel Creek.</li> </ul>
<u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The County should require the landowner to test site soils for hazardous materials contamination.</li> </ul>
<u>Noise</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There should be a sound wall between the proposed development and the Creekside Village Mobile Home Park north of the site. The sound wall should provide adequate draining and should be aesthetically pleasing.</li> </ul>
<u>Traffic and Transportation</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about trucks being able to turn in and out of the site.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIR should show that delivery trucks will be able to legally and safely negotiate Penn Valley.</li> </ul>
<b>Rough and Ready Highway Project</b>
<u>Aesthetics</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building design doesn't fit in.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building will max out site, obstruct views, will result in lack of privacy.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site size and design doesn't allow for reasonable setbacks and screening, should be on a bigger lot.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Size and height will dominate landscape and detract from views, it's out of scale with surroundings.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blight effects, especially if it goes out of business.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nighttime lighting in residential neighborhood where there aren't even any streetlights.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will lighting fixtures shield and prevent light from being visible from adjacent properties if building is facing east toward multiple houses 40–50 feet away?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will generate trash and litter.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The "phony Gold Rush façade will be visual blight."</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lights from vehicles turning into/out of parking lot is a concern in residential neighborhood.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out of character with rural/historic area.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Biological Resources</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing the property would result in loss of wildlife habitat and species, and only starlings and pigeons would adapt.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Land Use and Planning</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project doesn't belong in a residential neighborhood.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big box stores belong in commercial areas.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would detract from rural character.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project is contrary to General Plan, violates General Plan planning principles (scattered development, preserving natural/visual resources).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project isn't even in Rough and Ready center, it's 2 miles away.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The zoning designation for commercial made 20–30 years ago isn't appropriate for the residential neighborhood that's there now.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is urban sprawl.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Store in middle of residential area is unsafe.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Noise</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Truck noise not compatible with quiet residential neighborhood – engines, backup horns, etc.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Added traffic noise to already noisy highway will make it worse, truck noise especially.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous traffic noise until 10 PM.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise pollution from HVAC 24 hours and will be audible to nearby residents.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of delivery trucks after 10 PM in quiet area should be addressed in EIR.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car doors opening, people talking.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise from solid waste collection trucks in early morning hours will be annoying.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Water Supply</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water pressure might not be enough to serve existing res plus Dollar General. What happens if a fire, do residents lose their water? Where is study for this?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NID and TTG reports show flow is 49.5% lower than what is needed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Computer simulation not enough; no physical evidence or field tests show TTG proposal for pump and alarms to confirm pressures.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern about lack of connections on Rough and Ready Highway.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water situation is serious, what about leaks (example provided: large farm was put out of business because of conflict with NID).</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water availability needs to be addressed.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Wastewater</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar General septic tank would be diagonal to residential property owner. How will that affect residence septic field?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will septic affect neighborhood?</li> </ul>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is proposed septic adequate?</li></ul>
<u>Storm Water Drainage</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Four-inch pipe is too small.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How will storm runoff affect NID water ditch across the highway?</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Where does polluted runoff end up because drainage system is too small?</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What is applicant's plan for mitigating torrential rain, snow and ice? Where does excess go and how will that impact properties down the hill?</li></ul>
<u>Traffic and Transportation</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarify the location of delivery truck access at the site.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Roads aren't suitable for access/egress.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Truck turning to/from Rough and Ready Highway, potential for accidents.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Line of sight with curve to the west already causes accidents day and night.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic speeds already a problem, potential for accidents because of vehicles slowing/stopping to turn relative to curve in Rough and Ready Highway and speeds.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Customers turning in/out on Rough and Ready Highway, potential for accidents.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pedestrian safety along Rough and Ready Highway where there are no sidewalks, no crosswalks, no stop signs; bicycle safety.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cut-through traffic (delivery trucks and customer cars) on Sunset, it's narrow, kids play on local streets, Dollar General will create safety hazards.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic speed/volumes/congestion on Rough and Ready Highway already a problem; potential for accidents.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Cut-through traffic would further damage pavement on Sunset, which is not in good shape.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Number of parking spaces isn't what is required. Where would cars park – in the residential neighborhood?</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic report is incomplete, disagreement with traffic report.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The EIR should consider project traffic effects on Yuba River Charter School bus stops on Rough and Ready Highway.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The EIR should consider project traffic effect on public transportation bus stop.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Would add too much traffic to Ridge Road, school approved at Adams and Rough and Ready Highway that will add cars and buses.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic volumes not representative, timing of traffic counts skews the results; traffic study should be re-evaluated and needs to be more quantitative (see Gallus for details).</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Truck turning template shows trucks using West Drive, which barely meets fire code access standard; doesn't include other vehicles like bus stop, cars, other delivery trucks (Fed Ex, etc.).</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic study wasn't done during peak hours, doesn't take into account school bus, and doesn't take into account how traffic will be impacted by Yuba Charter School. Safety concerns about children boarding/exiting bus.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Traffic study failed to consider the "LeMond loop" and risks to cyclists from increased traffic from project. Traffic lights don't help mitigate impact on bicycle traffic unless there are dedicated bike lanes and switches to trigger lights; increased safety risks to bicyclists in general.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Delivery trucks will block corner of Sunset and West.</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Seems implausible trucks can make turns as shown in the drawings. Can trucks get in and out of site without using East Drive to West Drive loop via Sunset? This should be re-checked.</li></ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Telephone pole hazards on roadways.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crosswalks are needed on Rough and Ready Highway as project will attract pedestrians on opposite side; already a problem without them.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Widening the road (Rough and Ready Highway) would impact residences, and trucks would increase wear and tear. How far east are road improvements required/proposed?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to turn onto Rough and Ready Highway from West Drive already.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the West Drive improvements going to consist of?</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic study is a year old and traffic has increased significantly.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dollar General delivery trucks don't meet size requirements for Rough and Ready Highway and could not legally deliver to store. Rough and Ready Highway should not be changed to truck route to accommodate project.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear whether delivery will supply store from SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (south)/Rough and Ready Highway (north), or from one of the interchanges on SR 20 in Grass Valley.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAA trucks are not legal north of the feed store on Rough and Ready Highway.</li> </ul>
<p><u>Socioeconomics</u></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for increased crime and theft in neighborhood.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More Dollar General stores aren't needed, don't need that many so close together.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• County should support local businesses.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enough of these kinds of stores nearby already.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-quality store, cheap products.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other commercial in area has failed.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What happens when store fails, end up with a lot with empty building and a chain-link fence.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibility of more homeless people living near the Twin Cities Church because of Dollar General store within walking distance.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced property values.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighborhood won't feel safe.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be a mom &amp; pop business at location, fruit stand, park, diner, pub, small grocery – a local-serving business would be better.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Won't make money.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Won't provide value to the area.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic report conclusions aren't supported.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of life of residents in area will be adversely affected.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will increase loitering in the area, concern for kids' safety.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned about clients at Boyle House across the street shopping at store.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The homeless population will increase because Dollar General will be in easy walking distance, and more homeless will increase fire risk.</li> </ul>

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

---

This page intentionally left blank.