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NOTICE OF PREPARATION
NOTICE OF PREPARATION

DATE: January 6, 2016

TO: Responsible Agencies, Organizations, and Interested Parties

LEAD AGENCY: County of Nevada

Contact:
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Planning Department
Community Development Agency
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

SUBJECT: Environmental Impact Report for the Dollar General Project

In discharging its duties under Section 15021 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the County of Nevada (as lead agency) intends to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, consistent with Article 9 and Section 15161 of the CEQA Guidelines, that addresses the potential physical environmental effects of construction and operation of three Dollar General stores at three different sites (proposed projects). In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15082, the County of Nevada has prepared this Notice of Preparation to provide responsible agencies and other interested parties with sufficient information describing the proposal and its potential environmental effects.

The determination to prepare an Environmental Impact Report was made by the County of Nevada.

As specified by the CEQA Guidelines, the Notice of Preparation will be circulated for a 30-day review period. The County of Nevada welcomes public input during this review. In the event that no response or request for additional time is received from any responsible agency by the end of the review period, the lead agency may presume that the responsible agency has no response.

Comments may be submitted in writing during the review period and addressed to:

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

The Notice of Preparation comment period closes at 5:00 p.m. on February 8, 2016.
DECISION TO PREPARE A SINGLE EIR FOR THREE PROJECTS

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.

LOCATION OF PROJECT SITES AND CURRENT USES

The EIR will analyze three separate Dollar General stores in Nevada County. Project locations include:

- **Alta Sierra site**: 10166 Alta Sierra Drive, Grass Valley, CA 95949
- **Penn Valley site**: 17652 Penn Valley Drive, Penn Valley, CA 95946
- **Rough and Ready Highway site**: 12345 Rough and Ready Highway, Grass Valley, CA 95945

*Figure 1* shows the locations of the three sites relative to one another and the regional vicinity.

*Table 1* shows the acreage, current use, General Plan land use designation, and zoning district for each of the sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Assessor's Parcel Number</th>
<th>Project Acreage</th>
<th>General Plan Designation</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alta Sierra</td>
<td>25-430-08</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (NC)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (C1)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Valley</td>
<td>51-120-06</td>
<td>1.2**</td>
<td>Community Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>Community Commercial- Site Performance Combining (C2-SP)</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough and Ready Highway</td>
<td>52-122-03</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (NC)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (C1)</td>
<td>Single-story commercial building which appears to be in residential use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This site also includes an off-site septic system on APNs 25-430-10 and 25-430-12

** Portion of a 5.95-acre parcel

As shown in *Table 1*, two of the sites are currently vacant undeveloped land, while the Rough and Ready site has an existing commercial building. The building at the Rough and Ready site would be removed as a part of site development for that project.

**Alta Sierra Site**: The Alta Sierra site is located east of State Route (SR) 49 and south of Grass Valley, in the community of Alta Sierra (*Figure 2*). The site is located in the western Sierra Nevada foothills between Alta Sierra Drive and Little Valley Road. The parcel is covered entirely with montane hardwood-conifer forest and is situated on a hillside that generally slopes to the south. Elevations range from approximately 1,994 feet in the north to 1,964 feet near the southeastern and southwestern property corners.
**Penn Valley Site:** The Penn Valley site is located north of Penn Valley Drive and south of SR 20 in the community of Penn Valley (Figure 3). While the proposed project is located on a 5.95-acre parcel, only 1.2 acres are proposed for development. Vegetation on the site is dominated by annual grassland and a scattering of trees, including valley oak, Oregon ash, white alder, and arroyo willow, along the perimeter of the site. Wetlands have been identified on the site. In addition, Squirrel Creek is located on the 5.95-acre parcel but not within the proposed 1.2-acre project area. Project development would affect a portion of the identified wetlands. The site elevation is approximately 1,400 feet and generally slopes from the southeast to the northwest. The change in grade over the 1.2-acre site is approximately 7 feet.

**Rough and Ready Highway Site:** The Rough and Ready Highway site is located directly south of Rough and Ready Highway at the southwest corner of the highway and West Drive (Figure 4). The project site lies on the west slope of the Sierra Nevada foothills at an elevation of ±2,500 feet and is a fairly level parcel. The site contains mostly non-native varieties of horticultural plants, with the exception of one ponderosa pine and three grey pines.

**Surrounding Land Uses**

**Alta Sierra Site:** Existing commercial development is situated to the north and south of the Alta Sierra site, and Alta Sierra Drive and Little Valley Road are located to the west and east, respectively. West of Alta Sierra Drive are two undeveloped parcels zoned Neighborhood Commercial (C1). Other uses to the west include primarily commercial development, with a personal storage facility, a real estate office, and the Oak View Center, a commercial development. East of Little Valley Road is a developed residential parcel zoned Residential-Agricultural (RA-1.5). The next closest residential dwelling is approximately 180 feet from the northeastern property boundary and approximately 400 feet from the proposed building. Rural residential uses within the Alta Sierra residential subdivision dominate the landscape east of Little Valley Road. To the south of the project site is the Alta Sierra Market. To the north of the project site is another developed property with three commercial buildings. Farther north/northwest along Alta Sierra Drive are other commercially developed properties consisting of a variety of uses, including but not limited to a gas station, a bike shop, a pizza parlor, and a specialty wine shop.

**Penn Valley Site:** The Penn Valley site is surrounded on three sides by development. To the south is Penn Valley Drive, with the Penn Valley Seventh Day Adventist Church and the Penn Valley Gardens residential subdivision south of Penn Valley Drive. A US Post Office, a gas station, and the Penn Valley Shopping Center are located east of the site. Northeast of the site is vacant land followed by the Creekside Village mobile home park. Directly north of the site is vacant land followed by SR 20. West of the site is the Penn Valley Mini Storage facility.

**Rough and Ready Highway Site:** The Rough and Ready Highway project site is located in a rural residential neighborhood; however, as noted above, there is an existing commercial building on the property, which appears to be in use for residential purposes at this time. Adjacent land uses include two single-family residences and other rural residential uses to the west. Directly east of the site is West Drive and single-family residential uses, followed by a small mobile home park. South of the site are single-family residential uses. Finally, across Rough and Ready Highway to the north are single-family residential uses followed by vacant undeveloped land.
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PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

As stated previously, the subject of this NOP is the development of three Dollar General stores located at three different sites within Nevada County jurisdiction. As shown in Table 2, all three Dollar General projects would have the same building square footage and are similar in total developed area. Site plans for the three projects are shown in Figure 2 (Alta Sierra site), Figure 3 (Penn Valley site), and Figure 4 (Rough and Ready Highway site).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Building Area</th>
<th>Surfaced Area*</th>
<th>Landscape Area</th>
<th>Open Space (percentage of total)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alta Sierra</td>
<td>9,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>20,260 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,481 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,622 sq. ft. (15.2%)</td>
<td>43,463 sq. ft. (1.00 acre)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Valley</td>
<td>9,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>24,511 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,039 sq. ft.</td>
<td>11,823 sq. ft. (22.6%)</td>
<td>52,473 sq. ft. (1.20 acre)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough and Ready Highway</td>
<td>9,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>19,354 sq. ft.</td>
<td>8,451 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,405 sq. ft. (16.7%)</td>
<td>44,310 sq. ft. (1.02 acre)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Surfaced area includes paved area, hardscape surrounding building, sidewalks, ramps, and curbs

EXTERIOR BUILDING DESIGN

While the footprints of the proposed buildings are all the same for the three proposed Dollar General stores, the exterior design elements are slightly different. The exterior design of each of the buildings is based on a western motif. The tallest part of each building is 26 to 27 feet in height, with the majority of the building approximately 18 feet in height.

LIGHTING

Lighting for the proposed projects would be required to comply with Section L-II 4.2.8 of the Nevada County Code, which includes shielding to prevent the light source from being visible from adjacent properties or roadways. A lighting plan, including a photometric overlay, has been provided for each of the projects.

LANDSCAPING

As shown in Table 2, landscaping would be provided for each of the projects. The County requires landscaping to be installed along street frontages, within parking lot interiors, and along property lines of commercial or industrial sites abutting residential properties. A landscaping plan, based on County Code Section L-II 4.2.7, has been provided for each of the projects.

REQUIRED APPROVALS

County of Nevada: Actions that would be required from Nevada County may include but are not limited to the following for each of the proposed Dollar General store sites. While the EIR will evaluate each of the store sites, the County may elect to approve or deny one or all the proposed store sites.
• Certification of the EIR
• Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
• Approval of the following entitlements:
  - Development Permit for each site
  - Biological Management Plan (Alta Sierra and Penn Valley sites)

Central Valley Regional Water Quality Board (RWQCB): A National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit and Storm Water General Permit, and stormwater pollution prevention program (SWPPP) and Water Quality Certification or Waiver, under Sections 401 and 402 of the Clean Water Act.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW): Streambed Alteration Agreement (Sections 1601 and 1603 of the Fish and Game Code), if necessary.

US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE): Permits under Section 404 of the CWA.

Nevada Irrigation District: Provision of water service to the project sites.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Any change to the project area is likely to have environmental impacts. The EIR will assess the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects on all topics listed below.

• Aesthetics
• Agricultural and Forestry Resources
• Air Quality
• Biological Resources
• Cultural Resources
• Geology and Soils
• Greenhouse Gas Emissions
• Hazards and Hazardous Materials
• Hydrology and Water Quality
• Land Use and Planning
• Mineral Resources
• Noise
• Population and Housing
• Public Services
• Recreation
• Transportation and Traffic
• Utilities and Service Systems
• Mandatory Findings of Significance

Agency representatives, members of the public, and other interested parties are encouraged to provide comments on these and any other environmental issues that should be explored in the draft EIR.

NOTICE OF PREPARATION SCOPING MEETINGS

The County of Nevada Planning Department will conduct four scoping meetings during the 30-day public review period. The first three meetings will focus on each individual proposal and the fourth will be held before the Nevada County Planning Commission. The schedule for the scoping meetings is as follows:
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Alta Sierra. January 19, 2016- 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Alta Sierra Country Club
11897 Tammy Way, Grass Valley, CA 95949
6PM Start

Attendees should be prepared to discuss the scope and content of the environmental document for the Alta Sierra Proposal.

Rough and Ready Highway. January 20, 2016- 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Empire Room, Eric Rood Administrative Center (2nd Floor)
950 Maidu Ave. Suite
Nevada City, CA 95959

Attendees should be prepared to discuss the scope and content of the environmental document for the Rough and Ready Highway Proposal.

Penn Valley. January 25, 2016- 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Buttermaker's Cottage, Western Gateway Park
18650 Penn Valley Drive
Penn Valley, CA

Buttermaker's Cottage is located just past the main large parking lot at the center of the circle. The cottage is a replica of the original cottage on this land, and is home to the park's office.

Attendees should be prepared to discuss the scope and content of the environmental document for the Penn Valley Proposal.

Planning Commission (All Proposals) January 28, 2016- 1:30 p.m.

Board Chambers, Eric Rood Administrative Center (1st Floor)
950 Maidu Ave.
Nevada City, CA 95959

Attendees may provide comments on the scope and content of the environmental document for any of the three proposed projects.
Figure 1
Regional Vicinity

Legend
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Source: Nevada County (2015); ESRI streetmap.
Figure 2
Site Plan – Alta Sierra Site
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Figure 4
Site Plan – Rough and Ready Highway Site
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ALTA SIERRA
NOP COMMENTS
January 29, 2016

Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
County of Nevada, Community Development Agency
950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Public Scoping Meetings

Dear Mr. Barrington:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Dollar General Projects. Caltrans’ new mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California’s transportation system. We review this local development for impacts to the State Highway System in keeping with our mission, vision and goals for sustainability/livability/economy, and safety/health. We provide these comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

The proposed project locations are: 10166 Alta Sierra Drive in Grass Valley, 17652 Penn Valley Drive in Penn Valley, and 12345 Rough and Ready Highway in Grass Valley. Each Dollar General store is proposed as a 9,100-square-foot retail facility on approximately one-acre parcel. The following is our comments on the NOP of a DEIR:

Transportation & Circulation

We are concerned about the intersections that large delivery trucks will be traveling. We are requesting the DEIR to show that delivery trucks will be able to legally and safely negotiate the following intersections listed below:

1. **Grass Valley, CA—10166 Alta Sierra Drive**: State Route (SR) 49/Alta Sierra intersection.

2. **Penn Valley, CA—17652 Penn Valley Drive**: SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (South)/Rough and Ready Highway (North) intersection, and SR 20/Pleasant Valley Road intersection.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
3. Grass Valley, CA—12345 Rough and Ready Highway: It is not obvious whether delivery trucks will supply this store from the SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (south)/Rough and Ready Highway (north) intersection, or from one of the interchanges along SR 20 in Grass Valley. Please clarify the location of delivery truck access in the DEIR as well.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

If you have any question regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact Jennifer Jacobson, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Nevada County, by phone (530) 741-5435 or via email to jennifer.jacobson@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SUSAN ZANCHI, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning—NORTH

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
Monday, January 25, 2016

To Whom It May Concern:

Regarding the building of a Dollar General Store in the Alta Sierra area,

   It is my understanding that the erection of a Dollar General store will include septic drainage and tree removal, as well as storm water and sediment runoff. It will also require the frequent use of Little Valley Rd for construction equipment. Is there some kind of safe plan for excavation of the pipeline and leach field and the underground drainage storage system that could affect Little Valley Rd? With all this work being done, I have concerns about the “wear and tear” on Little Valley Rd. I also have concerns about the foot traffic of school children and residents. Many people enjoy walking their dogs and jogging on this narrow road. As I am sure you are aware, there are no sidewalks.

   Another concern is the traffic on Alta Sierra Dr going southbound pulling into the parking lot with northbound traffic coming at you with a 73 ft long tractor-trailer. The curves are already a hazard to car and pickup drivers. Any kind of accident on Alta Sierra Dr would be catastrophic, especially if gas and oil spill is involved. It could be hours to clear the road. Backing up one of the delivery trucks could also be very dangerous at the store.

   A third concern is the noise. Residents on Little Valley Rd would be subject to truck noises, back up horns, etc. The residents on Little Valley Rd do not want to see or listen to upwards of 40-50 trucks, trailers, construction equipment and workers throughout the day, potentially starting very early in the morning.

   Yet another concern involves the removal of up to 100 trees to be removed, as well as all the soil that will need to be removed. We enjoy the view that we have right now. To have a rock wall built and security lights that will light up residences on Little Valley Rd seven days a week is not something I would appreciate.

   Alta Sierra is five miles away from Dollar Tree, along with several markets, retail establishments and restaurants. There is currently a Dollar General store in Grass Valley. I strongly believe we do not need or want a Dollar General store in Alta Sierra.

Sincerely,

Richard Chandler
16330 Gibboney Lane
Grass Valley, CA 95949
January 31, 2016

Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Mr. Barrington,

The homeowners on the nearby streets of Gibboney Lane, Ariel Court, and Mountain Lion Lane, are definitely AGAINST the General Dollar Store being built on Alta Sierra Drive near the main entrance to our rural community! Gibboney Lane, Ariel Court and Mountain Lion homeowners are within three quarters of a mile to the proposed building site.

We believe that building this store in this location will be a detriment to the Alta Sierra community—especially those of us living closest to it—for the following reasons:

1. **The Dollar General Store will be an additional safety hazard to people driving on Alta Sierra Drive.** This large retail store would be built with a parking lot off an already dangerous, blind S-curve on Alta Sierra Drive. In addition to the increase in customer traffic, the large 60 to 70 foot delivery trucks pulling into The Dollar General Store’s parking lot or leaving would not be easily seen by traffic driving west toward Route 49 or turning in to Alta Sierra Drive off Route 49. Even with a third turning lane on Alta Sierra Drive, the large trucks would take more than those two lanes to turn in to or out of the parking lot.

2. **When the two C1 lots currently for sale directly across Alta Sierra Drive from the proposed building site of The Dollar General Store are developed there would be an increase in traffic congestion in that area.** This part of Alta Sierra Drive is also on that blind S curve.

3. **Allowing a Dollar General Store to be built on the proposed site sets a precedent for other large box warehouse-type stores to be built in the same area.** This is a rural community, and the residents moved here to live in a rural community. If we need the services of a Dollar General, there is one conveniently located just a few miles up Route 49.

4. **The additional traffic would also present additional danger to the many children who are dropped off in that area by the school bus.**

5. **Environmentally, this project will remove many trees, which, in addition to their landmark status, block both sound and light for the local residents.** Removal of these trees will increase traffic sound levels to all in the area, and bring additional unwanted light, including the new store’s lights, to nearby neighbors.

6. **The land values of many residents of Alta Sierra will depreciate if The Dollar General Store is allowed to be built on the proposed site on Alta Sierra Drive.** The Alta Sierra Drive Entrance to Alta Sierra is our main entrance to our rural community, and dangerous.

7. **There is already an existing business that supplies the area with local needs.** There is no way two similar businesses will survive. One or the other of these stores will go out of business, leaving an abandoned building and large, empty parking lot.

Again, we do not want Dollar General to build in this congested, dangerous area.

Sincerely,

Gibboney Lane Road Association
Gibboney Lane Road Association

Larry and Carol Purcell 16330 Gibboney Ln. G.V.
16312 Gibboney Ln. G.V.
16370 Gibboney Ln. G.V.
15973 Gibboney Ln. G.V.
15973 Gibboney Ln. G.V.
16320 Gibboney Ln. G.V.

15886 Gibboney Ln.
15886 Gibboney Ln.
10331 Mountain View Ln.

Dale L. Smoove
Elizabeth Schwitz
Richard Adam
Walter A. Mc

Ray & Bernardino Kunig
Sabine Allen Ostrame

James Bell
James R. Bean

Jeanette Pash
Susan Ferrari

Jenny Andraff
Gentlemen:

We have already written these letters and we are still trying to BLOCK the project of the Dollar General Store in Alta Sierra. Now the Environment Impact Report representative needs these letters for his reports.

All the trees and the excavation of the 3 parcels. Clear Cutting the trees, lead to soil erosion and run off problems to ruin neighbors property. Down goes property value.

The Septic system proposed for this project needs to be gone over with a lot of experts. Maybe even ruining near by parcels. Down goes the property value.

Noise, equipment traffic and dust will impact this project area plus the neighbors and the regular flow of traffic. Site for the entrance will cause traffic jams. This is a very busy area.

Businesses already established will suffer. Stores going into Bankruptcy. Lots of empty buildings already.

The people make up the Environment, and the consensus is the PEOPLE don't want or need the Dollar General Store in Alta Sierra. NO DOLLAR GENERAL STORE

Patricia Gruwell 14723 Penn Road., Grass Valley, CA 95949 (registered voter)
My husband & I are homeowners in Alta Sierra. We have enough problems here with stolen mail and home break-ins. We do not need a Dollar General here to bring down our property values.

No Dollar General Store Please.

Karen & Harvey Hart
16482 Judith Court
Grass Valley
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner

Mr. Barrington,

> I have sent this email in PROTEST of the application for DOLLAR GENERAL to build a 9100 sq. ft. building in our neighborhood. I live at 15691 Little Valley Road, which will be directly across the street from this oversized building. I share the same concerns that hundreds of my neighbors have presented, and even more so because I live across the street. I am OPPOSED to this project and RESPECTFULLY request that you NOT approve the application to build.

> Little Valley Road is already heavily trafficked by the thousands of residence in the Alta Sierra community. The road is somewhat dangerous because most drivers exceed the speed limit. A lot of us (including school children) use the road for our daily walks or jogs. The intersection of Little Valley Road and Alta Sierra is also somewhat of a danger as a lot of drivers do not make complete stops and just roll thru the intersection. The existing driveway on Little Valley Road going into the market can be a bit treacherous as well. The whole point of this is that ADDITIONAL traffic on Little Valley Road will only compound the existing problems. Adding a second driveway on Little Valley Rd. going into the proposed Dollar General Store would also become a traffic hazard. I am absolutely OPPOSED to having another driveway on LITTLE VALLEY ROAD.

> Our neighborhood is a pristine bedroom community as it is today. We take great pride in our flora and fauna. The existing commercial establishment are more than adequate to meet our needs so, to cut down a hundred or more of our old growth trees would be a travesty. We’ll never get them back and it will destroy the esthetics of that area, and not only that I feel that it will have a negative impact on my property value and that of my neighbors. I absolutely oppose the removal of those trees.

> Then there is the excavation issue. 6000 cubic yards of dirt, 700 truckloads to remove it all. What will be the negative impact on the drainable system for storm water runoff and flooding on our properties and the creek below! All this to build a 9100 sq. ft. building that will have a negative impact on me and my neighbors resulting in unwanted additional noise and lighting.

> WE DON’T NEED/WANT a Dollar General Store in our neighborhood. If we want to avail ourselves of their type of products, we can drive to their store in Grass Valley. As I understand it, their Grass Valley store is not doing that well as it is, so why do they want to spread themselves even thinner ??? My family and I WILL NOT patronize Dollar General and I have heard some of my neighbors feel the same. Besides, there are two other similar dollar type stores in Grass Valley, why does the planning department feel the need to saturate our town/area with more of this type of “cheap” foreign and generic products. Just because a property is zoned commercial, what about the master plan and balancing the demographics of commercial stores and their products and services.

> In closing, I would like to thank all of you for taking the time to read my email. I pray that I have made an impact on your thought process regarding the Dollar General Store application. Finally, I again RESPECTFULLY request that you DO NOT approve the application for Dollar General to build their store in our neighborhood...
Via Electronic Mail:
brian.foss@co.nevada.ca.us
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us
ed.scofield@co.nevada.ca.us

Brian Foss, Nevada County Zoning Administrator
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Ed Scofield
Nevada County Supervisor, Dist II
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 200
Nevada City, CA 95959

Laura Duncan
Planning Commission, Dist II

RE: Proposed Scope of Work for EIR Preparation for 9100 Sq Ft Dollar General Store at Alta Sierra

Dear Mr. Foss, Mr. Barrington, Mr. Scofield, and Ms. Duncan,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report for the Dollar General projects, especially at Alta Sierra. Many Negative Impacts were noted by Nevada County Agencies with this project, and many public concerns were also voiced, but the Developer has made no changes that sufficiently remove or reconcile these issues and impacts. “Where a project impacts cannot be avoided the Management Plan should provide feasible mitigation to reduce and compensate for the impact.” This project is full of impacts that can easily be avoided if proper code and conduct are followed.

It is my concern that because this project was recommended to the Planning Commission during the Negative Impact review process, those involved in this EIR may consider many of those issues somewhat resolved and accepted. They are not. Because the original reports that were submitted by the Developer were not based upon relevant local data, and continually ‘updated’ reports provided some contradictory information, there is now question of their reliability. I would like to receive assurance that the Engineer (Michael Baker International), and County Agencies, will proceed with this project with the intent to thoroughly investigate every aspect.

I would also like the lead Engineer with MBI to receive a copy of this letter, in addition to the two copies of previous letters from myself and my attorney (attached). Most issues are addressed there, and I would be happy to elaborate where needed.
This project was first presented as only affecting the one parcel that the building would be located upon. When it was made clear that it also involved two other parcels in the placement of sewage and sewage transport, the scope of this project was changed to include those two other parcels. The sharing of parcels with septic systems needs to be addressed very thoroughly since it has now become clear that a proper review of this project should also include at least one other parcel directly affected by this development. Please refer to the map below for this discussion.
Although the Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) Policy Implementation Reference allows “the use of all or part of an abutting lot to provide additional space for a private sewage disposal system or part thereof when proper cause, transfer of ownership, or change of boundary ... has been first established to the satisfaction of the Authority Having Jurisdiction”, it does not allow for transporting of sewage to a non-connected parcel. The Dollar General project proposes to pump sewage from parcel 8, past the abutting lot (10), and create a leach field on parcel 12. This should not even be considered. The Implementation Reference also refers to a transfer of ownership. Although there is one current owner for all three parcels, the project calls for a sale to the Developer of only parcel 8, where the building site is to be located, causing the septic leach field for the building site to be owned by another entity. Proper ownership of parcel 12, (or a part thereof since the septic system for the restaurant shares that space) should also transfer ownership with the building. This aspect is not addressed in this plan.

On a related matter, I have recently discussed with Tyler Barrington of Planning Department that the newly re-opened restaurant, known as Las Katarinas, will be faced with a reduction on future activities because of this project if there is a septic failure, unless it is shown that there is a study to show that there is sufficient acceptable area to allow a large enough repair area for their existing septic system. That is a big concern since most of this parcel is the site for its existing septic system, and proposes to also house the Dollar General’s septic system (and repair area).

The project’s revised Septic Plan based its findings of having sufficient repair area for the existing septic system for this restaurant on the owner’s claims in November of 2014, that the then-defunct restaurant would no longer be used for a restaurant, limiting any future of the building’s seating capacity from 95 to 65. He then rented the building to a very successful restaurant, with a tenant intent to expand. Simply put, the creation of this project in its current state has the inevitable result of limiting another successful pre-existing business from operating at its current and desired capacity.

Finally, the parcel south of the building site (7) currently houses the Alta Sierra Market. Shouldn’t the inevitable failure of that septic should also be considered since this parcel is land-locked, and completely covered with asphalt? The building site of Dollar General will affect its ability to operate in the future and should also be considered in the EIR.

I ask that you protect your residents by properly addressing all aspects of this plan, considering the neighborhood and its residents who will live with your results hereafter. Once these properties have been devastated, there will be no fix.

Thank you for your consideration,

Charisse Lolli

cc: D.B. Mooney, Attorney at Law
cc: Honerable Steven S. Honigman
Charisse Lolli  
15729 Little Valley Rd.  
Grass Valley, CA 95949  
(530) 273-3945  

June 30, 2015  

*Via Electronic Mail:*  
brian.foss@co.nevada.ca.us  
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us  
ed.scofield@co.nevada.ca.us  

Brian Foss, Nevada County Zoning Administrator  
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
Nevada County Planning Department  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959  

Ed Scofield  
Nevada County Supervisor, Dist II  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 200  
Nevada City, CA 95959  

RE: Proposed Plan for 9100 Sq Ft Dollar General Store at Alta Sierra  

Dear Mr. Foss, Mr. Barrington, and Mr. Scofield,  

Legal response has already been submitted by my attorney, DB Mooney, but I would like to express my concerns again for the above proposed development in the Alta Sierra Rural Center, as revised. As you know, this will be the 5th Dollar General Store proposed to be located within a 13 mile radius. Some of those concerns were not changed at all, and remain as ongoing concerns. I have addressed some of those issues that have provided revised data in more detail below.  

It is unfortunate that such an issue as a business enterprise should become such a heated controversy, pitting residents against the governing bodies that it has entrusted to preserve our way of life, and enforce its power against negative factors that threaten it. I must take this time to first express my disappointment at the Developer’s conduct (Simon CRE) by trying to appear as though they actually wanted to discuss the concerns and come to an equally beneficial way to make their project work with the community by hosting a “town meeting”. The Union reported that meeting as becoming heated as residents discovered it was nothing of the kind. After all, the Developer had already submitted their revised proposal by the meeting date.  

In the revised plan, the change amounted to nothing more than building a brick wall at the ‘temporary’ driveway created on Little Valley Rd, and a decrease in excavation as retaining walls and building elevation were increased. This is not an adequate solution to the many negative impacts produced by
this plan, and shows little regard by the Developer for those impacts on the community they intend to invade.

Per the revised IS/MND, it states that “Where a project impacts cannot be avoided the Management Plan should provide feasible mitigation to reduce and compensate for the impact.” (pg 38) (I added emphasis). Clearly this was not the approach taken when considering Little Valley Road as an access for any part of this project. There is no statement requiring the contractor to use this access. Instead, we are faced with a list of negative impacts upon the neighborhood due to 450 truck trips over a residential street, and the dirt, noise, and additional grading issues associated with their presence. Most of these impacts can be entirely avoided by eliminating even the temporary access from Little Valley Road. This is a commercial project and should use Alta Sierra Drive for all ingress/egress, and access from Little Valley Road should be eliminated from these plans.

Further avoidable impacts that bring attention to the land use of Alta Sierra Drive and Little Valley Road is the orientation of the building itself as it is designed to face the residences of Little Valley Road rather than the commercial road that serves it. By turning the building to face the commercial property, and allowing the back of the store to face the residential district, the issues of noise and light become so much smaller. It is inconceivable that the County could determine that the negative impact of a store facing the residential district could be mitigated to a “less than significant” impact to anybody in the residential zone. We believe that an EIR is needed to address this negative impact, and propose better solutions than building brick walls to hide it from view.

Through our community involvement, we were able to provide the Planning Department with many of the issues that were not addressed in the first reports. Unfortunately, rather than the Developer responding with revisions to the revised plans to eliminate many of those negative impacts, the Planning Department has responded by mitigating continued negative impacts with the collection of fees, as though that could remove a negative impact. The cumulative effects of these negative impacts are not given the appropriate level of importance, although the County has made several statements that demonstrate their understanding of the permanent devastating results of this plan. (pg 60 revised IS/MND) “The removal of the majority of the site’s trees, the construction of several large (up to 12-foot tall) retaining walls, the placement of a commercial building and its associated parking, lighting and screen walls on this site will forever change the look and feel of this site.” Based upon that statement alone, an EIR should now be requested. We are asking now that you request a full EIR be prepared for this project to determine the actual short and long-term impacts.

Recently, it has been learned that existing and re-opened businesses will likely be faced with limits on future activities because of this project. Specifically, the revised Septic Plan based its findings of having sufficient repair area for the existing septic system on the owner’s claims. In November of 2014, the owner claimed that the then-defunct restaurant would not be used for a restaurant, but a new restaurant is currently preparing to open very soon at that site. Simply put, the creation of this project in its current state has the inevitable result of limiting another pre-existing business structure from operating at its current full potential.
Aesthetics should be a very important aspect of project concerns, but several factors have still not been addressed. The plans state that there is “extensive new landscaping” to help hide this expansive structure. “The proposed building will appear to be approximately 30-feet tall or almost 3 stories” in building height. (pg 26 revised IS/MND). But is a 6-foot wall and a few remaining trees are meant to shield the neighborhood from the continual lighting and noise produced by this mammoth? There has been no landscaping proposed along Little Valley Road on the 2nd and 3rd parcels although additional proposed clearing for the septic line and leach field are part of the plan. Currently, existing commercial buildings that share those parcels were not constructed with much of a natural barrier between these structures and the residential district along Little Valley Road. Their continual lighting, the hours of traffic and the presence of an actively used trailer home that is parked at that complex suggest that residential occupancy may also be taking place in one or more of those commercial buildings. Just the clearing of brush and small trees that the owner has already done in preparing for this project has made those properties even more visible and imposing to the neighbors below it. Further tree removal and excavation at those sites will create an even greater aesthetic mar upon Little Valley Road than currently exists.

After reviewing the many revised reports, including the last one submitted only 2 days prior to your draft Initial Study/MND that addressed traffic, I continue to find some very important factors to be completely dismissed, or mitigated away. The traffic, drainage, and community issues are very threatening, and if your judgment is wrong by allowing it to proceed as planned, it will result in devastating and fatal outcomes that the residents will be forced to live with forever, with no ‘fix’ considered, just vague references to a promise to respond if traffic accidents increase.

Traffic has already been identified as very heavy in this area since Alta Sierra Drive is a Major Collector, and the proximity to Highway 49 and the severe S-Curve of Alta Sierra Drive make this a uniquely dangerous situation. The revised IS/MND has concluded that traffic impacts and circulation are potentially significant, and that the paying of mitigation fees will reduce the impact to a level of insignificance (revised IS/MND pg 69), but does not explain how fees can reduce an impact. The Sight distance to the store entrance approaching from Hwy 49 is shown as legally compliant, but does not consider the lack of sight distance to any vehicle that is out of sight because it has gone beyond the turn of the S-curve, and is at a stopped position to make the left turn into the entrance. It is likely that this situation will cause many accidents. The Staff Report states that if traffic accidents increase as a result of the Project, then this mitigation fee would be spent to reduce the impact, but does not provide any explanation of how it proposes to enforce that event. How will it be determined that this Project is responsible for increased accidents? Since there was only one recent accident noted, will two be the threshold? There is no review criteria outlined to determine whether any threshold has been met. How much is the mitigation fee, and HOW will it be spent to reduce the impact? This “wait-and-see approach with no mitigation plan or standards violates CEQA.”

A 25% reduction in “county code requirements” for parking stalls is being recommended for this project, even though it is in an area of high traffic risk. This is being allowed because the engineers hired by the Developer who recommended adhering to county codes contradicted their own recommendation with a “study” based upon 3 other non-disclosed Dollar General stores, and contains no information to support the conclusion. In light of the detrimental effects of the traffic issues,
residents are curious why an average sized Dollar General Store (7300 sf) in a rural center was not presented as an alternative to “avoid” some of the negative impacts rather than mitigate them away.

In regards to truck turn templates for deliveries, the consultant confesses that “it is not guaranteed that truck drivers will be able to make continuous sweeping movements, but with minor jockeying trucks are capable of ingress/egress at the project site.” The templates provided do not support the conclusion. The ending position for an inbound truck is not the beginning position of an outbound truck, and has no explanation for how a truck could switch positions. Neither does it address the time that it would take a delivery truck to make these maneuvers, closing off the ingress/egress to any other traffic. Reliance upon incorrect data results in incorrect conclusions.

I ask that you protect your residents by postponing the approval of this plan until it has undergone a full EIR to adequately address all of the negative impacts, both current and future. Once these properties have been devastated, there will be no fix.

Thank you for your consideration,

Charisse Lolli

cc: D.B. Mooney, Attorney at Law
June 29, 2015

Via Electronic Mail:

brian.foss@co.nevada.ca.us
joseph.scarbrough@co.nevada.ca.us

Brian Foss, Planning Director
Joseph Scarbrough, Assistant Planner
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Nevada County Zoning Administrator
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Re: Revised Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration
Dollar General retail store (DP14-001) and
Biological Management Plan (MGT14-010)

Dear Mr. Foss, Mr. Scarbrough and Zoning Administrator:

This office represents Charisse Loll with respect to the above-reference Project. We appreciate the opportunity to submit the following comments. We have submitted comments previously on the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (referred to together herein as “IS/MND”), and now submit comments on the Revised IS/MND. These comments supplement our previous comments.

As explained below, the Revised Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (referred to together herein as “Revised IS/MND”) for the Project does not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.) in certain essential respects, and the flaws of the initial IS/MND have not been remedied. An Environmental Impact Report (“EIR”) must be prepared for the Project.

I. The “Revised” Project

The July 1, 2015 Staff Report describes the revised project, stating that the applicant has “redesigned the project site plan to remove the proposed second access onto Little Valley Road.” (Staff Report, p. 2.) This is true for the operational phase, but an excessive number of truck trips will be allowed to use a temporary access onto Little Valley Road for the purpose of “exporting” soil from the site during construction. The Zoning Administrator requested that the applicant redesign the Project to omit the Little Valley Road access for two reasons: (1) to address neighborhood compatibility concerns; and (2) to reduce the amount of grading required for the Project. (Staff Report, p. 2.) Unfortunately, revising the Project to provide for access onto Little Valley Road during construction does not avoid either of these impacts. The grading
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(on what appears to be a slope greater than 30%) will have to occur to create the “temporary” construction access, and the neighborhood will suffer significant, unmitigated short-term impacts.

When the Zoning Administrator continued the Project hearing, with one of the issues clearly being the compatibility with the adjacent neighborhood, it would seem that the Project would be significantly re-designed away from the big-box store feeling, in favor of a project that would actually be compatible with the residential uses. The size of the Project was not reduced at all, and instead of re-orienting the proposed building on the Project site to reduce impacts to the residential neighborhood, the applicant simply added some hulking split-face block screening walls at the eastern edges of the site’s parking areas. (Staff Report, p. 2.) Further, because of an effort to reduce the amount of grading, some of the retaining walls will be even larger, up to 12 feet high. (Staff Report, p. 3.)

We understand from the Dollar General website that the size of a Dollar General store is approximately 7,300 square feet (“sf”). It is entirely unclear why, in a rural residential neighborhood, Dollar General has decided to build a massive 9,100 sf store. In this case, many of the serious impacts could be significantly reduced if the size of the store were reduced, and it is puzzling why the applicant and the County refuse to consider a smaller store. A smaller project could potentially be compatible with adjacent residential uses, and would avoid many of the aesthetic, biological, traffic and other impacts. This highlights the need for a full EIR and the opportunity to review and consider project alternatives, including a reduced size alternative.

The Staff Report for the revised Project describes additional studies and more than a dozen new mitigation measures. As discussed below, however, there is still substantial evidence in the record that the Project may have significant environmental impacts. A full EIR is required.

II. The IS/MND Ignores Cumulative Impacts

The Revised IS/MND is still deficient in its analysis of cumulative impacts. The conclusions regarding cumulative impacts to oak woodlands is based largely on the argument that there have been so many impacts to the oak woodlands over the years, another grove lost is really not a big deal. (Revised IS/MND, p. 74.)

The IS/MND must evaluate cumulative impacts and CEQA provides for two very different methods of identifying a project’s cumulative impacts. The environmental document may provide either: (1) a list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, or (2) a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. (CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G, Item 2.)

The Revised IS/MND does not use either method, and the cumulative impacts analysis is insufficient.
III. The Direct Impacts of the Project are Still Not Adequately Addressed

Impacts to Aesthetics, and the Project's contribution to noise and light pollution remain significant. The site will be nearly completely stripped of trees, the delivery trucks will come and go within a few hundred feet of people's homes, and the Revised IS/MND acknowledges that the store will "appear to 30-feet tall or almost three stories, which is within the allowable height limits of the CI Zoning District." (Revised IS/MND, p. 26.) Simply because the commercial zoning district may allow for a three story project does not mean that such a structure will have a less than significant aesthetic impact. The aesthetic impacts are acknowledged in the Revised IS/MND, and an EIR is required to fully analyze and mitigate for these impacts.

Additional impacts that remain potentially significant are addressed below.

A. Impacts to Biological Resources

As noted in earlier comments, the cumulative impact to heritage oaks is not adequately addressed in the IS/MND, and the Revised IS/MND also falls short. There is no discussion of the remaining heritage oaks within the County, nor how the remaining resource will be impacted by development anticipated in the General Plan or through other planning resources.

The Staff Report describes the Zoning Ordinance requirement that impacts to heritage oaks be mitigated with a Management Plan, and one of the requirements of such a plan is to describe why avoidance is not an option. In this case, staff sums it up this way: "avoidance is unachievable with this project as proposed by the applicant." (Staff Report, p. 9, emphasis added.) This is the type of situation where the failure to prepare an EIR results in significant, unmitigated impacts. An EIR is required because there is a potentially significant impact to heritage oaks, and an EIR would not only consider mitigation measures, but also project alternatives that would avoid impacts.

B. Impacts to Land Use

The Staff Report continues to state that if the Project is consistent with CI zoning it must be compatible with adjacent land uses. (Staff Report, pp. 10-11.) The discussion is simplistic, and ends with the following: "the project is not anticipated to result in major land use compatibility conflicts." (Staff Report, p. 11, emphasis added.) What is a major compatibility conflict? The fact is, this is the best conclusion that can be made because the Project will result in land use compatibility conflicts. It makes no sense to pretend that a big-box style store adjacent to someone’s home would be a compatible use.

The neighborhood commercial areas of the County are intended to serve the surrounding community and be compatible with adjacent uses. Simply because the site is zoned for commercial use does not mean that every commercial project proposed there would be compatible with adjacent residential uses.
Neighborhood Commercial zoning is not simply “commercial,” it is intended to serve the needs of the neighbors. The Neighborhood Commercial zoning designation was never intended to be used to allow big-box style stores in a quiet, residential area that will become a thoroughfare for shoppers from all over the County.

As stated in the original IS/MND, and acknowledged in the Revised IS/MND, commercial and residential uses are generally incompatible. The fact that the zoning designation is for Neighborhood Commercial does not make the impacts any less real. Accordingly, if the County intends to approve the Project, at the very least an EIR must be prepared to identify the significant impacts to the neighbors and develop mitigation measures or Project alternatives to reduce their severity.

C. Impacts to Traffic and Circulation

1. Short-term Impacts

As noted above, the revised Project allows for a huge number of truck trips to occur during the construction phase of the Project, hauling soil off from the site, and doing so through the residential neighborhood using Little Valley Road. (Staff Report, p. 5.) The significant impacts associated with 450 truck trips over a residential street are found to be insignificant with very little analysis, simply a conclusion that limiting truck trips to non-peak hours and to an overall period of 21 days will ensure that impacts would be less than significant. (Revised IS/MND, p. 11.)

There is no evidence to support this conclusion, and simply because the impacts will be short-term does not mean they will not be significant. If the County intends to allow the applicant to use the residential neighborhood as a route of access during construction, this will have a significant impact on Project neighbors. The noise and safety impacts of 40-50 trucks per day will not be mitigated. Further, the Revised IS/MND notes that the applicant will be required to keep paved streets adjacent to the Project clean during construction by sweeping or washing at the end of each day. (Revised IS/MND, p. 34.) The residential properties along Little Valley Road are somewhat below the street level, and so such sweeping or washing will just serve to push dirt and dust onto the homes of the Project neighbors. The mitigation for these impacts would obviously be to require that all access be through the other entrance, even during construction. There is nothing in the record to even suggest that this is infeasible.

2. Long-term Impacts

Alta Sierra Drive is identified as a Major Collector by the General Plan (Revised IS/MND, p. 67), and has numerous limits because of its volume of traffic directly off from Highway 49, the S-curve design, the major intersection at Little Valley Road, and limited line of sight. The Revised IS/MND does not adequately address cumulative impacts to Alta Sierra Drive, particularly in light of the challenges already faced in relation to this roadway.
The Revised IS/MND concludes that impacts to traffic and circulation are potentially significant, and finding that the payment of a mitigation fee will reduce the impact to a level of insignificance. (Revised IS/MND, p. 69.) There is no explanation in the Revised IS/MND or the Staff Report regarding how the mitigation fee will be used, or how it will reduce impacts at all, much less to a level that is less than significant.

Mitigation Measure 16A requires the payment of a traffic mitigation fee. (Revised IS/MND, p. 70.) The Staff Report states that in the event traffic accidents increase as a result of the Project, then the mitigation fee would be spent to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. (Staff Report, p. 5.) There is no discussion of how much this fee will be, or how the money would be spent to reduce this future impact. There is no performance criteria suggested.

It would likely be quite a surprise to anyone injured in a traffic accident as a result of this project to learn that the impact to traffic safety was considered less than significant. The wait-and-see approach with no mitigation plan or standards violates CEQA. Once again, if an EIR was prepared as required, then the impacts could be thoroughly evaluated and mitigation measures or alternatives could be adopted reduce traffic impacts and to protect the public safety.

3. Parking Area and Deliveries

The Revised IS/MND concludes that the developer’s proposed 34 parking spaces rather than the 46 required by the General Plan will have a less than significant impact. (Revised IS/MND, p. 69.) The study submitted purported to analyze the peak hour parking demand at “three similar Dollar General stores.” (Id.) There is no evidence in the record regarding whether those stores are the standard 7,300 sf, or if they are super-sized Dollar Generals like the one proposed here. There is also no evidence to support the conclusion that the stores are in similar areas, etc.

With respect to truck traffic and deliveries, the consultant acknowledges the difficulties of the situation: "While the situation is not ideal for truck traffic, it is within the capabilities of truck drivers to perform these movements. It is not guaranteed that truck drivers will be able to make continuous sweeping motions, but with minor jockeying trucks are capable of ingress/egress at the project site." (Revised traffic report.) The templates provided also do not support the conclusion. The ending position for an inbound truck is not the beginning position of an outbound truck, and there is no explanation for how a truck could switch positions. The diagrams are inaccurate and/or incomplete, and do not support the conclusions in the Revised IS/MND.

D. Impacts to Water Quality

In the section regarding hydrology and water quality of the Revised IS/MND, the issue of existing drainage problems in the area continues to be overlooked. Many commenters have submitted evidence in the form of first-hand observations, and the County has not taken this into account.
The quantities of runoff that regularly flow along the existing ditches are barely adequate for keeping the fast flowing drainages flowing to the creek without causing floods, and require intermittent and annual maintenance and repairs to maintain that condition. The revised drainage study fails to take the existing condition into consideration.

III. A Full Environmental Impact Report is Required

There is substantial evidence to support a fair argument that each of the Project impacts discussed above, as well as those discussed in our previous comments, may be significant. A full EIR should be prepared for other reasons as well. The cumulative impacts of the Project are significant. Where a project’s impacts are cumulatively considerable, adoption of a mitigated negative declaration is inappropriate unless the evidence in the record demonstrates that the mitigation measures will reduce all impacts to a level of insignificance. (See San Bernardino Valley Audubon Society v. Metropolitan Water District (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 382, 391.) That level of certainty does not exist here.

Further, as discussed above, the Project may have significant impacts that could be reduced or avoided by an alternative to the Project, such as a reduced size. By curtailing environmental review at this stage through the use of a negative declaration, the County would be circumventing the main purpose of CEQA to allow for the public and decisionmakers to consider mitigation measures and alternatives in order to reduce a Project’s impacts on the environment and the community.

For these reasons, we believe the document should be withdrawn and a revised environmental document, a full EIR, should be released which adequately addresses all direct and reasonably foreseeable impacts, provides adequate and feasible mitigation, considers the alternatives under the correct assumptions about the current environmental setting and avoids excessive and unnecessary impacts to the environment and people in the vicinity of the Project.

Sincerely,

Donald B. Mooney
Attorney

cc: Charisse Lolli
Charisse Lolli  
15729 Little Valley Rd.  
Grass Valley, CA 95949  
(530) 273-3945  

January 24, 2016

Via Electronic Mail:  
brian.foss@co.nevada.ca.us  
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us  
ed.scofield@co.nevada.ca.us  

Brian Foss, Nevada County Zoning Administrator  
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
Nevada County Planning Department  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959  

Ed Scofield  
Nevada County Supervisor, Dist II  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 200  
Nevada City, CA 95959  

Laura Duncan  
Planning Commission, Dist II  

RE: Proposed Scope of Work for EIR Preparation for 9100 Sq Ft Dollar General Store at Alta Sierra  

Dear Mr. Foss, Mr. Barrington, Mr. Scofield, and Ms. Duncan,  

In continuance of my previous letter of January 18, 2016, detailing the various issues with the proposed off-site septic system requiring the addition of two more other parcels to be included in the study, I would like introduce you to many of the previously noted Negative Impacts by Nevada County Agencies with this project that has led to the need for the Preparation of the Environment Impact Report, and many of those public concerns that were made public during that time. Throughout the project review process, the Developer has made no changes that sufficiently remove or reconcile these issues and impacts, so I am eager at this time to make mention of them. Specifically, when requested by Mr. Foss to remove all access by Little Valley Road and re-orient the building to face Alta Sierra Drive in order to be compatible with the residential issues, the Developer responded with eagerness to comply, but later only adjusted the amount of soil being removed from the site. It was this impasse, and the number of negative impacts that led us to the preparation of this EIR.  

It would be a gross mistake not to consider the economic effects of this Project. If one Investor owned the entire shopping center at Alta Sierra, he would not put in stores within the same area that compete with each other because of its obvious negative economic impact upon the center as a whole. (In fact, those centers have specific language in their contracts for tenants to ensure that competition does not take place). In this case, it is left to you, our County Seat, to review the economic impact of the existing stores at that location. The center in whole has a very low occupancy rate. However, there is a variety of businesses that cater to the local residents. One such business is the Alta Sierra Market, and it clearly
serves the customer base that Dollar General hopes to “capture”. The Alta Sierra Market maintains a minimum stock of almost everything that you can think that a person needs on impulse, in addition to some fresh fruits, vegetables, and hard alcohol. A business like Dollar General is in direct competition with a great deal of the inventory at the AS Market, and being a small business, this type of competition is substantial enough to force the AS Market into bankruptcy, resulting in another empty building, and loss of those unique items that are currently available in the immediate vicinity, but not offered by Dollar General. Consideration of these effects needs to be reviewed comprehensively.

In the same way, this EIR includes proposals of 3 more stores to Nevada County, with a 4th already centrally located at the Brunswick Basin. Nevada County residents cannot support 4 Dollar General Stores. What happens with these enormous buildings when these stores fold? The Dollar General stores historically draw customers from within a local radius, and are not attributed to bringing any new money into the county where they develop. This means that they take their income from existing businesses, many of them small capital businesses that cannot bear ‘bargain store’ competition. The approval of 4 of the same stores within Nevada County could be responsible for creating more ‘ghost towns’ out of our existing shopping centers.

The Project parcels in question are zoned for Neighborhood Commercial, and are accessed through the commercial roadway of Alta Sierra Drive. But the property behind the Project along Little Valley Road is residential, and should not be used for any aspect of the commercial development proposed. But the Project proposes to cut an access route from the residential district (on what appears to be a slope greater than 30%), to provide access to 450 trucks hauling excavated soils within the residential neighborhood during their construction process, not to mention the other construction personnel and vehicles or equipment. This causes a horribly negative impact upon the residential neighborhood that abuts this project without proper mitigation. Even their suggestions for sweeping or washing the roadway at the end of each day only causes more dust and debris pushed into the homes of the residents whose houses are at a lower elevation than the roadway.

Although land-use may permit a store of this size/plan to build a commercial structure upon that property, it does not provide the owner the right to build anything larger than the parcel can support, nor does it give the owner the right to build anything he wants to without being compatible with the neighborhood. The Developer has proposed to orientate his building so that it faces north, toward the Little Valley Road residents, rather than towards the commercial roadway that it serves to the west. The negative aspects of having a storefront facing a commercial district can only be eliminated by the obvious choice of facing the building towards the commercial district that it serves, rather than creating a large wall to try to hide it. By turning the building to face the commercial property, and allowing the back of the store to face the residential district, at least the issues of noise, delivery truck traffic, and light become smaller. According to comments by the Planning Department, the walls proposed by the Project will appear to be approximately 30-feet tall (almost 3 stories). Aesthetically, how can a three-story building fit into the landscape of the Alta Sierra Neighborhood Commercial environment?

The store of this size would normally require 46 parking stalls, but these plans only allow for 34. That’s more than a 26% reduction in County Code. The Developer has conducted his own “study” to show that his particular Name Brand store does not require an average number of parking stalls, and hopes that this explanation serves as a grounds to exempt them from code standards, but there are two problems with that
conclusion. First, the study that provided those results needs to explain how lower item dollars and ticket counts would produce less need to provide parking for their stores. Although the store chain claims that 25% of their goods are ‘dollar’ items, and their customers only spend a nominal amount of money per visit, that just doesn’t add up to need less parking stalls... making ends meet would require more parking and more customers. The assumption that there are lower needs for customer parking also means that the impact to local traffic has been likely underestimated. The second error in the rationale supporting decreased parking stalls is that it does not take into consideration the future of the building and neighboring businesses. Although, after much examination, it may be deemed that this chain store does not need as many parking stalls, it is unlikely that future businesses taking residence after them will have the same “study” results. In business, it is not an asset to claim you have less than the average number of customers. No other property development considerations are based upon the needs of only the current residents to determine legal building requirements, and neither should brand name stores. Also noted, in the Traffic Study by Kunzman, it states that “the site should provide sufficient parking spaces to meet County of Nevada parking code requirements in order to service on-site parking demand”, but later provides a report that says they don’t need that many, after all. This suggests that reports can change their conclusions according to the needs.

The size of this Project calls for the destruction of over 100 trees, and further describes the impact of this Project as affecting 1.4 acres of Landmark oak woodlands and 4 landmark oak trees). The building site should fit within the property, not the other way around. Allowing this destruction will result in the clear cutting of our landscape. Although mitigation laws may permit the payment of fees for planting of seedlings on an off-site parcel to make up for hundreds of years of growth, allowing this plan as proposed... “the removal of the majority of the site’s trees, the construction of several large (up to 12 feet tall) retaining walls, the placement of a commercial building and its associated parking, lighting and screen walls on this site will forever change the look and feel of this site” (Planning Department). A result we cannot fix once done. The ‘aesthetic’ landscape plan, as suggested, also does not address the increased exposure to the existing commercial district upon the residents upon Little Valley Road. The proposal removes what is already a limited tree barrier to commercial lights and noises.

Reports and truck templates provided by the Developer to provide the ingress/egress of delivery trucks provide confession by the consultant that “it is not guaranteed that truck drivers will be able to make continuous sweeping movements, but with minor jockeying trucks are capable of ingress/egress at the project site.” The templates provided do not support the conclusion. The ending position for an inbound truck is not the beginning position of an outbound truck, and has no explanation for how a truck could switch positions. Neither does it address the time that it would take a delivery truck to make these maneuvers, closing off the ingress/egress to any other traffic. These reports have been carefully reviewed by a known professional with both trucking and engineering experience, and need careful review by the engineers reviewing this project. Reliance upon incorrect data results in incorrect conclusions.

The size of trucks traveling along Alta Sierra Drive and Little Valley Road is limited by STAA truck route standards. However, the Dollar General is known to transport its store-brand merchandise on a weekly basis from the Southern California terminal, and uses a 73-foot truck to do so, one that is not legal to use on the road accessing the sites in Alta Sierra (or Rough and Ready). Although this subject has been brought up to the Developers, they have not addressed ‘how’ they will facilitate deliveries to these
locations. Who will enforce the mis-use of our roadways, and what will the applied punishment be to correct the mis-use?

Traffic studies do not address the real issue of line-of-site for those traveling in either direction near or at the proposed store entrance. Alta Sierra Drive is identified as a Major Collector by the General Plan, and the Project estimates at least a 10% increase on an already highly traveled road. Because the traffic traveling into Alta Sierra from Highway 49 is flowing through an S-curve, the line of sight does not allow enough distance to prevent rear-end collisions. It is far too short to allow for any vehicles to be sitting still in that lane while waiting to cross the oncoming lane of traffic to get into their store. Any additional vehicle stopped behind that car shortens the line-of-sight even more. The only way to safely allow for traffic to enter the store from that direction would be to supply a middle turn-lane for those cars to pull out of through traffic. It has already been noted that the line-of-site is even shorter if you are approaching from the other direction (from within Alta Sierra), and slowing to enter that site should allow for a right side pull-out to make that turn safely. Although deficiencies in traffic queue on Highway 49 and Little Valley Road have been identified in the Kunzman Traffic Reports, there is no comment on this in any County report that has been provided. The belief that development funds paid into the County coffers for future “traffic concerns” will address this situation is negligent. Any funds paid into that ‘fund’ will be spent based upon a determination by the State/County on where it will be used, and there is no promise or guarantee that any new traffic concerns will be addressed without providing a history of traffic back-ups, accidents, and fatalities.

The site is above and flows downward to Gold Creek, making watershed and water quality of utmost concern. Many from the neighborhood have already submitted evidence of existing drainage problems, but the issue fails to be addressed. As previously stated, “The quantities of runoff that regularly flow along the existing ditches are barely adequate for keeping the fast flowing drainages flowing to the creek without causing floods, and require intermittent and annual maintenance and repairs to maintain that condition. The revised drainage study fails to take that existing condition into consideration. (D.B. Mooney, June 29, 2015).

Again, I would also like the lead Engineer with this project at MBI (Patrick Hindmarsh) to receive a copy of this letter, in addition to a copy to Linda Duncan (her email address is not made public).

Thank you for your consideration,

Charisse Lolli

cc: D.B. Mooney, Attorney at Law
cc: Honerable Steven S. Honigman
This is my second letter in opposition to the Dollar General proposals for our County.

I live in Alta sierra where we support our local businesses. We do not want our neighborhood degraded by business that has no connection to our area.

Similarly, it seems ludicrous that they would consider putting another one in our ROUGH & READY!

I will not enumerate the same points of contention that we all feel, so please take my feelings as another opposed to this horrible idea.

Thank You

Jane Markham
2/8/16

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner, Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95949

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Attached are my comments and supporting materials for the Dollar General EIR. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully,

Marc Mayfield
15228 Stinson Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95949
ac120022@gmail.com
2/6/15

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner, Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Re: Transportation and Traffic under Potential Environmental Effects of the Dollar General EIR

Dollar General plans to route “interstate STAA trucks” [Attachment 1] to its Alta Sierra store from the SR 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection, down Alta Sierra Drive, then back up Alta Sierra Drive to SR 49. Dollar General’s proposed interstate STAA truck access to the Rough & Ready Highway store would be along Rough and Ready Highway for five miles, from SR 20, followed by a return to SR 20 on Rough and Ready Highway.

However, “interstate STAA trucks”—tractor and semi-trailer combinations 73 feet long—are prohibited on Alta Sierra Drive and, north of the feed store, on Rough and Ready Highway. Both roadways are thus restricted to “California Legal trucks,” which are, at most, 65 feet long. [Attachments 2-9] This means that Dollar General could not legally deliver to either store with the only tractor and semi-trailer combination the company utilizes: three-axle tractors and cargo van trailers 53 feet long. [Attachments 10-12]

Quoting Caltrans:

To open Alta Sierra Drive for STAA access, Nevada County would have to approve their roads and Caltrans would have to approve the State intersection at Alta Sierra Drive ... The County ... must assure Caltrans that its roads can accommodate STAA trucks ... If construction were to be necessary, the county would be responsible for its roads and Caltrans would be responsible for any construction within the State right-of-way. However, there is a lot of competition for Caltrans funds, and a project that benefits just one company is not likely to occur. [Attachment 13]

Clearly, Caltrans will not participate financially in rebuilding Alta Sierra Drive or Rough and Ready Highway to carry larger trucks. The costs—of planning, design, administration, right-of-way acquisitions, surveys, materials, cuts and fills, compaction, drainage and culvert placement, new access to private driveways, any intersections, signage, grading, paving, and striping—everything needed to widen and realign each roadway—will be borne by Nevada County, which is to say the taxpayers.
Dollar General’s first two traffic analyses for Alta Sierra—dated 10/6/14 and 3/25/15—included truck turning templates based on 43-foot long trucks. [Attachments 14A, 14B, 15A, 15B] After my 4/26/15 letter to Planning [Attachment 16] pointed out that error, Dollar General’s traffic engineer revised the templates to show correct truck lengths, but nonetheless depicted inaccurate and unrealistic truck ingress, on-site, and egress movements. [Attachments 17A, 17B] My concerns about traffic safety, sight and stopping distances on Alta Sierra Drive, site design, and truck maneuvers at the Altra Sierra site were summarized in the 4/26/15 letter.

---

I urge all stakeholders and decision makers to take safety on Nevada County’s roads, true and correct truck size, and truck restrictions in our communities seriously. Rough and Ready Highway should not be changed from a winding rural road into a truck route. Alta Sierra Drive should not be opened to STAA truck access. Dollar General’s application for the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway stores should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc Mayfield / 15228 Stinson Drive, Grass Valley, 95949 / ac120022@gmail.com

CC:
Ed Scofield, District 2 Supervisor
Hank Weston, District 4 Supervisor
Nevada County Planning Commission
TRUCK MAP LEGEND
TRUCK LENGTHS & ROUTES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Click here for the Truck Network Map

CALIFORNIA LEGAL ROUTES California Legal trucks (black trucks) can travel on STAA routes (green and blue routes), CA Legal routes (black routes), and Advisory routes (yellow routes). CA Legal trucks have access to the entire State highway system except where prohibited (some red routes).

California Legal Truck Tractor - Semitrailer
Semitrailer length: no limit
KPRA*: 40 feet maximum for two or more axles, 38 feet maximum for single-axle trailers
Overall length: 65 feet maximum *(KPRA = kingpin-to-rear-axle)

California Legal Truck Tractor - Semitrailer - Trailer (Doubles)
Option A
Trailer length: 28 feet 6 inches maximum (each trailer)
Overall length: 75 feet maximum
Option B
Trailer length: one trailer 28 feet 6 inches maximum
other trailer may be longer than 28 feet 6 inches
Overall length: 65 feet maximum

CA LEGAL ADVISORY ROUTES - CA Legal trucks only; however, travel not advised if KPRA length is over posted value. KPRA advisories range from 30 to 38 feet.

STAA ROUTES The STAA Network allows the “interstate” STAA trucks which are the green trucks shown below. The STAA Network consists of the National Network (green routes, primarily interstates) and Terminal Access routes (blue, primarily State routes). ("STAA" = federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982.)

(Click here for the Truck Network Map.)

Interstate “STAA” Truck Tractor - Semitrailer
Semitrailer length: 48 feet maximum
KPRA*: no limit
Overall length: no limit *(KPRA = kingpin-to-rear-axle)

Semitrailer length: over 48 feet up to 53 feet maximum
KPRA: 40 feet maximum for two or more axles, 38 feet maximum for single-axle trailers
Overall length: no limit

Interstate “STAA” Truck Tractor - Semitrailer - Trailer (Doubles)
Trailer length: 28 feet 6 inches maximum (each trailer)
Overall length: no limit

Terminal Access - Interstate “STAA” trucks may travel on State highways that exhibit this sign.

Service Access - Interstate “STAA” trucks may travel up to one road mile from the off ramp to obtain services (food, fuel, lodging, repairs), provided the route displays this sign.

SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS - Route restricted for vehicle length or weight, cargo type, or number of axles. Click here for the list of Special Route Restrictions.
From the Revised Traffic Analysis for Alta Sierra, dated 5/20/15:

Figures 7 and 8 show the truck turning templates for the project access. Truck turning templates are provided for both inbound and outbound truck turning movements at the project access. The truck turning templates utilized a WB-67 truck and are therefore a "worst case" analysis if Alta Sierra Drive became a STAA designated roadway, whereas the roadway is currently restricted to the California Legal trucks which are shorter in overall length than the STAA truck (WB-67). [emphasis added]

From the Revised Traffic Analysis for Rough and Ready Highway dated 7/17/15:

Figure 7 shows the truck turning templates for the project accesses. Truck turning templates are provided for both inbound and outbound truck turning movements at the project accesses. The truck turning templates utilized a WB-67 truck and are therefore a "worst case" analysis if Rough and Ready Highway became a STAA designated roadway, whereas the roadway is currently restricted to the California Legal trucks which are shorter in overall length than the STAA truck (WB-67). [emphasis added]

"WB 67" refers to truck wheelbase.
ATTACHMENT 3

Interstate STAA truck access sign on Rough and Ready Highway, 500 feet north of the SR 20 intersection.
ATTACHMENT 4

T-END sign on Rough and Ready Highway 1500 feet north of SR 20. Beyond this sign, lawful access by STAA combination vehicles is not allowed. North of the sign, Rough and Ready Highway narrows and for five miles—almost all of it uphill—a truck driver faces a series of S-curves and blind, tight-radius curves where tractors and trailers will occupy most or all of both lanes [Attachment 5], increasing the chances that an oncoming vehicle will hit the tractor head-on or be hit by the tractor head-on, or that an oncoming vehicle will be forced under the trailer. [Attachment 6] There are no marked turnouts for slow-moving vehicles, and no truck climbing lanes on Rough and Ready Highway. Trailers will offtrack dangerously going around the curves and may leave the pavement. [Attachment 7] “Offtrack” means that the rear wheels of a vehicle or combination of vehicles making a turn will describe a smaller arc than the front wheels. [Attachment 8, 9]
ATTACHMENT 5

The pictures are from Google. They were taken in North Carolina, but the same conditions are present on Rough and Ready Highway and Alta Sierra Drive. The photographs in Attachments 5-7 illustrate why STAA trucks are prohibited on many roads.
ATTACHMENT 6

Car drivers in North Carolina encounter STAA trucks on tight turns. This could happen on Rough and Ready Highway and Alta Sierra Drive.
Trailers in STAA combinations running off the pavement while tractors take up the opposing lane, a possibility on both Rough and Ready Highway and the curve on Alta Sierra Drive.
“Offtrack” theory. The longer the wheelbase—the distance between the front wheels and the rear wheels—the greater the amount of offtrack and the wider the maximum width of the swept path. STAA trucks present a very wide swept path when turning. On tight curves, an oncoming car has nowhere to go.
ATTACHMENT 9

Trailer offtrack at an intersection similar to the SR 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection, assuming that a northbound truck on 49 is turning onto Alta Sierra Drive.
ATTACHMENT 10

Dollar General delivery, Brunswick Basin with standard 53-foot long trailer and contractor's three-axle tractor with sleeper berth. Total tractor-and-trailer length is 73 feet.
ATTACHMENTS 11 and 12

Standard Dollar General 53-foot long trailers pulled by various contractors. Dividing loads onto smaller trucks would be time consuming and raise Dollar General’s costs.
Dear Mr. Mayfield:

Thank you for contacting the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) re. truck access in Nevada County. I'd be glad to guide you in this process, but first, please see this Caltrans web page which is an overview of the two truck categories based on lengths, and their legal routes: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trucks/truck-length-routes.htm. On that web page, you will see 3 steps to determine whether your truck is legal, and whether it may legally access your destination, as follows:

STEP 1 -- DETERMINE YOUR TRUCK CATEGORY (based on lengths)

STEP 2 -- DETERMINE THE STATE ROUTES YOU CAN USE (based on route colors on the map)

STEP 3 -- DETERMINE THE LOCAL ROADS YOU CAN USE (may need to contact the local government)

Since your truck is longer than 65 feet, you have a longer interstate STAA truck. As you can see on the Caltrans District 3 truck map, State Route (SR) 49 is a blue Terminal Access route that allows the STAA trucks.

To open Alta Sierra Drive for STAA access, Nevada County would have to approve their local roads and intersections, and Caltrans would have to approve the State intersection at Alta Sierra Drive.
This Caltrans web page “Terminal Access Application Procedure” is a step-by-step guide for both Caltrans staff and for local agencies: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trucks/routes/ta-process.htm. As you will see on that page, the County is responsible for the County roads but the County must assure Caltrans that their roads can accommodate the STAA truck. The STAA design truck that must be accommodated is not the 53' trailer truck, but the 48' semitrailer with the longer wheelbase. All that is explained on the web page.

If construction were to be necessary, the County would be responsible for any construction on their county roads, and Caltrans would be responsible for any construction within the State right-of-way. However, there is a lot of competition for Caltrans funds, and a project that benefits just one company is not likely to occur. On the Google map, that intersection looks tight, but we won’t be sure until we do the computer analysis.

Your main Caltrans contacts would the truck staff in District 3 who are listed on this web page: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trucks/contact-district-truck-staff.htm. Rick and Michelle just started in these truck positions last week, so please keep me informed so I can assist them as needed. They are cc’d.

We will be in touch.

Thank you,

Casey Robb

Ms. Casey Robb, P.E.
California Dept. of Transportation
HQ Traffic Operations
Office of Commercial Vehicle Operations
Legal Truck Access Branch
Sacramento, CA
(916) 654-5741
legal.truck.access@dot.ca.gov

From: Marc Mayfield |
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 6:05 PM
To: HQ Legal Truck Size - Weight@DOT
Subject: Truck access for Alta Sierra Drive in Nevada County
Alta Sierra Drive, a Nevada County roadway accessed directly off SR 49 via a controlled T-intersection, is limited to vehicles that are not longer than 65 feet. A proposed new business on Alta Sierra Drive would have to be serviced by trucks that are 73.5 feet long (53-foot long trailers and three-axle tractors equipped with sleeper cabs).

In order to allow the longer trucks on Alta Sierra Drive, the Nevada County Department of Public Works tells me, a survey would have to be conducted by Caltrans. My own view is that this is a county-level issue because Alta Sierra Drive is a county roadway. However, if a survey--by Nevada County, by Caltrans, or both--were to be conducted and if it is determined that Alta Sierra would have to be widened/realigned and/or that the SR 49-Alta Sierra Drive intersection would have to be rebuilt to accommodate longer trucks and longer turn radii, would Caltrans perform the construction work or would Nevada County--or both? Thank you.

Respectfully / Marc Mayfield / Grass Valley, CA
ATTACHMENT 14A

Inbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 10/6/14.
Figure 8
Alta Sierra Drive Outbound Truck Turning Template

ATTACHMENT 14B

Outbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 10/6/14.
ATTACHMENT 15A

Inbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 3/25/15.
Figure 8
Outbound Truck Turning Template

PROPOSED
DOLLAR GENERAL BLDG.
FFR=1976.50
130' x 14'
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ATTACHMENT 15B

Outbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 3/25/15.
ATTACHMENT 16


Attachment C is included. The reference is to Figure 6 in the traffic analysis dated 3/25/15. The 171-foot sight distance on the Alta Sierra Drive curve is reduced to 120 feet when a 73-foot truck is stopped on Alta Sierra Drive and is waiting to turn left into the proposed driveway. The Minimum Required Sight Distance is 150 feet.
04/26/15

Brian Foss
Planning Director
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Re: Revised Traffic Analysis for the proposed Dollar General store in Alta Sierra

Three important safety aspects have been overlooked in the traffic analysis: 1) The lengths of semi-trucks that would be used for deliveries at the proposed property. 2) Sight distance on Alta Sierra Drive. 3) The lengths of delivery trucks and blindside back-ups on the subject property.

1) The truck length shown in Figures 7 and 8 of the revised traffic analysis (43 feet at the scale of the figures; shown in the original traffic analysis as 34 feet) is incorrect.

Dollar General delivers from their distribution centers to their own stores with 53-foot trailers and three-axle tractors. The combined length is 73 feet. The inbound and outbound truck turning templates for the proposed store should have been based on trucks of that length, not on trucks that are 43 feet long. Outbound 73-foot long tractor-trailers will encroach across far more of the southbound lane of Alta Sierra Drive than is shown in Figure 8, and they will fully obstruct the northbound lane as they move slowly uphill to the Highway 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection. Traffic will back up behind them. I have not included Figure 8, because the encroachment will depend on the truck driver.

2) The 171-foot maximum sight distance to the driveway encroachment on southbound Alta Sierra Drive shown in Figure 6 is inaccurate.

The full length of an inbound 73-foot long combination vehicle stopped on Alta Sierra Drive and waiting to turn left across oncoming traffic was apparently not considered when the maximum sight distance was estimated.

The 171-foot sight distance shown in Figure 6 will in fact be reduced by the full length of a tractor-trailer stopped and waiting to turn left to 120 feet, which is 30 feet short of the required minimum sight distance of 150 feet. When a truck is waiting to turn left, southbound drivers coming around the sharp curve on Alta Sierra Drive will not be able to see the driveway encroachment. Truck or not, southbound drivers cannot see around the curve for nine months of the year because of leafed-out oak trees inside the curve. At times, the rear end of a trailer—or cars stopped behind the trailer—will be right around the curve, hidden by those oaks.

While waiting to turn, inbound trucks will be at risk of being struck in a rear-end collision, as will southbound vehicles lined up and waiting for the truck to complete the turn. While turning, there will always be a risk that the trailer could be struck from behind by a southbound vehicle or
from the side by a northbound vehicle, or that one of the tractor's fuel tanks could be hit, leading to a diesel spill. Alta Sierra Drive would be closed for hours for the cleanup, impacting traffic on Highway 49.

The only way to mitigate the sight distance problem for the proposed driveway location during deliveries is to re-align Alta Sierra Drive. Until that is done, the proposed driveway location will be too close to a blind curve and will present, at times, a dangerously short sight distance.

3) The true 73-foot truck length of Dollar General trucks (rather than 43 feet shown in Figures 7 and 8) and blindside truck back-ups near the driveway and through areas used by customers on foot and in their cars will compromise onsite safety.

Swept paths for blindsiding inbound semi-trucks will not be the neat arcs shown on Figure 7. They will be sinuous, will use the entire width of the parking area, and will block the driveway. They will also put trucks on areas of non-heavy duty pavement. (Link to video clip, below) The blindside back-up is the single most dangerous maneuver a truck driver can make and trucking companies instruct their drivers to avoid it whenever possible. Modern delivery areas should be designed and built so drivers won't have to blindside. (FHWA report, below)

The only way to mitigate potentially unsafe backing maneuvers is to redesign the proposed property so drivers will not be performing blindside maneuvers where customers will be walking and driving.

Respectfully,

Marc Mayfield
15228 Stinson Drive
Grass Valley CA 95949
ac120022@gmail.com

Attached:

A) 53-foot long trailer and three-axle tractor delivering to Dollar General, Brunswick.

B) Tractor-trailer truck length diagram.

C) Revised Traffic Analysis Figure 6 and enlarged portion of Figure 6 showing 73-foot long truck positioned for left turn on Alta Sierra Drive and reduced sight distance of 120 feet.

D) Revised Traffic Analysis Figure 7 showing 73-foot long tractor-trailer maneuvers on subject property. For reference, the short side of the proposed building is 70 feet long.
E) Federal Highway Administration Freight and Land Use Handbook (partial) and link.

This YouTube clip is better than words to explain a blindside back-up:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5t1O6P0buXI
The truck driver had more room to maneuver than is planned for the Dollar General store, but he still had to pull up and make numerous corrections very close to parked cars and pickups. Note the path the tractor takes once the driver starts to back-up and that throughout most of the maneuver, the driver is backing up blind.
ATTACHMENT 17A

Inbound truck turning template, corrected to 73-foot truck, traffic survey dated 5/20/15.
Figure 8
Outbound Truck Turning Template

ATTACHMENT 17B

Outbound truck turning template, corrected to 73-foot truck, traffic survey dated 5/20/15.
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
950 Maidu Ave.  
Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959

Ed Scofield, District 2 Supervisor  
950 Maidu Ave.  
Suite 200  
Nevada City, CA 95959

2/8/2016

Mr. Barrington & Mr. Scofield,

As residents of Alta Sierra, we believe that the Dollar General store doesn’t fit into the model of Alta Sierra. We are opposed to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Alta Sierra is designed to be a rural/residential community, and not a shopping destination. It does not have the infrastructure - roads, stop lights, etc. - to support a retail box store operation. The retail area in Alta Sierra is comprised of small, local businesses and not larger commercial operations that draw traffic off of the highway. There is also little demand for a larger commercial operation as most residents of the area do their shopping in Grass Valley, Auburn or Higgins Corner. As a result, the existing Alta Sierra Market struggles to thrive and has become a very large version of the urban corner store, selling mostly cigarettes, alcohol, other beverages and snack foods.

- Dollar stores have a hard time sustaining in well-trafficked shopping centers (example, a dollar store recently closed Roseville). If this concept doesn’t work in these commercial areas, why would it work in Alta Sierra? If it doesn’t work, there will be a big shell of a box store left behind, which has environmental and economic impacts on the area.

- Traffic for the Dollar General store would not be limited to that coming off the highway. People may cut through the Alta Sierra community to get to the store. The roads are wind; the speed limit is slow; and these are the features that attracted residents to this community. Owners and renters made a quality-of-life decision to live in Alta Sierra. From a commercial standpoint, this is an area where small and local businesses can coexist peacefully with local residents. A chain box store doesn’t make sense.
A Dollar General store would bring little to no benefit for existing residents and businesses. There is virtually no support for the development in Alta Sierra by the people who live and work here. A dollar store brings no value to the community, and so we are asking you to consider our objections in the planning and development decision making process.

Best regards,

Jon McDonald
Megan Riedel

Homeowners and residents of 10706 Alta Sierra Drive
February 5, 2016
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us

Regarding: Solicitation of Comments for Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Report for a Dollar General Store in Alta Sierra Subdivision (Section 15021 of CEQA and all referenced subsections).

General Comments

Project Comments Must be Understood Within the Following Context:

Nevada County, California has never created a county open space program and in fact, makes every effort to facilitate development of every open parcel for example, Alta Sierra Subdivision which has over 3,000 homes, has no public open space program and NGO-created open space/trails for this subdivision are grossly inadequate. Nevada County continues to ignore the need for greenbelts, trails, county parks and open space, particularly in Western Nevada County, despite public demand and need. Because there is no public open space program particularly for Western Nevada County, efforts to protect what is left are particularly contentious and controversial.

As an example, when Alta Sierra Subdivision and the adjacent subdivision, Lone Star, were approved, this required the development, if even through signage, of recreational easements for parks and trails. This was a condition of the approval of the Final EIR's. None of this was done. Despite the requirement of the EIR, Alta Sierra Subdivision and Lone Star were developed without a single sidewalk, park, bike path, greenbelt, open space preserve...and another tragedy is about to befall Alta Sierra in that Kimler Ranch, that was purchased to provide open space for Alta Sierra residents, is now up for sale and will never be open to the public which was the objective. Everyone is blaming it on "hostile residents" which is an utter cop-out (I have talked to residents in this area that WANT the park). A badly needed park and open space preserve for our subdivision may be sold off FOR DEVELOPMENT! This is how Nevada County does business.

In the meantime, Alta Sierra and Lone Star developments are for all intensive purposes built-out and NOW residents want parks and trails. The county has knowingly and quietly let these subdivisions build-out. The residents that want trails and parks are fighting with the ones that don't. You don't let a subdivision build-out then tell the residents you are putting trails in their backyards so of course, residents are fighting with one another. Because Nevada County never complied with the requirements of the EIR's for these developments just like Nevada County has never created a public open space program, an element of the County General Plan, Nevada County seems very pleased to dump this responsibility on its residents, the U.S. Forest Service, and California State Parks. Nevada County has also never fully complied with the Quimby Act.

Efforts to protect open space default down to the level of the citizen resulting in discord within the citizenry while Nevada County can then pose as "breaking up" these disagreements when the whole thing traces back to the negligence of Nevada County to do its job to begin with. This is yet another example. If Nevada County had in fact complied with State and Administrative Law and Regulations to begin with, this conflict regarding the Dollar General would most likely not be happening.

The applicant needs to understand the history of this issue regarding their development proposal. We don't have a public open space program in Nevada County so land use issues in Nevada County are more contentious. The selection of a county without a county public parks and open space program may not have been a prudent one on the part of the applicant.
Use of Prior Information Submitted

It is unclear if the information provided to me by my fellow citizens is true but I was told the County intends to "throw out" all prior information and comments regarding the project proposal. If this true, it is unfortunate and disingenuous on the part of the County if they are telling the citizens they have to "start over". They do not. This is in clear violation of the CEQA process based on the following sections:

Section 15006. (a), (d), (h), (i), (k), (l), (m), (s), (t) Reducing Delay and Paperwork. **In particular, it is a clear violation of (t) under this section which allows "using incorporation by reference" (15150).** Even though I am including prior comments as part of this new record of comments, I am also requesting that my prior comment letter can be "incorporated by reference" under this section.

Section 15150. Incorporation by Reference.  
An EIR or Negative Declaration may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document which is a matter of public record or is generally available to the public.

Section 15063. Initial Study. (C). Use of prior information, reports, information.

Section 15083. Early Public Consultation.  
Threats to "throw out" all prior testimony and comments violate one of the key provisions of CEQA whose objective it is to **encourage Early Public Consultation.** The public shall not be penalized for participating in this process early-on, the "reward" of which is all input will be "thrown out" as the CEQA process proceeds. Inclusion of all prior comments is PART OF the Early Public Consultation process and shall not be "thrown out". Violation of this component of CEQA may open the agency up to legal action.

Section 15084. (c). Any person, including the applicant, may submit information or comments to the Lead Agency to assist in the preparation of the draft EIR. **The submittal may be presented in any format,** including the form of a draft EIR. **The Lead Agency MUST consider ALL information and comments received.** The information or comments may be included in the draft EIR in whole or in part.

I am formally requesting the county incorporate by reference all prior comments and testimony for this project including my letter submitted on June 2, 2015, parts of which are also included in this letter. It is also attached verbatim.

The County Has Authority to Disapprove Projects,  
Section 15042. CEQA allows for the "Authority to Disapprove Projects" for both direct and indirect environmental effects.

Significant Effects,  
Section 15064. Determination of Significant Environmental Effects Caused by a Project.

(b). The determination of whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment calls for careful judgement on the part of the public agency involved, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data. An ironclad definition of significant effect is not always possible because the significance of an activity may vary with the setting. **For example, an activity which may not be significant in an urban area may be significant in a rural area.**

(c). In determining whether an effect will be adverse or beneficial, the Lead Agency shall consider the views held by members of the public in all areas affected as expressed **in the whole record** before the lead agency.

7 (h)(1)Cumulative Impacts must include permanent cumulative effects on watershed/stormwater run-off and climate change impacts among many others.
15064.5 Determination of Significant Impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources. This must be thoroughly examined in the EIR including the historical and cultural significance of native plants and ecosystems.

Sections 15002. Impacts suffered under the project proposal meet the definition of "Significant Effect".

"Significant effect on the environment means a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment. A social or economic change related to a physical change may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant."

The following should be included to determine "significance effects" on the environment:

PARCEL SIZE

The proposed location for this store is not even one acre. Parcel size is too small. It threatens the health and safety of the citizens and residents because it may increase likelihood of more accidents and wildlife kills. If it is made to fit, it is going to be an eye-sore and so damage the area such that is will increase erosion, urban runoff, and continue to degrade the area long after it is built. This of course, must be analyzed in the cumulative impacts section.

IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES WHEN DOLLAR GENERAL STORES ARE NOT PROFITABLE.

Irretrievable commitment of resources refers to the simple fact that once you destroy, invoke an intentional extinction event, you can never ever replace what you destroyed. Never--the trade-off being a locally beautiful, historic, reasonable high biodiversity landmark oak grove that provides ecosystem services for the community--for a likely non-viable "variety" store that will most likely go out of business. We will never get the landmark oak woodland back.

Also, the county must keep in mind that in the course of proceeding through this public process, the site may be knowingly or unknowingly damaged in favor of the development, meaning natural resources on the property in the form of wildlife and plants may be disturbed/altered/destroyed. In checking on one population of plants observed last year, to the best of my ability, it appears to be completely gone. This is also "irretrievable commitment of resources" under CEQA.

REVISION TO ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT(S)

Section 15020: "The Lead Agency shall not knowingly release a deficient document hoping that public comments will correct defects in the document."

Any revisions to the biological report/lists that include this information must designate the source, in this case, Virginia Moran, Biologist. This is a requirement of CEQA. The consultants, project proponent may not supplement inadequate information without citing the source:

"Virginia Moran, Information Provided in Project Comments To Supplement Incorrect/Inadequate Information".

INADEQUATE BIOLOGICAL SURVEY* (*nn=non-native)

The biological site description for the herbaceous layer is inaccurate and inadequate.
Here is a corrected version. Plant community classification is: 1-Nevada County Natural Resources Report (NCNRR); 2-Natural Communities List-CNDDB/CDFW (NCL); 3-Wildlife Habitats-CDFW (WHR).

Corrected Dominant Herbaceous Plant Community Description
Barrens and Herbaceous (NCNRR)
(NCL: annual (non-native)/perennial grassland and native/non-native herbaceous [41.640.00, 42.026.00, 42.044.00, 44.150.00]; WHR annual and perennial grass/forb).

The site is distinguished by the presence of quite a high diversity of California native plants considering its small size. Locally dominant stands of native grasses and herbs are found on this small parcel. The native herb/grass community comprises that of a relict native plant meadow—therefore it is also important historically. The native herb flora in Alta Sierra has been basically extirpated by intermittent logging, the introduction of weeds by the construction/construction equipment from long ago, and wide-spread distribution of an old SCS seed mix full of weeds, including rosy clover that has completely out competed and replaced native clovers. (It is almost impossible to find a native clover anywhere in W. Nevada County). "Brush clearing" has put the final nail in the coffin for native herb species diversity in Alta Sierra. It is rare to see any place in Alta Sierra with a palette of California native grasses and herbs now.

A significant number of primarily native flora are missing from the flora list for the project. Many of these species are perennial and evident throughout the year so it is unclear how they could be missed. Also, the surveys were done too late (June 2014). The most important period for plant surveys, early-mid spring (March-June), was completely missed. Owing to the drought and climate change, the flowering and fruiting times of plants are accelerated and they can set fruit as early as June. The best time to do plant surveys, keeping in mind climate change is causing earlier flowering times, is now generally January-June.

Species missing from the flora list and components of the herb layer are:
nn=non-native:

FAMILY SPECIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agavaceae</td>
<td>Soap plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiaceae</td>
<td>Hartweg's tauschia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>California aster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California mugwort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain tarweed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
<td>Moneywort/Penny Wort (Lunaria annua)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprifoliaceae</td>
<td>Hairy honeysuckle (Lonicera hispida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvulaceae</td>
<td>Field bindweed (Convolvulus arvensis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>Broadleaf lupine (Lupinus latifolius)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra pea</td>
<td>(Lathyrus nevadensis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur pea</td>
<td>(Lathyrus sulphureus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvaceae</td>
<td>Checker mallow (Sidalcea malviflora asprella)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onagraceae</td>
<td>Diamond fairy fan/Diamond clarkia (Clarkia rhomboidea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poaceae</td>
<td>California brome grass (Bromus carinatus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California melic grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nnnRattail fescue</td>
<td>(Festuca myuros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nnnSilvery hairgrass</td>
<td>(Aira caryophylla)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nnnWild oat</td>
<td>(Avena barbata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Sticky cinquefoil (Potentilla (&quot;Drymocallis&quot;) glandulosa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themidaceae</td>
<td>Wild hyacinth (Dichelostemma capitatum)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife/Birds

4
The property provides potential nesting habitat for a number of bird species, including raptors. No specific surveys were done for wildlife on the property including for amphibians and reptiles. These surveys should be completed.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Based on a review of the documents available on the County website for this project, a thorough and complete archaeological/cultural resources survey is lacking. Black oaks are on the property. Black oaks were the most important oak species for native peoples in California. The site allows views of the surrounding area and is just east of Rattlesnake Creek and its tributaries. It was likely used/occupied by native peoples of the region area and should be surveyed for past and "recent past" archaeological and cultural resources as required by CEQA and in compliance with Nevada County Code.

Native plants and ecosystems are not only ecologically/environmentally significant, they are also historically significant therefore their historical and cultural significance should be included under historical and cultural resources.

CALIFORNIA IS IN A DROUGHT; THIS PROJECT WILL WORSEN DROUGHT CONDITIONS OVER TIME

It is well established that open land, filter strips, native vegetation, etc. serve the extremely important purpose of allowing rainwater to soak back into the ground. Asphalt sheets rainfall/pollution off the site, overwhelming our local creeks. It also transports this precious water out of our watersheds. Our native vegetation not only prevents erosion but enables this precious rainwater to recharge local aquifers.

Not only is it now mandated by the state, but as a community we should do everything we can to preserve local water supplies. It's pretty obvious bulldozing over a functioning oak woodland for an asphalt parking lot for a business that will use hundreds of gallons of water over time to maintain itself, have a parking lot that will increase sheet runoff and carry the waste from cars (gasoline, anti-freeze, lubricants--everything associated with the modern day vehicle) into our local creek/the groundwater (while the store will most likely go out of business)--that this is NOT in the best interest of conserving our local water supplies.

The oak woodland on site serves a tremendous number of ecosystem services, particularly because it does act as a buffer between continuous development in that area.

ECOSYSTEM SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE OAK WOODLAND

What impact will the loss of these services have on the environment? This should be analyzed under cumulative impacts.

Old-growth forests and woodlands serve a multitude of ecosystem services (Cain et al., 2014; Perry et al., 2008; hundreds of additional sources).

Water Conservation

Research has shown that woody plants (vines, trees, and shrubs), funnel water deep into groundwater aquifers/fracture locations. The water follows the deep root channels made by woody plants and in this way, woody plants help recharge groundwater (Perry et al., 2008; Wood, et al., 2006). Non-native grasses, that are also spreading due to air pollution, specifically nitrogen deposition, do not serve this function. Therefore, the removal of old growth trees with significant root channels to groundwater threatens local water supplies.

Preservation of Genetically Superior Tree Stock
Removal of old growth trees is not in the best interest of maintaining the genetic vigor of remaining forests and woodlands because old growth trees are obviously genetically superior or they would not still be around after 100-200-300 years. This in fact is one reason for ordinances across the United States to protect old-growth trees.

Trees Including Old Growth Trees Act as "Ecosystem Engineers" (Jones et al 1994)

It is depressing that I have to include a paragraph to my county about the benefits of trees when this very county includes in its own resources code a provision to protect old-growth trees but routinely ignores its own resources code and in this case, for a redundant use--a box store--that will destroys a population of old growth. Nonetheless, let me explain why trees are important. I can no longer assume this is common sense.

Trees are considered "bioengineers" because they change whatever environment they grow in in a way that greatly benefits OTHER species and the soil environment. Trees provide shade and cover. In a hot and dry climate like ours, retaining soil moisture and reducing ground temperatures is critical. Trees act as windbreaks, reducing further drying. (The "fuels clearing" is actually creating more fire dangerous conditions because it is opening up cool shaded areas, drying out the soil, and promoting the invasion of invasive grasses that are considered flash fuels and can start a fire very quickly. The drying self-perpetuates (called the edge effect) causing drying as far as 400 meters into the uncut area (previous references)). The layers/leaves of a tree capture rainfall and funnel it back into the ground through canopy drip.

Tree roots stabilize soils particularly on steep slopes, again something 99.9% of other places understand but not Nevada County which is why steep slopes and banks are collapsing/eroding in Alta Sierra. The removal of the shade and cover on the banks then, owing to the edge effect, causes the drying of the area around it creating a vicious cycle of erosion that in some cases may threaten homes. (It is likely the only way Nevada County is going to "get" this is the way Nevada County insists on getting everything (as nothing seems to punch through its institutional arrogance)--a lawsuit. A lawsuit the county will contest using our tax dollars).

The tree continues to provide services even as and after it dies--the fallen limbs/trunk provide habitat for many organisms, and the decaying matter rebuilds the soil.

Trees hold carbon, preventing the release of carbon into the atmosphere thereby mitigating the effects of climate change. To cut down trees is to basically cut our own throats as a society. In many places that get it, the Bartlome's could apply to use their forest to sell carbon credits. In other words, they would make just as much or more money PRESERVING the forest than hacking it down for an ugly pathetic box store full of crap from China that will probably go out of business. What a sad trade off and what a sad commentary on our society and this county.

A native tree is a miracle, a gift from God that benefits every living organism in a community--benefits the ENTIRE community, human and non-human-- but apparently not as much as a Dollar General Store.

15065. Mandatory Findings of Significance.

(a) (1). The project has the potential to: substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of fish or wildlife species: cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels--; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered rare, or threatened species; or eliminate important exampled of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

Section 15126.2. Consideration and Discussion of Significant Environmental Impacts.

The following must also be incorporated into this section of the Draft EIR.

Section 15126.6. Alternatives to the Proposed Project.
The Draft EIR must include analysis of a/the "no-project" alternative (e) in comparison and contract to the proposed
project proposals.

Section 15144. Forecasting.
Drafting an EIR or preparing a Negative Declaration necessarily involves some degree of forecasting. While foreseeing the unforeseeable is not possible, an agency must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.

Nevada County must forecast not only permanent cumulative effects of the project on environmental and cultural resources but also if the business being proposed is a financially viable economic venture in the long-term. The removal of an old-growth woodland for yet another box store that will/may go out of business within a couple years, or the intention to undertake the project primarily as a speculative venture (knowingly installing the business with the intention to "get out" of it and sell it to someone else, such as Walmart) must be included in the analysis of the project. The applicant must be forthcoming with this information. Also, a bond must be required by the applicant to cover any costs in the event the business fails or in the event the applicant was not forthcoming with future plans and the community is expected to shoulder the burden for this.

Residential Infill

In the event this project is considered to be a Residential Infill project under current County Planning and Zoning/General Plan, it must also meet the requirements of the following:

Section 15192. Threshold Requirements for Exemptions. Residential Infill Projects.

Section 15332. In-fill Development Projects.
Section 15192.

(d) The site of the project:

(2) Does not have any value as an ecological community upon which wild animals, birds, plants, fish, amphibians, and invertebrates depend for their conservation and protection.

Response: The project site harbors significant wildlife and plant habitat.

(3). Does not harm any species protected by the federal ESA, Native Plant Protection Act, or is otherwise included in Fish and Game (Wildlife) Codes (Division 2 and 3).

Response: Because surveys of the site were so incomplete, this cannot be stated for sure.

(4) Does not cause the destruction or removal of any species protected by local ordinance in effect at the time the application for the project was deemed complete.

Response: THE PROPOSAL VIOLATES THE COUNTY'S OWN ORDINANCES AND LAND USE CODE not the least of which is considering the complete destruction of a landmark oak woodland:

Nevada County Land Resources Code-Resource Standards- Section L-II 4.3.1

Purpose

"The primary purpose of site development resource standards is to avoid the impact of development projects on sensitive environmental resources (i.e. Nevada County Code Section L-II 4.3.15 Trees (Landmark Oaks)) and natural site constraints. Where avoidance is not possible, development should minimize impacts in a reasonable fashion that strikes a balance between allowing development of the project site and protecting the resource or avoiding the constraint. Standards shall ensure protection of the County's unique character; environmentally sensitive resources,
and important agricultural, mineral, and timber resources. Standards shall also assist in preventing and reducing public health and safety hazards associated with wildland fires, floods, avalanches, and earthquakes. Standards are not in lieu of, but are in addition to, the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

In addition, standards shall be used to assist in proper community design, provide transitions between various land uses, reduce potential land use conflicts, enhance native vegetation and landscaping, and provide for open space."

The Dollar General project violates:

- Avoidance of sensitive environmental resources by destroying them.
- Does NOT strike a balance between allowing the development and protecting sensitive resources.
- Does NOT protect the County's unique character part of which is our native (native meaning they live here like residents that have lived here for decades or were born here; they have the same rights) flora and oaks that occur no where else in the world but in our region. These ecosystems also preserve HISTORY-locally, regionally, state-wide, nationally, and globally, nothing less than a historic structure. They have evolved in these locations over thousands of years. They comprise HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT resources in addition to environmental.
- Does not preserve public health and safety; whether anyone in the county wants to admit it or not, due to climatic changes/lack of precipitation, Alta Sierra soils are becoming more unstable, particularly from county-sponsored native tree and shrub cutting on steep slopes/embankments. In some cases where slopes are eroding or have already collapsed, this is threatening homes. This is not expected to change based on current soil science. The placement of this store at this location, could initiate soil erosion of catastrophic levels. This is not in the interest of public health and safety nor is putting the store on a dangerous curve, in a dangerous location.
- Regarding the last paragraph of these standards (starting with "In Addition..."), this project does none of these things.

4 (g). The project does not have a significant effect on historical resources pursuant to Section 21084.1 of the Public Resource Code.

Response: Because surveys of the site were so incomplete, this cannot be stated for sure.

4 (l). Site does not present a landslide hazard, flood plain, flood way, or restriction zone, or the applicable general plan or zoning ordinance contains provisions to mitigate the risks of a landslide or flood.

Response: Development of the site will result in stormwater impacts to Alta Sierra Drive, Little Valley Road, and the property owners/watershed below these two roads.

4 (m). The project site is not located or developed open space.

Response: Very conveniently, Nevada County never created the General Plan mandated open space program otherwise, this would have perhaps been designated a park long ago.

Thank you for considering my comments. Please keep me posted on the progress of this project.

PDF Copy emailed to Mr. Barrington on February 7, 2016.

Signed,

Virginia Moran, Ecologist, M.S. and B.S.
15495 Nancy Way
Alta Sierra Subdivision
Grass Valley, CA 95949
www.ecooutreachvsm.com
vsm@ecooutreachvsm.com

Mailing address:
POB 2858
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-272-7132

Major References:
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All County Parties Associated with Dollar General Project:
Ed Scofield, Chair/County Supervisor
Tyler Barrington, Planner
Brian Foss, Zoning
Rick Haffey, CEO
Alison Barratt-Green, County Counsel

Additional Interested Parties

Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Subject: Submittal of Comments in Opposition of Dollar General Store, Alta Sierra Subdivision; General Observations About Nevada County's "Planning" Process.

General Comments on Nevada County Planning

Nevada County should not still be learning how to do proper community planning at this point. It's 2015. I have lived in many locations throughout my adult life and can say that of all of them, the place that seems least able or willing to engage in true community planning is Nevada County, CA. The Dollar General project is yet another example of this.

Alta Sierra has gone through quite a few contentious experiences in the past few years: trying to put in trails after the fact; the ASPOA nightmare that is only now settling down; the Emigrant Trail conflict; the cutting of vegetation on private land (including mine) with no public involvement/notice (in some cases resulting in the possible loss of property values); the removal of woody vegetation on steep slopes/banks which is now causing instability and collapse of slopes throughout the subdivision, including de-stabilizing properties/homes; and not to be outdone, now the attempted ram-rodding of the Dollar General store into the subdivision.

One provision of the Alta Sierra and Lone Star developments was that the Emigrant Trail and public trails would be provided for in this part of the county. The county knowingly dropped any provision for this leaving literally thousands of residents without parks, public trails, open space. Despite also that it is an element in the County General Plan, the county has never provided county trails, parks, open space. They have knowingly dumped this responsibility on the backs of the state (state parks) and federal government. They have dumped this responsibility on the backs of the residents and local NGO's. The county has also ignored the Quimby Act. Decades later, as the population grows, of course, the residents want these things.

The only place we can walk in Alta Sierra is literally in the roads which, again per "excellent" county planning, are dangerous. I have been confronted by my fellow residents in Alta Sierra who ask who I am and why I am walking down their street. They complain about this--the dogs, the people. Once I explain to them that we have no trails, no parks, not even sidewalks, and we HAVE to walk in the roads here to "recreate", they understand and back off however--this puts pressure on certain areas of the subdivision to support the recreational needs of the residents--recreational needs the county ignored completely and now has put on the backs of the residents, the result being, it causes occasional friction between us. Decades later, residents want the trails but it is too late. You don't put in a subdivision then decades later decide you want to put trails through people's back yards you never bothered to install during the construction phase. The resident's resistance to this is completely justified. You put the trails/open space in BEFORE and/or DURING the construction; THEN you sell the lots, homes,
with the trails clearly established; the potential residents know where the trails are, where the public will be funneled to...but not in Nevada County. Also, it has been shown that public trails/parks add significantly to property values.

The lack of leadership on the part of this county to foresee this demand as the population increased, meet the requirements of the Quimby Act, to provide these basic needs for its residents has since caused conflict between the residents. Then the county "steps in" to break it all up in some farce of being the great peace-keepers but it traces back to something the county caused to begin with. There has some been contrition on this point, but not enough. Basically Nevada County has been about profit, not providing the highest quality planning for its existing residents. The Dollar General project is just another example of business as usual.

Nevada County is opts out for lawsuits--spending public dollars that could be spent on real community planning--to defend itself against its own citizens; citizens entirely justified to be upset. It's an "US" versus "THEM" scenario and how tragic that instead of the county being our partner, looking out for us, we are put on the defensive--hiring lawyers, etc. just to maintain our quality of life and to life our lives in peace.

General Comments-Dollar General Project

Violation of Administrative Procedures Act and CEQA

The County engaged in fait accompli practices meaning they approved this project (IS/MND) prior to implementation of the proper administrative and regulatory procedures under CEQA. Administrative and Regulatory procedures for this project have not been followed and the county is now trying to play "catch-up" in a knee-jerk response to a community that should have been consulted months before this project was even proposed, let alone quietly and quickly approved. The county has violated the Administrative Procedures Act and CEQA. This is the first thing and should be the basis of legal action.

I called the morning of March 11, 2015 about the "zoning hearing" for the Dollar General project. Here is what I was told: "it's not a public hearing"; "you will not get a chance to speak"; "it's just a meeting about the current zoning": "you don't need to come". I don't know who was on duty at the Zoning Counter that day but this is what they told me. Intentional or not, this was in fact, wrong. I received a phone call that night from a neighbor asking me where I was.

The way this entire thing has been handled is slipshod, irregular, sporadic, and in violation of CEQA. Also, the county does not apply the standards for compliance with local code/regulations equitably. I have been a consulting biologist in this county for over ten years. Many of my former clients have had to "jump through" far more "hoops" to consider taking down even ONE landmark oak. This has meant additional costs for landmark oak surveys, reports, habitat management plans, mitigation plans. In fact, I just finished a survey for a family in south county that wants to put a pool in next to their home. The impacts are minimal. The county sent me back out there to double check no landmark oaks would be affected--there were only TWO trees that could be potentially affected and they did not mean the minimum dbh criteria. I find it intriguing that this Dollar General project was approved (and so quickly!) when an entire landmark oak woodland grows on the project site. Apparently, small local landowners have to go through more demanding "hoops" if you will, than corporations. Why is this?

Specific Comments

It is common knowledge that the shopping center in Alta Sierra has never really been able to sustain itself. I have lived here over a decade and have seen many businesses come and go. "The rate of commercial turnover of the smaller businesses here is really high anyway but especially the shopping center in Alta Sierra," is a quote from a
local commercial real estate agent I know who gave me permission to use his name but I am not going to out of respect for him. It's not like he needs to tell us! Just live here a few years and you see it. The only businesses in the Alta Sierra Shopping Center that have remained viable (for over a couple years) is the store and the pizza place. This is it. The theme of the shopping center is/was that of a "Swiss" or Alpine Village. A Dollar General does not fit into this "theme" however diluted through time.

(As a side note, the business center would be successful if the type of businesses the residents need and want were placed there; listening to my neighbors over the years, this includes: a picnic spot, such as that offered on the space of land slated for the DG Store, a copy shop, a good restaurant that serves breakfast, a Trader Joe's (that would go where the current store is located), an ice cream shop, a bakery, a doggie day care/dog boarding business—these are the kinds of businesses that are logically near and thrive near a residential area but for whatever reason, again, Nevada County and perhaps the owners of the shopping center do not get this. It's called "outward planning" based not on what the County wants (more $$$ from whoever) or a scattershot approach by the property owners (whoever they can get rent from); it assesses FIRST what the COMMUNITY wants and bases decisions on this. If you look at successful towns across America, their "outward"-based planning is the cause of their success and with this comes regular rent/tax revenue and happy residents).

The county seems to like redundancy or is so blinded with greed regarding the taxes it will bring in, that it continuously approves developments of the exact same kind literally next to one another--example: the multiple drug stores in Brunswick Basin. The county does not seem to care if these businesses then go OUT of business, if they are viable in the long-term, if they increase congestion, threaten pedestrians...It is pretty obvious Nevada County is driven by money, planning coming second if at all. 'Let the residents fight it out while we increase our tax base (which insures our paychecks)'--this is the definition of "planning" by Nevada County. In keeping with this theme, once again, the County has approved a store next to a store. Not only this but it will require the extirpation of a so-called "protected" resource in the Nevada County Code--a landmark oak woodland. For this, there was no public involvement; there was only stamping the permits as quickly as possible and ramming through the CEQA process. Here we go again.

The approval of this project at this location violates the county's own Resources Code and CEQA policy of "avoid, minimize, mitigate" based on the presence of environmentally sensitive resources. FYI, this is from the COUNTY'S OWN STANDARDS:

**Nevada County Land Resources Code-Resource Standards- Section L-II 4.3.1**

**Purpose**

"The primary purpose of site development resource standards is to avoid the impact of development projects on sensitive environmental resources (i.e. Nevada County Code Section L-II 4.3.15 Trees (Landmark Oaks)) and natural site constraints. Where avoidance is not possible, development should minimize impacts in a reasonable fashion that strikes a balance between allowing development of the project site and protecting the resource or avoiding the constraint. Standards shall ensure protection of the County's unique character; environmentally sensitive resources, and important agricultural, mineral, and timber resources. Standards shall also assist in preventing and reducing public health and safety hazards associated with wildland fires, floods, avalanches, and earthquakes. Standards are not in lieu of, but are in addition to, the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

In addition, standards shall be used to assist in proper community design, provide transitions between various land uses, reduce potential land use conflicts, enhance native vegetation and landscaping, and provide for open space."
The Dollar General project violates:

- Avoidance of sensitive environmental resources by destroying them.
- Does NOT strike a balance between allowing the development and protecting sensitive resources.
- Does NOT protect the County's unique character part of which is our native (native meaning they live here like residents that have lived here for decades or were born here; they have the same rights) flora and oaks that occur no where else in the world but in our region. These ecosystems also preserve HISTORY-locally, regionally, state-wide, nationally, and globally, nothing less than a historic structure. They have evolved in these locations over thousands of years. They comprise HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT resources in addition to environmental.
- Does not preserve public health and safety; whether anyone in the county wants to admit it or not, due to climatic changes/lack of precipitation, Alta Sierra soils are becoming more unstable, particularly from county-sponsored native tree and shrub cutting on steep slopes/embankments. In some cases where slopes are eroding or have already collapsed, this is threatening homes. This is not expected to change based on current soil science. The placement of this store at this location, could initiate soil erosion of catastrophic levels. This is not in the interest of public health and safety nor is putting the store on a dangerous curve, in a dangerous location.
- Regarding the last paragraph of these standards (starting with "In Addition..."), this project does none of these things.

PARCEL SIZE

The proposed location for this store is not even one acre. It is inconceivable to me how the County could approve this store not only in a horrible location traffic-wise, thereby threatening the health and safety of the citizens and residents because there WILL be more accidents and wildlife kills, but simply because the parcel is so small! I have tried to picture the store, based on the current dimensions, on this site and it does not even seem possible it would "fit". If it is made to fit, it is going to be such an eye-sore and so damage the area, increase susceptibility of erosion, urban runoff, that it will continne to degrade the area long after it is built.

IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES WHEN DOLLAR GENERAL STORES ARE NOT PROFITABLE

Irretrievable commitment of resources refers to the simple fact that once you destroy, invoke an intentional extinction event, you can never ever replace what you destroyed. Never--the trade-off being a locally beautiful, historic, reasonable high biodiversity landmark oak grove that provides ecosystem services for the community--for a likely non-viable "variety" store that will most likely go out of business. This means, it's ok, in the eyes of the county, to destroy this piece of Nevada County history (it is no different than any other historic arifact/building/structure) for something that that provides a redundant service, will be ugly, will increase sheet/urban run off into our local creek, is not successful other places, and could end up like so many of the other businesses in the Alta Sierra Shopping Center--empty. This is the trade-off the county apparently is willing to make. We will never ever ever get that oak woodland back.

Of course, there is the hypocrisy of the "grand-standing" over the non-native ornamental redwoods being cut down in Penn Valley for which the county fined the landowner $30,000+ dollars while at the same time, the county was approving the complete decimation of a landmark oak woodland protected by its own code.

(Side Note: One of the reasons bees are dying is lack of wildflowers as the many of the practices for "fire clearing" have only ENHANCED the spread of flammable native grasses. When I first came to Nevada County, it was in 1975--the roads here were bordered by beautiful native wildflowers now gone, permanently, due to actions of public agencies/the county--the result being our roadsides now are lined in extremely flammable invasive grasses--bees cannot nectar off these plants. The lack of caring/intelligence of personnel in these
agencies is one of the problems as the herbicides that are used target "dicots"=wildflowers and leave the
"monocots"=flammable invasive grasses. The tragedy is no one seems have noticed this and now our roadsides
are more dangerous than ever now forcing us into this expensive endless cycle to get rid of the invasive grasses
CAUSED by the actions of these agencies themselves; now even the President of the United States is calling for
the mass planting of native wildflowers to help the bees--to say this issue has become absurd is an
understatement).

The past few months, I have found myself sitting in the parking lots of two Dollar General Stores: Grass Valley
and Marysville. (I sat in my car and graded papers). While I realize this is anecdotal, I wanted to see for myself
just how busy these stores get. Each time, I sat in my car for 45-60 minutes for a total of two times per location
(2 hours+/-per location). Times were 5:30 Monday and Wednesday, Marysville; and 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m.
Tuesdays, Grass Valley location. At both locations, the maximum number of cars I saw in the parking lot at any
one time was no more than four cars. Max number of cars observed over the entire period at the Marysville
location for both visits: 6. Max at the Grass Valley location: 5. If this is typical for a store of this type, then I do
not understand how they stay in business. I would also like to know when they go out of business, what will the
tax payer be responsible for as far as the damages done to the environment from the new store, erosion,
vandalism, once the store is shut down. When this store goes out of business, what will we, as residents and tax
payers, be responsible for paying for?

At the Marysville location, I "interviewed" four people entering the store. I asked them one question. "Is this a
dollar store, do you know?" Three of them said yes. One of them didn't really know. I then explained to all of
them that "Dollar General" is NOT a "dollar store". They did not know this. I feel this store engages in false
advertising and knows this. "Dollar General" needs to disclose, clearly, that it is NOT a "dollar store."

I guess the only way these stores stay in business is through "market saturation", meaning building a lot of them
because it sure wasn't demand. At no time were either of these stores "busy" in any real sense.

BIOLOGICAL SURVEY*
nn=non-native

*Any revisions to the biological report/lists that include this information must designate the source, in this case,
Virginia Moran, Biologist. The consultants, project proponent may not supplement inadequate information
without citing the source: "Virginia Moran, Information Provided in Project Comments To Supplement
Incorrect/Inadequate Information".

The biological site description for the herbaceous layer is inaccurate and inadequate.

Here is a corrected version. Plant community classification is: 1-Nevada County Natural Resources Report
(NCNRR); 2-Natural Communities List-CNDDB/CDFW (NCL); 3-Wildlife Habitats-CDFW (WHR).

Corrected Dominant Herbaceous Plant Community Description

Barrens and Herbaceous (NCNRR)
(NCL: annual (non-native)/perennial grassland and native/non-native herbaceous [41.640.00, 42.026.00,
42.044.00, 44.150.00] ; WHR annual and perennial grass/herb).

The site is distinguished by the presence of quite a high diversity of California native plants considering its small
size. Locally dominant stands of native grasses and herbs are found on this small parcel. The native herb/grass
community comprises that of a relict native plant meadow--therefore it is also important historically. The native
herb flora in Alta Sierra has been basically extirpated by intermittent logging, the introduction of weeds by the
construction/construction equipment from long ago, and wide-spread distribution of an old SCS seed mix full of weeds, including rosy clover that has completely out competed and replaced native clovers. (It is almost impossible to find a native clover anywhere in W. Nevada County). "Brush clearing" has put the final nail in the coffin for native herb species diversity in Alta Sierra. It is rare to see any place in Alta Sierra with a palette of California native grasses and herbs now.

A significant number of primarily native flora are missing from the flora list for the project. Many of these species are perennial and evident throughout the year so it is unclear how they could be missed. Also, the surveys were done too late (June 2014). The most important period for plant surveys, early-mid spring (March-June), was completely missed. Owing to the drought and climate change, the flowering and fruiting times of plants are accelerated and they can set fruit as early as June. The best time to do plant surveys, keeping in mind climate change is causing earlier flowering times, is now generally January-June.

Species missing from the flora list and components of the herb layer are:
nn=non-native:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>SPECIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agavaceae</td>
<td>Soap plant (<em>Chlorogalum pomeridianum</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apiaceae</td>
<td>Hartweg's tauschia (<em>Tauschia hartwegii</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteraceae</td>
<td>California aster (<em>Symphyotrichum chilense</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California mugwort (<em>Artemisia douglasiana</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain tarweed (<em>Madia glomerata</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brassicaceae</td>
<td>Moneywort/Penny Wort (<em>Lunaria annua</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caprifoliaceae</td>
<td>Hairy honeysuckle (<em>Lonicera hispidula</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convolvulaceae</td>
<td>Field bindweed (<em>Convolvulus arvensis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabaceae</td>
<td>Broadleaf lupine (<em>Lupinus latifolius</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra pea (<em>Lathyrus nevadensis</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sulphur pea (<em>Lathyrus sulphureus</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvaceae</td>
<td>Checker mallow (<em>Sidalcea malviflora asprella</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onagraceae</td>
<td>Diamond fairy fan/Diamond Clarkia (<em>Clarkia rhomboidea</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poaceae</td>
<td>California brome grass (<em>Bromus carinatus</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California melic grass (<em>Melica californica</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rattail fescue (<em>Festuca myuros</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Silvery hairgrass (<em>Aira caryophyllea</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wild oat (<em>Avena barbata</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosaceae</td>
<td>Sticky cinquefoil (<em>Potentilla (&quot;Drymocallis&quot;) glandulosa</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themidaceae</td>
<td>California wild hyacinth (<em>Dichelostemma capitatum</em>)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wildlife/Birds

The property provides potential nesting habitat for a number of bird species. No specific surveys were done for wildlife on the property including for amphibians and reptiles. These surveys should be completed.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

Based on a review of the documents available on the County website for this project, a thorough and complete archaeological/cultural resources survey is lacking. Black oaks are on the property. Black oaks were the most important oak species for native peoples in California. The site allows views of the surrounding area and is just
east of Rattlesnake Creek and its tributaries. It was likely used/occupied by native peoples of the region area and should be surveyed for past and "recent past" archaeological and cultural resources as required by CEQA and in compliance with Nevada County Code.

CALIFORNIA IS IN A DROUGHT; THIS PROJECT WILL WORSEN DROUGHT CONDITIONS OVER TIME

It is well established that open land, filter strips, native vegetation, etc. serve the extremely important purpose of allowing rainwater to soak back into the ground. Asphalt sheets rainfall/pollution off the site, overwhelming our local creeks. It also transports this precious water out of our watersheds. Our native vegetation not only prevents erosion but enables this precious rainwater to recharge **local** aquifers.

Not only is it now mandated by the state, but as a community we should do everything we can to preserve local water supplies. It's pretty obvious bulldozing over a functioning oak woodland for an asphalt parking lot for a business that will use hundreds of gallons of water over time to maintain itself, have a parking lot that will increase sheet runoff and carry the waste from cars (gasoline, anti-freeze, lubricants--everything associated with the modern day vehicle) into our local creek/the groundwater (while the store will most likely go out of business)--that this is **NOT** in the best interest of conserving our local water supplies.

The oak woodland on site serves a tremendous number of ecosystem services, particularly because it does act as a buffer between continuous development in that area.

ECOSYSTEM SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE OAK WOODLAND

Old-growth forests and woodlands serve a multitude of ecosystem services (Cain et al., 2014; Perry et al., 2008; hundreds of additional sources).

Water Conservation

Research has shown that woody plants (vines, trees, and shrubs), funnel water deep into groundwater aquifers/fracture locations. The water follows the deep root channels made by woody plants and in this way, woody plants help recharge groundwater (Perry et al., 2008; Wood, et al., 2006). Non-native grasses, that are also spreading due to air pollution, specifically nitrogen deposition, do not serve this function. Therefore, the removal of old growth trees with significant root channels to groundwater threatens local water supplies.

Preservation of Genetically Superior Tree Stock

Removal of old growth trees is not in the best interest of maintaining the genetic vigor of remaining forests and woodlands because old growth trees are obviously genetically superior or they would not still be around after 100-200-300 years. This in fact is one reason for ordinances across the United States to protect old-growth trees.

Trees Including Old Growth Trees Act as "Ecosystem Engineers" (Jones et al 1994)

It is depressing that I have to include a paragraph to my county about the benefits of trees when this very county includes in its own resources code a provision to protect old-growth trees but routinely ignores its own resources code and in this case, for a redundant use--a box store--that will destroys a population of old growth. Nonetheless, let me explain why trees are important. I can no longer assume this is common sense.

Trees are considered "bioengineers" because they change whatever environment they grow in in a way that greatly benefits OTHER species and the soil environment.
Trees provide shade and cover. In a hot and dry climate like ours, retaining soil moisture and reducing ground temperatures is critical. Trees act as windbreaks, reducing further drying. The "fuels clearing" is actually creating more fire dangerous conditions because it is opening up cool shaded areas, drying out the soil, and promoting the invasion of invasive grasses that are considered flash fuels and can start a fire very quickly. The drying self-perpetuates (called the edge effect) causing drying as far as 400 meters into the uncut area (previous references)). The layers/leaves of a tree capture rainfall and funnel it back into the ground through canopy drip.

Tree roots stabilize soils particularly on steep slopes, again something 99.9% of other places understand but not Nevada County which is why steep slopes and banks are collapsing/eroding in Alta Sierra. The removal of the shade and cover on the banks then, owing to the edge effect, causes the drying of the area around it creating a vicious cycle of erosion that in some cases may threaten homes. (It is likely the only way Nevada County is going to "get" this is the way Nevada County insists on getting everything (as nothing seems to punch through its institutional arrogance)--a lawsuit. A lawsuit the county will contest using our tax dollars).

The tree continues to provide services even as and after it dies--the fallen limbs/trunk provide habitat for many organisms, and the decaying matter rebuilds the soil.

Trees hold carbon, preventing the release of carbon into the atmosphere thereby mitigating the effects of climate change. To cut down trees is to basically cut our own throats as a society. In many places that get it, the Bartlome's could apply to use their forest to sell carbon credits. In other words, they would make just as much or more money PRESERVING the forest than hacking it down for an ugly pathetic box store full of crap from China that will probably go out of business. What a sad trade off and what a sad commentary on our society and this county.

A native tree is a miracle, a gift from God that benefits every living organism in a community--benefits the ENTIRE community, human and non-human-- but apparently not as much as a Dollar General Store.

EVALUATION OF MITIGATION PROPOSAL

I certainly support the preservation of the 35+- acres in Clover Valley (the Bach parcels). I know this site because I did the surveys for the original landowner/speculator builder. I tried to explain to this person that this was not a good site for a home (for many reasons) This is yet another example of a project the county should have rejected outright. The insanely steep "driveway" crosses and is above S. Wolf Creek. The home was going in on a steep slope in an isolated part of the slope. If we are talking fire danger here, this is it, yet the county probably would have gleefully approved this home site if the landowner had not gone belly-up. (No hypocrisy here re: fire danger).

This is not appropriate mitigation for the Dollar General project. The county needs to reject the Dollar General Project and preserve the oak woodlands on the parcel, period.

I also reject this mitigation based on documentation by BYLT that if the land is used as mitigation, they are going to go in and make it "fire safe" which means intentional action to take a pristine, stable steep slope above S. Wolf Creek, and intentionally destabilize it, causing a potential collapse into the creek. Doing this with a masticator or just hand tools...either way, this is ridiculous. While pulling out the non-native weeds/plants carefully may make some sense (though I did not see any years ago but the invasive spurge is spreading in that area), there can be nothing more INSANE then going into this beautiful, pristine, STABLE STEEP area and intentionally degrading, decimating it by removing the native shrubs and trees. Here is something else I will clue you in on--shade repels weeds. Shade repels invasive grasses. Shade repels scotch broom. Removing woody native plant cover CAUSES THE INVASION OF NONATIVE WEEDS and often it is a permanent type conversion. This then makes an area even more fire prone due to the change in species composition and the
edge effect. Also, this ridiculous proposal will do NOTHING to stop a fire. This is what it will do—destroy an area of decent biodiversity and introduce weeds/allow weeds already in the area to establish, destabilize the slope, potentially causing deposition of sediment into the watershed below, and increase fire danger.

I am not convinced that the BYLT is competent when it comes to proper land management decisions. This is based on fact. Theilsen Park in Alta Sierra was a haven of biodiversity before the "Land Trust" got a hold of it. It was covered in native lilies and even had a small population of native orchids on it. I took photographers to see these plants. All these populations have been destroyed not only by the BYLT but also by California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife that did a "habitat enhancement" project there, at taxpayer expense. While the removal of the scotch broom is of tremendous value to the ecology of the preserve, this was at the cost of degrading the remaining biodiversity of the "preserve". I shudder at the thought of the "Land Trust" managing the Bartlome parcel and beg for contrition on their part that they don't always know what they are doing.

"The Owners Want to Make Money"

I heard this over and over again at meetings and among people I have talked to about this project. We all want to make money. I understand. In order to request the property owners reconsider, they should be offered viable solutions that allow them to also earn income. Supposedly, the County maintains an "Tree Preservation Fund" (Trees Section L-II 4.3.15 C. No.4). The County should consider buying the land from the owners with this funding. The parcel could then be dedicated and left open.

It is not necessary to "do" anything to this parcel. The only recommendation is to remove the non-native plants (by hand) and allow the native grasses and wildflowers to take over these locations. Doing any more than this could in fact tip the fragile balance on the property toward the takeover by the nonnative plants on the property (they thrive on disturbance/mass soil movement). This is what will happen if the delicate balance there is degraded with mass soil movement. The area is fragile (think of it as a museum of the past which is what almost all our native ecosystems are now--museums of the past).

To reiterate, if a party took it over as a preserve, investment of time and resources would be nothing more than removing the non-native plants every few months otherwise there is NOTHING that has to be done. It is already in a (albeit fragile) balance. This is one reason why it has some remaining native plant biodiversity. Stick a picnic table at the top of the slope by the parking lot (at the maximum but you don't even need to do this), leave the little existing trail on it, and remove the invasive plants every few months. This is it.

If the county cannot buy the parcel from the owners, then the county should consider allowing the owners to use the parcel for the purposes of selling mitigation/carbon credits in order to preserve it. I am not writing this letter in any way to feather my own nest but this is a service my company can provide and/or I can put the owners in touch with companies that do this.

There is the option that the Alta Sierra Property Owner's Association could solicit donations in order to buy the parcel, again, minimal "management" is needed. Volunteers could remove the nonnative plants. Manage it as a "botanical preserve" open space buffer zone.

Landowners could pursue a Conservation Easement option. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife may have options for purchase as well.

I would be willing to help the owners, at no cost, find economically beneficial ways to preserve this piece of property and would request, with their approval, the area is called "Bartlome Preserve" in perpetuity. Their legacy will stand forever, their compassion for the community solidified, their contribution to preserving our local ecology sealed. This seems to me a far better legacy than yet another empty, decaying box/store in this
perpetually struggling shopping center.

CONCLUSION

I do not care how many additional "revised" reports the county posts. As an ecologist and resident of Alta Sierra, I am and will remain firmly opposed to this terrible project. I am also appalled that the county disregarded this community, almost completely, until we showed our disapproval. This is not "planning", fyi. **Rubber stamping permits and planning are not the same thing.** The county obviously does not respect its own residents enough to engage in real community planning; we are something to avoid, dodge, bully in order to broaden that tax base thereby insuring your own jobs. **Until you develop respect for your own citizenry enough that you engage in genuine community planning, please leave Alta Sierra out of it.**

Thank you for considering my comments. Please keep me posted on the progress of this project.

PDF Copy provided to county parties-consider signed

Virginia Moran, Ecologist, M.S. and B.S.
www.ecooutreachvsm.com
15495 Nancy Way
Alta Sierra Subdivision
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Mailing address:
POB 2858
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-272-7132

Major References:


Tyler Barrington

From: john murray <eldorado37@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 12:52 PM
To: Tyler Barrington; Ed Scofield
Subject: Dollar Genera Alta Sierra

A 9,100 square foot Dollar General Store with associated parking, lighting, signage and landscaping in the unincorporated area of western Nevada County at the following locations:
Alta Sierra (10166 Alta Sierra Drive, approximately 550 feet from State Highway 49)

Physical impacts that concern me are stated above, large obtrusive bldg., like the one in Grass Valley in a quiet neighborhood of rural pines and landscape, this is not needed in our area.
I watch the traffic at the one in GV and it never seems like anyone/cars in the parking lot, I admit that I have never been in the one there as I see no need to shop there, everything I personally need can be found at many stores already in existence in town.
Whomever is responsible for allowing this structure to be built in Alta Sierra should listen to the residents who live here and just tell them that this Store is not wanted or not needed.
Appreciate your time and effort for moderating all the meetings.

Thank you
John Murray
email: eldorado37@hotmail.com

Have a good day and Enjoy the ride!
I’m still at a loss to understand why anyone ever thought that we REALLY NEED a Dollar General store in Alta Sierra.

Apparently, from what I am hearing, the majority of residents do not want or need it. Why then, does it appear that it is out of our hands, and primarily in those of the property owner (Serge Bartlome) and the applicant (Dollar General), secondarily the County Planning Department (for review). It feels as if we are being forced into this situation regardless of the community’s wishes. It does not even come close to meeting the needs of our community.

Why do they feel this would be a good location for their project?? Would that be primarily monetary gain on the part of the property owner and applicant? (without regard for the needs of Alta Sierra Residents?...Which is somewhat of a conflict!)

Just because it is legal, does not mean they should be building this in Alta Sierra!! The destruction, negative visual impacts and degradation of our neighborhood is what we believe will happen.

Again, we do not need and do not want it! We believe it to be an EXTREMELY poor choice for this neighborhood. Our shopping will continue to be done in Grass Valley, Auburn or further, as we have for the last 30+ years, never at Dollar General.

We believe it will serve nothing, except to downgrade this neighborhood in a multitude of ways:

- Not the type of store Alta Sierra Residents frequent
- Extremely aesthetically unattractive building (ugly/does not fit this area)
- Building design in very poor taste for this area
- Terrible choice of merchandise
- Definitely not up to Alta Sierra standards
- Does not even come close to meeting the needs of our community

More importantly...just because you can, does not necessarily mean you should!!

Sherill Parker
jps4sep@suddenlink.net
During the Dollar General Mtg Jan 19, 2015 at AS Country Club, someone asked what would happen if the Dollar General Store did not prove to be a viable business. They were told that this did not pertain to the discussion at hand since the meeting was about the EIR and urban blight. I then asked the question "How is this not an EIR and Urban Blight" issue? Neither Tyler nor the other gentleman had any answer at all, actually they had nothing whatsoever to say...total silence.

If the business failed, and we were left with an empty building, the very real possibility of an unkempt lot (eyesore) with weeds, trash, rodents and such, vagrants, homeless using the building, graffiti, drugs & such, criminal activity, fire risks...how does this NOT pertain to Urban Blight and the EIR? All of which greatly impact everyone of Alta Sierra's residents in many ways (safety, property values, traffic issues & more) I see this a lot in the Sacramento area...and it sure looks like an environmental and urban blight issue to me.

Who would be responsible for removing the building and cleaning up the property? The property owner, Dollar General, the Developer, the county or??? A very important question I believe!

Sherill Parker
The concept of providing us with a service is good, but Dollar General does not do this. It impacts Alta Sierra (and all of Nevada County) in a very negative manner. Nothing about this project is aesthetically correct for our community and I see it as being in direct conflict with Alta Sierra Market and other businesses at the front of Alta Sierra.

The possible long term negative effects on property values for all of Nevada County are numerous. The fact that Dollar General seems to multiply like rabbits, once they get started, no telling how far it will go.

Maybe looking into upgrading Alta Sierra Market some, might be a better option. Sprucing up the current buildings in the front of Alta Sierra might also be worth looking into. Casa Las Katarinas has done this, and it seems to have been a very positive move on their part.

I am extremely concerned about the negative impacts (immediate & long term) on our properties in Alta Sierra, should this be given the go-ahead. Traffic issues, especially in a fire situation.

If the business failed, and we were left with an empty building, the very real possibility of an unkempt lot, with weeds, trash, rodents and such, vagrants, homeless using the building, graffiti, drugs & such, criminal activity, fire risks... all of which greatly impact everyone of Alta Sierra's residents in many ways (safety, property values, traffic issues & more) I see this a lot in the Sacramento area...and it sure looks like a huge environmental and urban blight issue to me.

Who would be responsible for removing the building and cleaning up the property? The property owner, Dollar General, the Developer, the county or?? A very important question I believe!

Sherill Parker
February 6, 2016

To: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
Planning Department  
Community Development Agency  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959

From: Julie Reaney  
10942 Henson Way  
Grass Valley, CA 95949  
challengen@cebridge.net

I realize that over the past year + I have sent more than a few letters of concern to you and Ed Scofield. I now have yet another opportunity to state my opposition to Dollar General’s presence in Alta Sierra. It is best summarized on that sign standing at the juncture of Little Valley Rd. and Alta Sierra Dr.:

“No Dollar General. This is not Roseville”…yet.

Per CEQA Guidelines, there are 18 Potential Environmental Effects for assessment. I will address two of the 15 EIR elements that appear to apply to Alta Sierra.

TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION

- I travel Alta Sierra Dr. almost daily at different times of the day. The State and County Engineering Regulations & Studies state this (A.S. Dr.) is a “major collector” which it certainly is. What is not adequately addressed is its current lack of safety let alone its future level, if Dollar General is built. What is addressed as engineers, is what they are expected to do by training and code. This consists mostly of measurements or conditions that either need or don’t need changing. Not safety outcomes. These lie with the developer and the Planning Department.

As is, A.S. Dr. is not a safe road, primarily because:

- Out-going, it has an inclining very tight “S” curve causing street traffic to back up as they enter or exit the one common driveway at the business center or as they go directly to Hwy-49. That driveway already has cars making sudden left or right turns into it with short or no notice & leaving even shorter stopping space for the car(s) behind them, partly due to the “S” curve.

- Even though Dollar General has offered, to “increase cuts & flares on the driveway entrance to allow better turning access for their long trucks & emergency vehicles”. This would do little to help automobiles enter the area during truck delivery times. In fact, it would again add to
traffic congestion, frustrate drivers who may lose their tempers or end up with minor car damage.

- The “S” curve beginning at Little Valley Rd. up to Hwy-49 has blind spots caused by the curve itself exacerbated by the tall brush/weeds & the mini-multiple office building at the intersection of A.S. Dr. & Hwy-49. While I do not anticipate that the Dollar General would attract much business, just a few more cars along with its very long*(65'-73' length)* delivery trucks alone, will add congestion, especially with the use of the one common driveway.

- Studies of signal timing & traffic counts do not take into account the “S” curve, driveway impacts & poor driver habits as a cumulative collective whole, an element which is generally lacking throughout most Developer, Engineering & Planning Dept. studies & assessments.

- Our County’s Traffic Impact fee of $23,320 & Dollar General’s projected number of trip fees of $64,130 don’t appear to mitigate anything, but will increase ongoing maintenance to County roads. If this not so small, small-box store ends up here, it might be more appropriate to designate those General’s “wear & tear” fee to Alta Sierra road maintenance.

- There are no mitigation measures requiring developer improvement of the intersection at Alta Sierra Dr. & Hwy 49 or of the two short turn pockets. Neither is there a requirement that they pay anything towards the expense of the now completed Hwy.-49 widening improvements, which they will use prolifically. These areas are addressed, but monetary responsibilities and requirements are not.

- The recent history with Dollar General consists of their making very few compromises & promises, then later even ignoring them. However their refusal to compromise on the size of the building footprint is firm. It MUST be 9,100 sf, because that’s what all of their new stores are required to be.

- So, it is imperative that included in the mitigated negative declaration or as a part of the permit/contract, that there be specific, significant penalties (monetary or other) for non-performance, negligence, poor performance or damages.

**TRANSPORTATION**
Alta Sierra has 4 bus systems and one sheltered stop.

- **Gold Country LIFT**
- **Gold Country Stage**
- **Gold Country Telecare Senior and Disabled Transportation**
  I believe the first 2 have bicycle carrying racks.
- School buses serving not so nearby schools.
- Otherwise, if you’re in Olympic condition, you can ride a bicycle up & down our steep hills or walk.
The most common form of transportation is by car or truck. With numerous larger size company service trucks.

Possible Mitigations:

- Explore developing a 2nd major driveway, though I don’t know where there would be space for one or if it would even be permitted under the traffic code. But engineers could figure that one out fairly quickly, I’m sure.

-I don’t read blueprints at all well. I’m assuming that the small sort-of-concrete-divider that currently runs down A.S. Dr., the length of the gas station property, will hopefully be eliminated to provide wider incoming, outgoing lanes and wider turning pockets, if needed. This is another item that the County Roads Dept. should deal with regardless of Dollar General’s presence.

-Straighten out the “S” curve, using as leveling fill for the drop off edge, some of the 6000 cubic yards from the excavation (ruination) of the building site, in lieu of the ineffective suggestion of cutting down the weeds & removing the shrubbery.

-Ensure that the proposed solutions are realistic & that the EIR ratings, which in the end tend to appear subjective, reflect what is needed, achievable & enforceable, with specific consequences if compliance is not achieved.

-Almost at the top of Alta Sierra Dr. where it meets Hwy. 49, the Hwy. there is a significant rise as you reach the top of the hill, making it difficult to see traffic on #49. Adding to the problem are the drivers exiting the gas station from the right into the right lane who often don’t stop first to see if there are any cars there. For some reason these folks feel a need to exit quickly without looking, occasionally “burning rubber”. While this situation is not part of the developer’s responsibility, perhaps the County could install a “Slow” or “Stop” sign facing towards the gas station at the driveway, to make that Hwy. approach more safe. Cutting down bushes is never a permanent option for better highway vision & is not one for careless quickly exiting cars from the gas station.

Reasonable Alternatives to this Project

-Don’t build here; in no way does that building or kind of business fit the environment, site or Community needs.
- Make more accommodations regarding size, soil removal amount, rural look & turning front.
- Cherry Creek Lane area would be ideal for Dollar General. Probably even less expensive in spite of toxic (gasoline) cleanup costs. It would make more sales from visitors heading N-E on Hwy-49 to camp, fish etc. who would be more likely to need a few items “on the run” and could very easily see & access the Store. Area residents are few & scattered up in the hills. The site is completely level and spacious.
LAND USE, SITE DEVELOPMENT AND AESTHETICS

The General Plan, including the updated 2014 edition, continues to emphasize as an aesthetic element, to "Promote and provide for aesthetic design in new development which reflects the existing character of the area". Alta Sierra is one of the most rural, pastoral residential communities in Western Nevada County.

- As noted above, Alta Sierra is primarily a residential community. Those living on Little Valley Rd. have this proposed fortress literally in their faces, as do nearby homes, but to a lesser extent. This not only results in a loss of privacy and beauty, but provides bright lighting, (most of our streets do not have any street lights, by design), noise, truck fumes, the changing possibility that Little Valley Rd. will become a thoroughfare for access to the store, which still faces that neighborhood instead of turning the building’s front (as promised, but so far, not delivered) towards Alta Sierra Dr. where other businesses are located, facing A.S. Dr. and home values will depreciate.

- No matter what architectural changes Dollar General has “slapped on” to its exterior to accommodate that basic requirement, it still looks like the oblong box store that is its’ trademark architecture. It is appalling that the County and the separate “expert architectural body” whose name I can’t dig out of my resource pile, even felt that the resident requested 3D painting of it still makes it look rural! **

- The insistence of Dollar General to build where it is not needed also goes against General Plan guidelines. We are within 5 miles of a variety of completely stocked stores that are, incidentally, correctly zoned C2, Retail Commercial. Dollar General is neither needed or wanted. The size of this proposed store that is a 9,100 sf two story building with a 12’ barricade around its neighborhood facing side, is on a very small plot and would stick out like a sore thumb. All of the surrounding businesses, while not architecturally uniform, don’t look transplanted from the city. It barely squeezes into C1 Neighborhood Commercial zoning category.

The devastation that will occur to that currently unique scenic site will be complete and permanent. And the idea that beauty lost taken from one area can be replaced in another as an exchange, makes no sense. We will have lost our beauty while another area will gain the beginnings of 30+ year old Oaks and pines. I realize that the Federal and State governments have implemented this concept. Which doesn’t necessarily make it right or effective. And now, in our own 2014 General Plan, the same practice is suggested for implementation. It is called “Transferable Development Credits”. No matter the label, how can this be seen as really changing anything. If you transfer some area’s permitted noise level to another, you have simply moved the noise, not eliminated it. But our 2014 General Plan is clearly aimed at development trade-offs, the effects of same would add clarity and consistency to new development area guidelines and/or provide for a significant increase in County wide development.

In summary, those are my suggestions, observations and fears for this Project.

Cc Ed Scofield Dist. II Supervisor ed.scofield@co.nevada.ca.us

Julie Reaney
I received the Notice of Preparation regarding the Dollar General store that is being considered for placement in Alta Sierra.

I'd like to again offer some input regarding this issue. The people in Alta Sierra, and in our county as a whole, do not want stores like Dollar General impacting the environment, atmosphere and beauty of our county. This appears to be another grab by a large corporation to insinuate itself in ever rural corner of the globe to increase profits on the backs of residents. I built a home in Alta Sierra and my brother did likewise, so I can say with some authority: *Alta Sierra residents don't want this structure or any like it changing our community in this negative manner.*

This entire endeavor describes perfectly the astute lyrics by Joni Mitchel: *"They paved paradise and put up a parking lot."* We don't want it!

*Please* don't let this happen. Thank you.

---

Michelle Reynolds

"Earth" without art is just "eh."
Tyler Barrington

From: Katherine Scourtes <kscourtes@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Fwd: Dollar General - Alta Sierra

Katherine Scourtes
15579 Lorie Dr., Grass Valle, CA 95949
Mailing: P. O. Box 854, Grass Valley, CA 95945
(530) 274-1772 * fax (530) 274-9241 * cell (530) 913-7826
E-mail: kscourtes@gmail.com

FEBRUARY 8, 2016

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

RE: EIR - DOLLAR GENERAL STORE – ALTA SIERRA

Dear Mr. Barrington:

1
Please forward this letter to the consultant preparing the draft EIR regarding the Dollar General project in Alta Sierra. I'd like to also make sure that your Negative Declaration, in its entirety, becomes part of the record the consultant reviews in the preparation of the draft EIR because it addresses, in depth, most of our concerns regarding this project.

However, I have some additional concerns that I'd like to see addressed in the draft EIR as follows:

**AESTHETICS, AIR QUALITY & ZONING:**

If right now, you imagine the store finished and built, with its surrounding 6-12 ft retaining walls, plus the height of the building with the extended roof, the huge delivery trucks in and out spewing diesel fumes coming down the hill and then idling, and the area practically denuded of its current beauty, can you honestly say that the project conforms to the C1 designation? I believe that a project with such wide ranging impacts should be located in a C2 area, just as the one in Brunswick did. If the average size of a Dollar General store is 7K sq ft, why is Dollar General locating a 9,100 sq. ft. store in our little rural Alta Sierra, which can't even accommodate adequate parking? Perhaps it should be recommended that they reduce the size of the store, including the height, due to the stretching of the limits of C1 zoning. In any case, this is a definite area of concern that the EIR should review.

Secondly, I believe that Dollar General doesn't even conform to the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zoning designation, and this is an issue I'd like to see addressed by the EIR. Specifically, the products that DG will bring are already available five miles away (at SPD, Kmart, etc), and some even next door, at the Alta Sierra Market. Despite their analysis that says otherwise, Dollar General will be in direct competition with Alta Sierra Market, which is situated directly behind the proposed site and also carries some fresh produce, such as fruits and vegetables. If DG forces Alta Sierra Market out of business, the surrounding neighborhood will be impoverished—not enriched.

In short, the residents of Little Valley Road will be looking at an 8-12 foot wall plus the 30' building instead of the natural beauty they are facing now and they will be listening and smelling truck engines and fumes until 7:00 pm while relaxing (???) on their decks especially in the summer. It is indisputable that this huge project will lower their property values and degrade their quality of life from the stressful and financially detrimental imposition on to their homes, their lives and their neighborhood. I'm therefore wondering how the "Neighborhood Commercial" zoning, which is supposed to enhance the needs of the neighborhood, can be so stretched and twisted to instead cause long term detrimental effects to the surrounding community.
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS:

The EIR should review the economic analysis as it relates to the 8 employees, which the project description says, on page 2, that the project will support "at any given time." My understanding, from the developer’s presentation (and empirical knowledge from other DG stores), is that they have 2 employees in the store at any given time. My personal experience, having visited other Dollar General stores in other parts of the country is that they are under-staffed (2, possibly 3 employees at a time) and that they look "junky" inside and outside since the very few employees don’t have time to keep the store and the parking areas in good order.

Additional review should be on the following:

Even though the ALH Economic Analysis of 3-27-15, that the applicant submitted, concludes that “there is more than sufficient market area demand to support the proposed Alta Sierra Dollar General store,” further up at the top of page 8 it admits that “The Economic Census information ..... is a clear indicator that retail sales [in Alta Sierra] are limited, especially in the major categories” [that the DG carries]. The analysis further concludes that DG can survive by capturing a small portion of the local population’s disposable income but it does not at all address how sales will suffer from the resistance of the local population to patronizing the store, because it was “shoved down their throats.” That particular commercial area has had many long term vacancies over time, and the potential of another failed business should be taken into consideration. Moreover, please consider the contrast between a currently beautiful green area with more that 100 shade providing trees to the blighted mausoleum of failed buildings surrounded by hot blacktop and garbage.

TRAFFIC:

Finally, although I’m sure many others have addressed the traffic concerns that should be reviewed in the EIR that we all have with the sloping "S" curve of Alta Sierra Dr. right across from the entrance of Dollar General, I’d like to direct your attention to the intersection of Alta Sierra Drive and Hwy 49. The developer’s own traffic study had found the “turn pocket” lengths inadequate (one turn pocket short by 6 ft and the other short by 25 ft--see Kunzman study of 3/25/2015 pages 4 & 5). And yet, there is no remediation measure required in the Negative Declaration anywhere that I can find and there should be one. Also, I’d like to see what CALTRANS has to say about this problem. It seems CALTRANS has an interest in the safety and unimpeded traffic flow into and out of Hwy 49, in which case, at least the traffic study should be distributed to CALTRANS with an invitation to comment. I have the same questions regarding the Nevada County Department of Transportation (DOT), which, it seems to me, should be coordinating with CALTRANS to resolve the inadequate turn pockets, at the developer’s expense.
In conclusion, I urge you to consider the following:

1. Will the local, Alta Sierra, market conditions allow the Dollar General store to be successful considering that one is already in existence (in Brunswick) and two more are proposed in Penn Valley and Rough & Ready?
2. Will Dollar General add sales revenue to the county or will it rob sales from neighboring businesses and negatively affect them?
3. Will the needs of the neighboring community be met, enhanced or impoverished?
4. Will it detrimentally impact the quality of life of the residents in the area?
5. Will the additional property and sales tax dollars offset the cost to the taxpayers incurred from the mitigation of the identified but un-addressed traffic problems at the intersection of Alta Sierra Dr. and Hwy 49?
6. Are all the above, coupled with the for-ever-destruction of the natural beauty of the three parcels in question, worth the few minimum wage jobs?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Katherine Scourtes

Cc: Ed Scofield
Katherine
(530)274-1772
(530)913-7826
Gentlemen:

Have either of you visited a Dollar General? We have a Dollar General already in Grass Valley. We also have The Dollar Store and Dollar Trees stores. Now they are proposing 4 more Dollar Generals in the near area (Alta Sierra, Penn Valley, etc. I am a resident of Alta Sierra and have been in all the mentioned stores. How many of such low quality stores do we need here in Grass Valley? I can only imagine the tourists heading up our way to visit all our Dollar Stores. (Just think of all the tax dollars. HA!!) In Alta Sierra we have a Market. Anyone needing to run to the Market needs to drive in their car to get there. The same would be the situation with the Dollar General. So it would not be convenient to the needy. Besides it would be more dangerous than it already is with people walking down Alta Sierra Drive, much less all the cars pulling in and out of Dollar General and making it harder for residents just trying to get past and on home to their families. They are not proposing using any of the empty developed property we already have, no they want to tear down trees and build something new that probably won’t make it and will end up empty and unsightly at the entrance to our area. The lovely new restaurant that has opened in that area will not benefit in any way from the Dollar General. With the turn down in the economy the businesses at the entrance have been decimated and are now really a becoming an eyesore. With stores like Kmart, Sears, and Macy’s closing down some of their stores, it doesn’t look like we are having major economic turn around. I see no reason to force some of our local stores out of business because some big company comes in with all their big ideas and promises! As is, if I need to get something in the line of groceries, I drive to Grass Valley anyway.

Regards:
Susan Seeman
Alta Sierra, Ca.
Dear Mr. Foss, Mr. Barrington, Mr. Scofield, Ms. Duncan,

Dollar Gen. is a large chain store. They have the ability to make bulk purchases, therefore driving down the cost of goods. Cheaper prices will cause neighboring stores to go out of business. This needs to be addressed in the EIR.
Tyler Barrington

From: ryedding <ryedding@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 02, 2016 11:32 AM
To: Brian Foss
Cc: Tyler Barrington; Ed Scofield
Subject: EIR Impact comments

Importance: High

EIR impact comments

January 29, 2016

Via Electronic Mail:
brian.foss@co.nevada.ca.us
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us
ed.scofield@co.nevada.ca.us

Brian Foss, Nevada County Zoning Administrator  Ed Scofield
Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Nevada County Supervisor, Dist. II
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 200
Nevada City, CA 95959

Laura Duncan
Planning Commission, Dist. II

RE: Proposed Scope of Work for EIR Preparation for 9100 Sq. Ft Dollar General Store at Alta Sierra

Dear Mr. Foss, Mr. Barrington, Mr. Scofield, and Ms. Duncan,

The size of this Project: calls for the destruction of over 100 trees, and further describes the impact of this Project as affecting 1.4 acres of Landmark oak woodlands and 4 landmark oak trees). This will decrease the amount of water shed and create more water onto Little Valley Road (which already has a drainage flow problem.) The landscape plan as suggested does not address the increased exposure to the back side of the existing commercial buildings upon the residents living on Little Valley Road. The proposal removes what is already a limited tree barrier to commercial lights and noises,plus it reduces the flora fauna area for small birds and animals (squirrels, rabbits, raccoons etc.) Just the clearing of brush and small trees that the owner has already done in preparing for this project has made those properties even more visible and imposing to the neighbors below it. Further tree removal and excavation at those sites will create an even greater aesthetic blight upon Little Valley Road than currently exists. We are also faced with a list of negative impacts upon the neighborhood due to 450 truck trips over a residential street during construction, the dirt, and noise,not to mention the parking problem that will be created by the laborers vehicles. It would be a mistake not to consider the economic effects of this Project. It is left to you, our County Seat, to review the economic impact of the existing stores at that location. Mainly the Alta Sierra Market and it clearly serves the customer base that Dollar General hopes to “obtain”. The AS Market maintains a limited stock of almost everything that a person
needs on impulse, in addition to some fresh fruits, vegetables, and hard alcohol. Dollar General is in direct competition with a great deal of the inventory. The AS Market, being a small business, with this type of competition it is substantial enough to force the AS Market into bankruptcy, resulting in another empty building, and loss of those unique items that are currently available in the immediate vicinity, but not offered by Dollar General. Consideration of these effects needs to be reviewed comprehensively.

In the same way, this EIR includes proposals of 3 more stores to Nevada County, with a 4th already centrally located at the Brunswick Basin. Nevada County residents cannot support 4 Dollar General Stores in roughly a 15 mile area. The Dollar General stores draw customers from within a local radius, and are not attributed to bringing any new money into the county where they develop. This means that they take their income from existing businesses, many of them small capital businesses that cannot bear ‘bargain store’ competition. The approval of 4 of the same stores within Nevada County could be responsible for creating more ‘ghost towns’ out of our existing shopping centers.

Delivery truck traffic in Alta Sierra: The ending position for an inbound truck is not the beginning position of an outbound truck, and has no explanation for how a truck could switch positions. Neither does it address the time that it would take a delivery truck to make these maneuvers, closing off the ingress/egress to any other traffic, the Dollar General is known to transport its store-brand merchandise on a weekly basis from the Southern California terminal, and uses a 73-foot truck to do so, one that is not legal to use on the road accessing the sites in Alta Sierra. Because the traffic traveling into Alta Sierra from Highway 49 is flowing through a reverse S-curve, the line of sight does not allow enough distance to prevent rear-end collisions. It is far too short to allow of traffic to get into their store. Especially in the winter months when there is ice and snow on the roadway. I have lived here at the intersection for thirty plus years and have witnessed innumerable accidents with the CHP and emergency vehicles tying up traffic and redirecting it for hours.

The quantities of water runoff that regularly flows down Alta Sierra Drive from the paved entrances of existing businesses shows that the water flows across Alta Sierra Drive at both curves in the reverse S. (in the winter this creates black ice.) The existing ditches are barely adequate for keeping the fast flowing drainages flowing to the creek without causing floods, and require intermittent and annual maintenance and repairs to maintain that condition (which hasn’t been done) in years. The revised drainage study fails to take that existing condition into consideration. I have left on file with the planning dept. approximately 40 photographs showing these conditions.

It has been learned that existing and newly re-opened Mexican restaurant could likely be faced with limits on future activities because of this project. Specifically, the revised Septic Plan based its findings of having enough sufficient repair area for the existing septic system on the owner’s claim. In November of 2014, the owner claimed that the then-defunct restaurant would not be used for a restaurant, but the new restaurant has recently opened at that site. This project in its current state could result in limiting another pre-existing business structure from operating at its current full potential.

I would also like the lead Engineer with this project at MBI (Patrick Hindmarsh) to receive a copy of this letter; in addition to a copy to Linda Duncan (her email address is not made public).

Thank you for your consideration,

Ray Yeddung
10195 Alta Sierra Drive
Grass Valley, Ca 95949
ryeddung@sbcglobal.net
January 19, 2016
Alta Sierra Dollar General Store Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Alta Sierra Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: Jacqueline C Finlay
Address: 10901 Thornicroft Way, Grass Valley 95949

Comments:

I think having a Dollar General Store in Alta Sierra is a disaster waiting to happen.

It will ruin what little natural beauty remains near where Alta Sierra and Highway 49 meet.

Alta Sierra is already a dangerous road in that area, with blind curves and constant "near misses." Adding more cars turning into a parking lot - and coming out onto Alta Sierra - is almost a guarantee for accidents and road rage.

Do I want a Dollar General in Alta Sierra? No
January 19, 2016
Alta Sierra Dollar General Store Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Alta Sierra Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: Alice J. Marcus
Address: 11994 Wheatland Dr., Grass Valley, CA 95949
Comments: My husband & I bought 2 acres in the early 1960’s.
It is across from the auto mechanics shop and a little further up the hill from where the proposed site for the Dollar General Store is.
Over the years it seems that business has not done well and the area hasn’t developed to the potential it could. I’m sure that if a “Trader Joe’s” wanted to develop the property the Alta Sierra neighborhood would not have the negativity it does now.
I am very concerned that if the Dollar General does not go through it would greatly devalue my property as a potential commercial site. I am sorry that a more prominent business has not come forward to buy these 3 parcels.
Please consider allowing the Dollar General to proceed with their plans. I think they have done their homework and can support the area with good business.
APPENDIX 1.0-C
PENN VALLEY
NOP COMMENTS
January 29, 2016

Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
County of Nevada, Community Development Agency
950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Public Scoping Meetings

Dear Mr. Barrington:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Dollar General Projects. Caltrans’ new mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California’s transportation system. We review this local development for impacts to the State Highway System in keeping with our mission, vision and goals for sustainability/livability/economy, and safety/health. We provide these comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

The proposed project locations are: 10166 Alta Sierra Drive in Grass Valley, 17652 Penn Valley Drive in Penn Valley, and 12345 Rough and Ready Highway in Grass Valley. Each Dollar General store is proposed as a 9,100-square-foot retail facility on approximately one-acre parcel. The following is our comments on the NOP of a DEIR:

Transportation & Circulation

We are concerned about the intersections that large delivery trucks will be traveling. We are requesting the DEIR to show that delivery trucks will be able to legally and safely negotiate the following intersections listed below:

1. Grass Valley, CA—10166 Alta Sierra Drive: State Route (SR) 49/Alta Sierra intersection.

2. Penn Valley, CA—17652 Penn Valley Drive: SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (South)/Rough and Ready Highway (North) intersection, and SR 20/Pleasant Valley Road intersection.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
3. **Grass Valley, CA—12345 Rough and Ready Highway:** It is not obvious whether delivery trucks will supply this store from the SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (south)/Rough and Ready Highway (north) intersection, or from one of the interchanges along SR 20 in Grass Valley. Please clarify the location of delivery truck access in the DEIR as well.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

If you have any question regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact Jennifer Jacobson, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Nevada County, by phone (530) 741-5435 or via email to jennifer.jacobson@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,


SUSAN ZANCHI, Chief
Office of Transportation Planning—NORTH

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
Tyler Barrington

From: Cliff Bryant <cliff204@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 12:50 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General, Penn Valley

Tyler,
After attending the meeting at Buttermaker Cottage I thought I should submit my thoughts to you regarding the Dollar Store in Penn Valley.
I am especially concerned about the truck’s making the turn into and out of the store. I believe a turning lane is the best option and should be required of the builder.

Also, this is the proper time to require the land owner to test the soil for contamination from the open pit, cess pool that borders the property. Although the person from Dollar General said they are not required to do so because they are not building at that end of the property, it seems “the right thing to do” on the part of the county. Using his line of thinking, the county could never require clean up of waste, or even determine if there was contamination, as long as part of the property went undeveloped.

Because Squirrel Creek flows thru this property the county should take all reasonable and necessary steps to protect a Nevada County natural resource. Perhaps there are state environmental laws that should be applied to this situation and the proper authorities contacted at the State level.

Regards,
Cliff Bryant

Sent from Windows Mail
Good evening

My name is Sharon Lewis; I am the manager of Creekside Village Mobilehome Park Community.

There is a couple of things I would like to request from your company Dollar General, to consider.

Frist would be a sound barrier wall between Creekside Village and Dollar General that would have adequate drainage as to help prevent flooding of the resident's yards that back up to the lot where the Dollar General will be built; I would also like the sound barrier wall to be appeasing to the eye, for example as you can see by the picture I have provided, the wall could be stone veneer lakeshore river rock on the bottom half and wood planks on the top half, this would match the exterior of the building and the base around the light post that is in the plans page two under site plan and lighting (the decorative stone could be replaced with stone veneer river rock). If the developer was to erected the wall before construction begins, it will help by cutting down on some of the dust, noise and other disturbance construction can cause for the residents of Creekside Village.

Second I would like for the landscaper to consider a different type of ground cover something that is more drought tolerant, less evasive, and would not attack rodent. Boston ivy as mentioned in your landscaping plans, Boston ivy watering requirements are high and the ivy grows fast, not only does it spread by the vine growing it is also spread by seeds the flower produces as you can see in the information that I have provided. There are several other types of ground coverage that is less evasive and are drought tolerant, such as Stonecrop (Angelina Sedum), Sedum has several different types and color, Candytuft also comes in several different colors, and Ice plant (delosperma cooperi) this is just a few less evasive and more drought tolerant ground coverage type plants that are easier to control.

Creekside Village is looking forward to working with Dollar General to help resolve the concerns I have voiced.

Thank you for your time and giving me the opportunity to voice my concerns.
APPENDIX 1.0-D
ROUGHL AND READY HIGHWAY
NOP COMMENTS
January 29, 2016

Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
County of Nevada, Community Development Agency
950 Maidu Ave, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report and Public Scoping Meetings

Dear Mr. Barrington:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Dollar General Projects. Caltrans’ new mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California’s transportation system. We review this local development for impacts to the State Highway System in keeping with our mission, vision and goals for sustainability/livability/economy, and safety/health. We provide these comments consistent with the State’s smart mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

The proposed project locations are: 10166 Alta Sierra Drive in Grass Valley, 17652 Penn Valley Drive in Penn Valley, and 12345 Rough and Ready Highway in Grass Valley. Each Dollar General store is proposed as a 9,100-square-foot retail facility on approximately one-acre parcel. The following is our comments on the NOP of a DEIR:

Transportation & Circulation

We are concerned about the intersections that large delivery trucks will be traveling. We are requesting the DEIR to show that delivery trucks will be able to legally and safely negotiate the following intersections listed below:

1. Grass Valley, CA—10166 Alta Sierra Drive: State Route (SR) 49/Alta Sierra intersection.

2. Penn Valley, CA—17652 Penn Valley Drive: SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (South)/Rough and Ready Highway (North) intersection, and SR 20/Pleasant Valley Road intersection.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
Mr. Tyler Barrington, County of Nevada  
January 29, 2016  
Page 2

3. **Grass Valley, CA—12345 Rough and Ready Highway**: It is not obvious whether delivery trucks will supply this store from the SR 20/Penn Valley Drive (south)/Rough and Ready Highway (north) intersection, or from one of the interchanges along SR 20 in Grass Valley. Please clarify the location of delivery truck access in the DEIR as well.

Please provide our office with copies of any further actions regarding this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to review and comment on any changes related to this development.

If you have any question regarding these comments or require additional information, please contact Jennifer Jacobson, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Nevada County, by phone (530) 741-5435 or via email to jennifer.jacobson@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

SUSAN ZANCHI, Chief  
Office of Transportation Planning—NORTH

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
Hello Dan,...

Yesterday I walked around our neighborhood and talked to residents as you suggested (West Drive, Sunset Ave. and East Drive). I gave them your email address, and in the case of the older residents who don't use the internet, I gave them your physical address. I hope that many of them will contact you to let you know how they feel.

This is what I learned. Two of the older residents "don't care one way or the other". Another neighbor said, "Of course I don't want it, but that doesn't matter. They'll do what they want anyway no matter what we want. You're wasting your time". I think that was the SADDEST thing to hear. One resident who wasn't aware of the situation said, "There could be FOUR Dollar General Stores in Grass Valley and one of them in a NEIGHBORHOOD?! So, I guess the next thing they'll do is rename the town Grass Valley General!!" Yikes!!

Anyway, all the others are all opposed and for pretty much the same reasons:

...We are a NEIGHBORHOOD in a predominately residential area and big box stores belong in commercial areas.
...There is already a Dollar General store less than 10 minutes from our location.
...We're located 5 minutes from the shops in downtown Grass Valley.
...Because of the configuration of West/Sunset/East (a U-shape, off of Rough and Ready) the traffic we have on our streets is almost exclusively residents; therefore, the many young children who live here are free to play in the streets and that will end if Dollar General is allowed to be built here.
...Increase in crime...The few other commercial businesses that have tried to exist in this area have failed. What will happen when this store fails? What happens to our neighborhood when we are left with a "big empty lot with an empty building surrounded by a tall chain link fence"?
...fire safety....water pressure being reduced to the neighborhood ...traffic safety - residents driving west on Rough and Ready Hwy., turning left onto West Dr. are already experiencing problems with accidents occurring when opposing traffic is traveling around the existing curve and driving on the wrong side of the road. This is happening during both daytime and nighttime hours.
...The addition of noise and lights in the neighborhood ...The possibility of even more homeless people living across Rough and Ready Hwy. near the Twin Cities Church because of the accessibility of a Dollar General within walking distance.
...reduction in property values

There were a lot of other concerns, but I thought I would just give you the ones that were mentioned the most. Our neighborhood is like so many others. We have a nice 'family-feeling' community where we care about each other and watch out for others. It's a very well established neighborhood where some of the neighbors have been here for over forty years. Yesterday, I met a lady on Sunset who has lived there for FIFTY NINE years!

My husband and I are relatively new to the neighborhood and there are quite a few new neighbors who have recently moved into the neighborhood who are young and have small children and they ALL told me that the reason they bought
houses here was that the neighborhood is so quiet and 'family friendly' and seemed like such a safe place to raise their children.

I'd like to thank you SO much for listening to our concerns. We all really appreciate anything you can do to help keep the Dollar General Store out of our neighborhood.

Beth and Angelo DiVecchio

Sent from my iPad
Jessica Hankins

From: Red DiVecchio <divecchio1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 6:33 PM
To: Jessica Hankins
Subject: The Dollar General Store...Rough and Ready Hwy.. location

There are many issues that we are concerned about with the possible location of the Dollar General Store on Rough and Ready Hwy. and West Drive.

The environmental issues:

...water... According to Dollar General's plans, their use of water in the event of a fire, will affect the neighboring area.

...traffic...The additional traffic will put school children, pedestrians, bicyclists, *etc., in jeopardy.

...noise...The constant running of air conditioners and refrigeration will be an annoyance to residents in the immediate area.

...lights...The use of lights at night will also affect the neighborhood.

...delivery truck....The possibility of a 73.5' delivery truck entering our neighborhood is both a major health and safety issue.

...building height...The height and the overall size of Dollar General's commercial building is an eyesore in the middle of a residential area.

If the Dollar General store is allowed to be built at the Rough and Ready location, the neighboring areas will be adversely affected.

We have an issue in our area about which we are already concerned. On the north side of Rough and Ready Hwy., between East Drive and the Twin Cities Church, there are numerous groups of homeless people camping out. During the summertime we are already extremely concerned about the possibility of a fire being started due to the multiple campfires where the homeless are living. It is to be expected that, with the Dollar General store being located within an easy walk, the population of the homeless in the area will increase, thereby, increasing the risk of fires.

As far as the affect of the location of the Dollar General store in our neighborhood, the following are our concerns:

We live on Sunset Avenue. *There are many young couples with small children who ride tricycles, scooters, bicycles, skateboards, etc. on our street. We also have elderly residents who walk their small grand children and one of our neighbors has a child who is blind. We have a 95 year old resident who takes care of her disabled grandson who is blind and wheelchair bound and they are all now able to live their lives safely outside of their homes.

This is the type of neighborhood where, due to the location, the addition of the Dollar General Store would be VERY dangerous to our residents and neighboring areas.

We are also wondering what the NEED is, of an additional Dollar Store, especially in a location that is predominantly residential, when there is already one in existence less than ten minutes from this proposed location on Rough and Ready Hwy. Also, if another Dollar General store is allowed to be built in Penn Valley, our neighborhood will be located within ten minutes from TWO Dollar General stores.
This is a predominately residential area and a Big Box Dollar General Store is obviously environmentally out of place here, along with being detrimental to the well being of citizens of Nevada County. This neighborhood has no need for this store, as there is an existing Dollar General store, along with numerous other retail stores less than ten minutes away.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Beth and Angelo DiVecchio

Sent from my iPad
#1 Insufficient Water Volume For Fire Flow Mitigation

Based on the reports from NID and TTG, the computer simulated test provided by NID shows that the calculated flow rate is deficient and from the required CFC 2013 Fire Flow of 1,500 GPM by 741 GPM, approximately 49.5% lower than the standard needed. There is also a concern for the lack of connections on Rough & Ready Highway, noted in the first 2-3 paragraphs of page one from NID (from February 11, 2015).

TTG proposes a fire pump and additional fire alarms, however, no physical evidence or field tests show any testing or justification that water volume/flow is adequate in this area regardless of pump sizes. This falls short of NIDs recommendations and the local code-requirements in order to have a safe volume rate for Dollar General, let alone the local neighborhood.

Pertaining to the fire flow mitigation, there is no additional justification available from TTG or any companies supporting the applicant (DG) that would meet or exceed the current concern for water volume.

Lastly, a computerized simulation was done to estimate fire flow pressures to ensure they meet performance standards; however, no field testing has been done to confirm these proposed water pressures are not readily available, nor has water volume been confirmed. I believe a field test is needed due to various conditions that could take place (recent rain, erosion, and other natural discrepancies) that computerized simulation does not account for.

#2 Traffic Report Provides Inadequate Analysis Based On Local Trends

After reviewing the traffic report provided by Kunzman Associates I have a couple concerns and comments regarding the analysis.

Point #1 – Although the traffic analysis summarizes the data in many different ways it does not take into account local, specific trends we see in the area. For Example, this traffic report was taken on 12/10/2014 which was a Wednesday and does not represent a “typical” day of activity on Rough and Ready Highway. Although the analysis does note the local organizations that due increase traffic volume (i.e Twin Cities), it does not show quantitative results from a typical week when these organizations are in business. Church is on Sunday, not on Wednesday. 12/10/2014 would have been Christmas break for multiple schools as well, so the overall traffic analysis is skewed due to the date and timing it was done. I’d encourage the county (and the consulting firm) to re-evaluate the traffic analysis and have another one provided that’s more quantitative to the trends we see in the community.
Point #2 - The truck turning template (Figure 7 in the traffic analysis) shows the use of West Drive when a delivery truck is coming east (from town) on Rough and Ready. As you know, West Dr. is a residential road and barely meets the minimum requirements for the California Fire Code Vehicle Access of 20ft (California Fire Code - Minimum Width Required). In various areas, West Drive barely makes the 20 ft requirements for being a paved road (per measurements from Google Maps).

Having delivery trucks deliver at least once a day with the option to come down West Drive is an environmental risk for the county road, close electrical poles and neighboring vehicles and properties. Keep in mind that doesn’t include any traffic, the bus stop or any/all cars coming through (FedEx, UPS, USPS, etc).

Point #3 – Light Pollution. According to the building plans, various parking lights and signage will be lit in the parking lot and building. Page 53 of the building plan indicates: “All outdoor lighting shall meet the following standards: 1. All outdoor light fixtures shall be fully shielded to prevent the light source or lens from being visible from adjacent properties and roadways.”

My comment is how will the lighting fixtures shield and prevent light from being visible from adjacent properties if the building is facing east towards multiple houses, only 40-50 ft away? This is an environmental concern with the amount of light being exposed since we don’t even have street lights.
10200 East Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945-8502

February 1, 2016

Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Mr. Barrington:

Re: Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store, Project Draft EIR

I am a resident of the Sunset District of rural Grass Valley and I am opposed to the development of Dollar General Store at the proposed site at 12345 Rough and Ready Highway. My opposition is based primarily on the fact that this proposed retail business is so excessively large in size that it in no way fits into the existing neighborhood, and in fact, if built, it will have an adverse effect on my neighborhood while providing nothing of value to the residents of the area.

In reviewing the Volume 1, Section 1 of the Nevada County General Plan, I find that this proposed store is contrary to the General Plan Philosophy upon which the General Plan is based. Specifically, one of the central themes of the plan is that “Planned land use patterns will determine the level of public services appropriate to the character, economy and environment of each region”. This is further articulated in the supporting themes that served as guidance in the delineation of policies to set specific direction for the future commercial development of the County. Those supporting themes applicable to this project are:

- Provide urban services only in areas with sufficient land use intensities or population densities...
- Ensure that intensive growth will only be allowed concurrent with the provision of needed services, to include, participating in financing, public studies programs, phased construction projects, or phased construction projects that enhance public benefit.
- Minimize conflicts due to incompatible land uses.

When I reviewed the Economic Report, prepared by the developer, I find that their analysis does not support the Rough and Ready Dollar General site development, in fact it demonstrates that the proposal is likely to fail economically. My reason for this conclusion follows:

The Economic Report is generalized and does not do an adequate job of analyzing the specific existing situation. It contains inaccuracies that lead me to believe that there was little or no study of the current, local conditions, but rather a complete dependence on statistics and reports available from public sources. Examples that lead me to this conclusion are;

1. The statement that the Rough and Ready site is 9.2 miles from the Grass Valley store. The distance between the two stores is actually 4.1 miles by one route and 4.7 miles by another commonly used travel route.
2. The Rough and Ready Dollar General Store site is approximately 2.1 miles from the Post Office in Rough and Ready. The proposed site is not within Rough and Ready but rather in a portion of rural Grass Valley known as the Sunset District and this area has a Grass Valley Zip Code.

3. Rough and Ready is only about 3 miles from the proposed Penn Valley store site and it is likely that many of the residents in the Rough and Ready census designated places (CDP), zip code 95975, would do their shopping in Penn Valley rather than at the Sunset District site because there are other services available in Penn Valley. There is no retail at or near the proposed Sunset site, and if traveling in that direction, it is likely that a person would continue another 2 miles to the heart of Grass Valley to do his/her shopping where services and selections would far exceed what would be available at the Dollar General Sunset site.

4. It is stated that the opening of the Rough and Ready (Sunset District) Dollar General, “will likely serve as an economic development catalyst, drawing in customers and thus enhancing the potential of other nearly (sic) commercial spaces”. There are no commercial spaces to enhance along Rough and Ready Highway for a good reason, the lack of infrastructure to support such businesses. To think that the Dollar General, which would severely stress the existing infrastructure, is going stimulate economic development along Rough and Ready Highway shows a complete lack of knowledge and understanding of the area and existing conditions.

5. Annual sales from Dollar General Stores are expected to be $1.6 million per year. Using the CDP provided for the Rough and Ready (Sunset District) store, it would require each household to spend $10.00 per day, or $70.00 per week to reach this goal and that would require 100% of the households to utilize the store which is an unreasonable assumption. The fact that this report reaches the conclusion that this site is viable leads the reviewer to question the validity of any and all the reports and conclusions commissioned by Dollar General.

6. Later in the report, the distance of the Rough and Ready site from the proposed O’Reilly store is given as 3.8 miles (similar to my 4.1 miles) and the O’Reilly site is within a few hundred feet of the Grass Valley Dollar General site. Again, the discrepancy in these figures, the lack of understanding of where the population center of Rough and Ready is located in relation to the Sunset District, and the reliance on numbers from public information indicates a gross lack of understanding of the market potential for the Sunset District site.

As I stated above, the General Plan states that we “Ensure that intensive growth will only be allowed concurrent with the provision of needed services ...” The proposed site fails in the availability of needed services in that there is no sewer system and the water delivery system is stressed. In addition, the roads serving the site are not suitable for the ingress and egress of the large volume of traffic proposed as well as the size of commercial vehicles needed to service the facility. The large building placed on such a small lot in the middle of a residential area further violates the planning principles used to prepare the General Plan including but not limited to:

- Avoidance of scattered or leap frog development that may not be able to be consolidated.
- Preservation of the natural and visual resources of the County.
- Establishes spaces between buildings and uses with setbacks and buffers.
- Prevents environmental degradation through control of noise, air pollution, disposal of wastes, grading, tree removal and other adverse affects.
- Protects the health and welfare of the residents of the county.
I will address the above points:

There is no other reasonable development that could be consolidated with the proposed site considering the topography, existing land uses, conditions of the roads, and availability of services (water, sewer, etc.). Therefore, the Dollar General store will exacerbate leap frog development in this area.

The size of the proposed building is so much larger than the surrounding residential structures that the visual impact of this building will be to dominate the landscape and detract from the view of the existing structures as well as having a negative impact on the view from the existing residences. In addition, the proposed monument sign is totally out of character for this area and will add to the visual blight resulting from the construction of this giant building in among very modest residential structures. Currently, there is not one business on Rough and Ready Highway with a sign of a similar scale and negative visual impact.

The small size of the lot, and the very large size of the building with required parking areas does not allow for reasonable setbacks and screening of the Dollar General building, the parking and the driveways. The difference in scale of the buildings, the difference in land uses, and the intensity of commercial use could be softened greatly if the building was to be located on a much larger lot, however the existing proposal does not allow for this.

The proposed project will result in environmental degradation, in that noise pollution will be continuous as the heating, cooling and venting units will run 24 hours a day and will be audible to all the nearby residents. Furthermore, traffic entering and leaving the site will be continuous daily until 10:00 p.m. The visual quality of the area will be changed and existing services (road and water) will be impacted.

Finally, the health and welfare of the residents of the immediate area will be adversely affected by the construction and operation of the Dollar General Store; many of these residents have lived in the area for decades.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Sincerely,

Bill Haire

cc: Dan Miller
Dear Supervisor Miller and Commissioners Barrington and Hankins:

I would like to join my neighbors on West Drive in asking you to dismiss the proposal to build another Dollar General store in this residential neighborhood.

I am in agreement with the ‘negative factors’ excerpted from the project documents, as assembled in a letter to neighbors by Beth and Angelo, who live on Sunset Avenue. Aside from the many arguments that might be made against this superfluous plastic crap store is the hazard that R&R Highway bears fast-moving traffic at West Drive, as cars are gearing up after stopping at the Bitney Springs road just below and speed past the West Drive entrance. I have learned over the years to be wary of traffic coming up toward GV, and if someone were to suddenly slow to enter a Dollar General driveway even before West Drive comes up there will be sudden stops and possibly collisions. There just aren’t good sight lines at that point.

Aside from the more utilitarian aspects of noise and public safety is the fact that the proposed store is not going to serve any real purpose to the people of the surrounding community because it doesn’t sell anything one really needs or can’t easily get somewhere else. What is REALLY needed, and especially down toward Rough and Ready which no longer has ANY grocery store, is a small business basic-staples-and fresh-food type of store which might even include - heaven forbid! - a counter and stools for a cup of coffee and a piece of pie, as a place for some of the older folks stuck in their homes all day to pick up some real food for dinner and possibly have a chat with someone they know. (That’s what makes a neighborhood.) Two other stores not far from this location already offer all the liquor, cigarettes, and junk food anyone could possibly want. One of those, in fact, replaced a nice little market (the Oak Market) which had a small deli and cafe tables where workingmen would come and enjoy a freshly-made hot lunch. I think the people of this neighborhood would welcome a small grocery where they could pick up what they needed to cook and eat well at home.

But that’s a lost dream. Now we have to deal with predatory spinoff businesses to launder profits from unknown corporations which do nothing to improve the physical or social well-being of its customers. I have driven in rural areas in Northern California and through the poorer small towns in Oregon, and the Dollar Generals (and their ilk) are everywhere and have become a scourge. Research shows that these stores are generally sited in low income communities and small towns. Does Grass Valley and Nevada County want to wear that label too?

Sincerely yours,

Mary Henderson
10090 West Drive
Grass Valley
opposition to Dollar General Store (2)

Joan Kremmer <joankremmer@yahoo.com>
To jessicahankins@co.nevada.ca.us

To: Jessica Hankins, senior planner
re: Proposed Dollar General
for Rough & Ready Hwy.

From: Joan Kremmer
Grass Valley resident

I am writing to state my opposition to the proposed Dollar General for the Rough & Ready Hwy.
Personally I do not see the need for this lower end, chain discount store, it seems to be a duplication of merchandise we already have readily available to us through the recently opened Dollar General, and other existing stores such the currently enlarging Grocery Outlet, K-Mart, and the other dollar stores. Aren't we in Nevada County always trying to build up our image as a tourist destination. Do we really want to be known as county rife with dollar stores? Come here for discount shopping.Is that an image we want to cultivate? If all of the currently proposed Dollar Stores get approved, that may become what Nevada County may be known for.

Beyond my opinion that that we really don't need it, especially at this rural location which is the entrance to Grass Valley from the west, there are other specific objections The additional traffic of customers and delivery trucks, coupled with the additional noise, and lights will really detract from the authentic, rustic and quiet Rough & Ready area. I expect that the proposed building with a phony Gold Rush facade will also be a visual blight.

I feel that once a rural area goes, it is gone for good. And there is no monetary measure of the loss of a rural area to the construction of a chain discount store. Yes, a few jobs will be generated, and a bit more money collected from sales tax, but how does this compare to the loss of the character of the place.? For these considerations, I strongly oppose this project.

Joan Kremmer 530 477 3334
275 Hazel Lane
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Joan Kremmer <joankremmer@yahoo.com>
To tylerbarrington@co.nevada.ca.us
CC jessicahankins@co.nevada.ca.us

Today at 2:32 PM

2/5/2016 2:35 PM
2/8/16

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner, Nevada County Planning Department  
950 Maidu Avenue  
Nevada City, CA 95949

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Attached are my comments and supporting materials for the Dollar General EIR. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Respectfully,

Marc Mayfield  
15228 Stinson Drive  
Grass Valley, CA 95949  
ac120022@gmail.com
2/6/15

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner, Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue
Nevada City, CA 95959

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Re: Transportation and Traffic under Potential Environmental Effects of the Dollar General EIR

Dollar General plans to route “interstate STAA trucks” [Attachment 1] to its Alta Sierra store from the SR 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection, down Alta Sierra Drive, then back up Alta Sierra Drive to SR 49. Dollar General’s proposed interstate STAA truck access to the Rough & Ready Highway store would be along Rough and Ready Highway for five miles, from SR 20, followed by a return to SR 20 on Rough and Ready Highway.

However, “interstate STAA trucks”—tractor and semi-trailer combinations 73 feet long—are prohibited on Alta Sierra Drive and, north of the feed store, on Rough and Ready Highway. Both roadways are thus restricted to “California Legal trucks,” which are, at most, 65 feet long. [Attachments 2-9] This means that Dollar General could not legally deliver to either store with the only tractor and semi-trailer combination the company utilizes: three-axle tractors and cargo van trailers 53 feet long. [Attachments 10-12]

Quoting Caltrans:

To open Alta Sierra Drive for STAA access, Nevada County would have to approve their roads and Caltrans would have to approve the State intersection at Alta Sierra Drive ... The County ... must assure Caltrans that its roads can accommodate STAA trucks ... If construction were to be necessary, the county would be responsible for its roads and Caltrans would be responsible for any construction within the State right-of-way. However, there is a lot of competition for Caltrans funds, and a project that benefits just one company is not likely to occur. [Attachment 13]

Clearly, Caltrans will not participate financially in rebuilding Alta Sierra Drive or Rough and Ready Highway to carry larger trucks. The costs—of planning, design, administration, right-of-way acquisitions, surveys, materials, cuts and fills, compaction, drainage and culvert placement, new access to private driveways, any intersections, signage, grading, paving, and striping—everything needed to widen and realign each roadway—will be borne by Nevada County, which is to say the taxpayers.
Dollar General’s first two traffic analyses for Alta Sierra—dated 10/6/14 and 3/25/15—included truck turning templates based on 43-foot long trucks. [Attachments 14A, 14B, 15A, 15B] After my 4/26/15 letter to Planning [Attachment 16] pointed out that error, Dollar General’s traffic engineer revised the templates to show correct truck lengths, but nonetheless depicted inaccurate and unrealistic truck ingress, on-site, and egress movements. [Attachments 17A, 17B] My concerns about traffic safety, sight and stopping distances on Alta Sierra Drive, site design, and truck maneuvers at the Altra Sierra site were summarized in the 4/26/15 letter.

I urge all stakeholders and decision makers to take safety on Nevada County’s roads, true and correct truck size, and truck restrictions in our communities seriously. Rough and Ready Highway should not be changed from a winding rural road into a truck route. Alta Sierra Drive should not be opened to STAA truck access. Dollar General’s application for the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway stores should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Marc Mayfield / 15228 Stinson Drive, Grass Valley, 95949 / ac120022@gmail.com

CC:

Ed Scofield, District 2 Supervisor

Hank Weston, District 4 Supervisor

Nevada County Planning Commision
TRUCK MAP LEGEND
TRUCK LENGTHS & ROUTES
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Click here for the Truck Network Map

CALIFORNIA LEGAL ROUTES  California Legal trucks (black trucks) can travel on STAA routes (green and blue routes), CA Legal routes (black routes), and Advisory routes (yellow routes). CA Legal trucks have access to the entire State highway system except where prohibited (some red routes).

California Legal Truck Tractor - Semitrailer
Semitrailer length : no limit
KPRA* : 40 feet maximum for two or more axles,
        38 feet maximum for single-axle trailers
Overall length : 65 feet maximum *(KPRA = kingpin-to-rear-axle)

California Legal Truck Tractor - Semitrailer - Trailer (Doubles)
Option A
Trailer length : 28 feet 6 inches maximum (each trailer)
Overall length : 75 feet maximum
Option B
Trailer length : one trailer 28 feet 6 inches maximum
other trailer may be longer than 28 feet 6 inches
Overall length : 65 feet maximum

CA LEGAL ADVISORY ROUTES  - CA Legal trucks only; however, travel not advised if KPRA length is over posted value. KPRA advisories range from 30 to 38 feet.

STAA ROUTES  The STAA Network allows the “interstate” STAA trucks which are the green trucks shown below. The STAA Network consists of the National Network (green routes, primarily interstates) and Terminal Access routes (blue, primarily State routes). (“STAA” = federal Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982.)

(Click here for the Truck Network Map.)

Interstate “STAA” Truck Tractor - Semitrailer
Semitrailer length : 48 feet maximum
KPRA* : no limit
Overall length : no limit *(KPRA = kingpin-to-rear-axle)

Interstate “STAA” Truck Tractor - Semitrailer - Trailer (Doubles)
Trailer length : 28 feet 6 inches maximum (each trailer)
Overall length : no limit

Terminal Access - Interstate “STAA” trucks may travel on State highways that exhibit this sign.

Service Access - Interstate “STAA” trucks may travel up to one road mile from the off ramp to obtain services (food, fuel, lodging, repairs), provided the route displays this sign.

SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS - Route restricted for vehicle length or weight, cargo type, or number of axles. Click here for the list of Special Route Restrictions.
ATTACHMENT 2

From the Revised Traffic Analysis for Alta Sierra, dated 5/20/15:

Figures 7 and 8 show the truck turning templates for the project access. Truck turning templates are provided for both inbound and outbound truck turning movements at the project access. The truck turning templates utilized a WB-67 truck and are therefore a "worst case" analysis if *Alta Sierra Drive became a STAA designated roadway, whereas the roadway is currently restricted to the California Legal trucks which are shorter in overall length than the STAA truck (WB-67).* [emphasis added]

From the Revised Traffic Analysis for Rough and Ready Highway dated 7/17/15:

Figure 7 shows the truck turning templates for the project accesses. Truck turning templates are provided for both inbound and outbound truck turning movements at the project accesses. The truck turning templates utilized a WB-67 truck and are therefore a "worst case" analysis if *Rough and Ready Highway became a STAA designated roadway, whereas the roadway is currently restricted to the California Legal trucks which are shorter in overall length than the STAA truck (WB-67).* [emphasis added]

"WB 67" refers to truck wheelbase.
ATTACHMENT 3

Interstate STAA truck access sign on Rough and Ready Highway, 500 feet north of the SR 20 intersection.
ATTACHMENT 4

T-END sign on Rough and Ready Highway 1500 feet north of SR 20. Beyond this sign, lawful access by STAA combination vehicles is not allowed. North of the sign, Rough and Ready Highway narrows and for five miles—almost all of it uphill—a truck driver faces a series of S-curves and blind, tight-radius curves where tractors and trailers will occupy most or all of both lanes [Attachment 5], increasing the chances that an oncoming vehicle will hit the tractor head-on or be hit by the tractor head-on, or that an oncoming vehicle will be forced under the trailer. [Attachment 6] There are no marked turnouts for slow-moving vehicles, and no truck climbing lanes on Rough and Ready Highway. Trailers will offtrack dangerously going around the curves and may leave the pavement. [Attachment 7] “Offtrack” means that the rear wheels of a vehicle or combination of vehicles making a turn will describe a smaller arc than the front wheels. [Attachment 8, 9]
The pictures are from Google. They were taken in North Carolina, but the same conditions are present on Rough and Ready Highway and Alta Sierra Drive. The photographs in Attachments 5-7 illustrate why STAA trucks are prohibited on many roads.
ATTACHMENT 6

Car drivers in North Carolina encounter STAA trucks on tight turns. This could happen on Rough and Ready Highway and Alta Sierra Drive.
ATTACHMENT 7

Trailers in STAA combinations running off the pavement while tractors take up the opposing lane, a possibility on both Rough and Ready Highway and the curve on Alta Sierra Drive.
"Offtrack" theory. The longer the wheelbase—the distance between the front wheels and the rear wheels—the greater the amount of offtrack and the wider the maximum width of the swept path. STAA trucks present a very wide swept path when turning. On tight curves, an oncoming car has nowhere to go.
ATTACHMENT 9

Trailer offtrack at an intersection similar to the SR 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection, assuming that a northbound truck on 49 is turning onto Alta Sierra Drive.
ATTACHMENT 10

Dollar General delivery, Brunswick Basin with standard 53-foot long trailer and contractor's three-axle tractor with sleeper berth. Total tractor-and-trailer length is 73 feet.
ATTACHMENTS 11 and 12

Standard Dollar General 53-foot long trailers pulled by various contractors. Dividing loads onto smaller trucks would be time consuming and raise Dollar General’s costs.
Truck access for Alta Sierra Drive in Nevada County

HQ Legal Truck Size - Weight@DOT
<HQ.Legal.Truck.Size_Weight@dot.ca.gov>

Thu, Jul 30, 2015 at 9:11 AM

To: Marc Mayfield
Cc: "Montre, Rick E@DOT" <rick.montre@dot.ca.gov>, "Parkinson, Michelle R@DOT" <mparkinson@dot.ca.gov>, "Fonseca, Manuel@DOT" <manuel.fonseca@dot.ca.gov>, "Hui, Cyrus C Y@DOT" <cyrus.c.hui@dot.ca.gov>, "Robb, Casey J@DOT" <casey.robb@dot.ca.gov>

Dear Mr. Mayfield:

Thank you for contacting the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) re. truck access in Nevada County. I'd be glad to guide you in this process, but first, please see this Caltrans web page which is an overview of the two truck categories based on lengths, and their legal routes: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trucks/truck-length-routes.htm. On that web page, you will see 3 steps to determine whether your truck is legal, and whether it may legally access your destination, as follows:

STEP 1 – DETERMINE YOUR TRUCK CATEGORY (based on lengths)

STEP 2 -- DETERMINE THE STATE ROUTES YOU CAN USE (based on route colors on the map)

STEP 3 -- DETERMINE THE LOCAL ROADS YOU CAN USE (may need to contact the local government)

Since your truck is longer than 65 feet, you have a longer interstate STAA truck. As you can see on the Caltrans District 3 truck map, State Route (SR) 49 is a blue Terminal Access route that allows the STAA trucks.

To open Alta Sierra Drive for STAA access, Nevada County would have to approve their local roads and intersections, and Caltrans would have to approve the State intersection at Alta Sierra Drive.
This Caltrans web page “Terminal Access Application Procedure” is a step-by-step guide for both Caltrans staff and for local agencies: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trucks/routes/ta-process.htm. As you will see on that page, the County is responsible for the County roads but the County must assure Caltrans that their roads can accommodate the STAA truck. The STAA design truck that must be accommodated is not the 53’ trailer truck, but the 48’ semitrailer with the longer wheelbase. All that is explained on the web page.

If construction were to be necessary, the County would be responsible for any construction on their county roads, and Caltrans would be responsible for any construction within the State right-of-way. However, there is a lot of competition for Caltrans funds, and a project that benefits just one company is not likely to occur. On the Google map, that intersection looks tight, but we won’t be sure until we do the computer analysis.

Your main Caltrans contacts would the truck staff in District 3 who are listed on this web page: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/trucks/contact-district-truck-staff.htm. Rick and Michelle just started in these truck positions last week, so please keep me informed so I can assist them as needed. They are cc’d.

We will be in touch.

Thank you,

Casey Robb

Ms. Casey Robb, P.E.
California Dept. of Transportation
HQ Traffic Operations
Office of Commercial Vehicle Operations
Legal Truck Access Branch
Sacramento, CA
(916) 654-5741
legal.truck.access@dot.ca.gov

From: Marc Mayfield |
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 6:05 PM
To: HQ Legal Truck Size - Weight@DOT
Subject: Truck access for Alta Sierra Drive in Nevada County
Alta Sierra Drive, a Nevada County roadway accessed directly off SR 49 via a controlled T-intersection, is limited to vehicles that are not longer than 65 feet. A proposed new business on Alta Sierra Drive would have to be serviced by trucks that are 73.5 feet long (53-foot long trailers and three-axle tractors equipped with sleeper cabs).

In order to allow the longer trucks on Alta Sierra Drive, the Nevada County Department of Public Works tells me, a survey would have to be conducted by Caltrans. My own view is that this is a county-level issue because Alta Sierra Drive is a county roadway. However, if a survey--by Nevada County, by Caltrans, or both--were to be conducted and if it is determined that Alta Sierra would have to be widened/realigned and/or that the SR 49-Alta Sierra Drive intersection would have to be rebuilt to accommodate longer trucks and longer turn radii, would Caltrans perform the construction work or would Nevada County--or both? Thank you.

Respectfully / Marc Mayfield / Grass Valley, CA
ATTACHMENT 14A

Inbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 10/6/14.

KUNZMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
Over 35 Years of Excellent Service
ATTACHMENT 14B

Outbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 10/6/14.

Kunzman Associates, Inc.
Over 35 Years of Excellent Service

5780/7
ATTACHMENT 15A

Inbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 3/25/15.
ATTACHMENT 15B

Outbound truck turning template, incorrect 43-foot truck, traffic survey dated 3/25/15.
ATTACHMENT 16

Attachments A, B, D and E mentioned in my letter are not included here. A, B, and D are redundant. The link to the full Federal Highway Administration Report referred to in E is: www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/fhwahps/12006/sec_4.htm.

Attachment C is included. The reference is to Figure 6 in the traffic analysis dated 3/25/15. The 171-foot sight distance on the Alta Sierra Drive curve is reduced to 120 feet when a 73-foot truck is stopped on Alta Sierra Drive and is waiting to turn left into the proposed driveway. The Minimum Required Sight Distance is 150 feet.
04/26/15

Brian Foss
Planning Director
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Re: Revised Traffic Analysis for the proposed Dollar General store in Alta Sierra

Three important safety aspects have been overlooked in the traffic analysis: 1) The lengths of semi-trucks that would be used for deliveries at the proposed property. 2) Sight distance on Alta Sierra Drive. 3) The lengths of delivery trucks and blindside back-ups on the subject property.

1) The truck length shown in Figures 7 and 8 of the revised traffic analysis (43 feet at the scale of the figures; shown in the original traffic analysis as 34 feet) is incorrect.

Dollar General delivers from their distribution centers to their own stores with 53-foot trailers and three-axle tractors. The combined length is 73 feet. The inbound and outbound truck turning templates for the proposed store should have been based on trucks of that length, not on trucks that are 43 feet long. Outbound 73-foot long tractor-trailers will encroach across far more of the southbound lane of Alta Sierra Drive than is shown in Figure 8, and they will fully obstruct the northbound lane as they move slowly uphill to the Highway 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection. Traffic will back up behind them. I have not included Figure 8, because the encroachment will depend on the truck driver.

2) The 171-foot maximum sight distance to the driveway encroachment on southbound Alta Sierra Drive shown in Figure 6 is inaccurate.

The full length of an inbound 73-foot long combination vehicle stopped on Alta Sierra Drive and waiting to turn left across oncoming traffic was apparently not considered when the maximum sight distance was estimated.

The 171-foot sight distance shown in Figure 6 will in fact be reduced by the full length of a tractor-trailer stopped and waiting to turn left to 120 feet, which is 30 feet short of the required minimum sight distance of 150 feet. When a truck is waiting to turn left, southbound drivers coming around the sharp curve on Alta Sierra Drive will not be able to see the driveway encroachment. Truck or not, southbound drivers cannot see around the curve for nine months of the year because of leafed-out oak trees inside the curve. At times, the rear end of a trailer—or cars stopped behind the trailer—will be right around the curve, hidden by those oaks.

While waiting to turn, inbound trucks will be at risk of being struck in a rear-end collision, as will southbound vehicles lined up and waiting for the truck to complete the turn. While turning, there will always be a risk that the trailer could be struck from behind by a southbound vehicle or...
from the side by a northbound vehicle, or that one of the tractor’s fuel tanks could be hit, leading to a diesel spill. Alta Sierra Drive would be closed for hours for the cleanup, impacting traffic on Highway 49.

*The only way to mitigate the sight distance problem for the proposed driveway location during deliveries is to re-align Alta Sierra Drive. Until that is done, the proposed driveway location will be too close to a blind curve and will present, at times, a dangerously short sight distance.*

3) The true 73-foot truck length of Dollar General trucks (rather than 43 feet shown in Figures 7 and 8) and blindside truck back-ups near the driveway and through areas used by customers on foot and in their cars will compromise onsite safety.

Swept paths for blindsiding inbound semi-trucks will not be the neat arcs shown on Figure 7. They will be sinuous, will use the entire width of the parking area, and will block the driveway. They will also put trucks on areas of non-heavy duty pavement. (Link to video clip, below) The blindside back-up is the single most dangerous maneuver a truck driver can make and trucking companies instruct their drivers to avoid it whenever possible. Modern delivery areas should be designed and built so drivers won’t have to blindside. (FHWA report, below)

*The only way to mitigate potentially unsafe backing maneuvers is to redesign the proposed property so drivers will not be performing blindside maneuvers where customers will be walking and driving.*

Respectfully,

Marc Mayfield
15228 Stinson Drive
Grass Valley CA 95949
ac120022@gmail.com

Attached:

A) 53-foot long trailer and three-axle tractor delivering to Dollar General, Brunswick.

B) Tractor-trailer truck length diagram.

C) Revised Traffic Analysis Figure 6 and enlarged portion of Figure 6 showing 73-foot long truck positioned for left turn on Alta Sierra Drive and reduced sight distance of 120 feet.

D) Revised Traffic Analysis Figure 7 showing 73-foot long tractor-trailer maneuvers on subject property. For reference, the short side of the proposed building is 70 feet long.
E) Federal Highway Administration Freight and Land Use Handbook (partial) and link.

This YouTube clip is better than words to explain a blindside back-up:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5t1O6P0buXI
The truck driver had more room to maneuver than is planned for the Dollar General store, but he still had to pull up and make numerous corrections very close to parked cars and pickups. Note the path the tractor takes once the driver starts to back-up and that throughout most of the maneuver, the driver is backing up blind.
Figure 7
Inbound Truck Turning Template

ATTACHMENT 17A

Inbound truck turning template, corrected to 73-foot truck, traffic survey dated 5/20/15.
Figure 8
Outbound Truck Turning Template

ATTACHMENT 17B

Outbound truck turning template, corrected to 73-foot truck, traffic survey dated 5/20/15.

KLINZMAN ASSOCIATES, INC.
Over 35 Years of Excellent Service
Hello Ms. Hankins,

I’m writing to express my opposition to the proposed 3 new Dollar General stores in Nevada County. I attended the Planning Commission meeting on 1/28 and voiced my comments there.

I live at 10139 Alta Vista Dr, Grass Valley. My primary concern is with the proposed location on Rough and Ready Hwy, since this is my neighborhood and I drive past this parcel twice a day on my way to my children’s school. While I’m not as familiar with the other two proposed locations in Penn Valley and Alta Sierra I oppose the building of all of these stores for the same reasons.

1) This is a rural residential neighborhood. Dollar General does not fit the aesthetic environment of this area. Furthermore, the building and parking lot will completely max out the parcel, crowding the immediate neighbors with lights and lack of privacy and obstructing views. I understand that this parcel is zoned for commercial use, however that designation was made 20-30 (?) years ago and is no longer an appropriate zoning for what this neighborhood now is.

2) Rough and Ready highway is narrow, curvy, and steep in places. The Dollar General semi-trucks are too big for this size of road and will create traffic, noise pollution, and increased hazards on the road.

3) There are no sidewalks, stop signs or crosswalks on Rough and Ready Highway in this location. Increased pedestrian traffic to access the store creates major hazards for pedestrians and drivers on this road.

4) This type of store seems unsustainable to me - there is already one Dollar General in the Brunswick area, and it’s empty of customers. Why build three more? If they fail, we are stuck with these ugly buildings and parking lots which may well be unviable for any other type of business to move into.

5) I do not welcome corporate chain stores moving in to small towns and taking customers away from local businesses and income out of the local economy.

6) This store will create a trash and litter problem - snack food wrappers, soda cans, bags, boxes and all other forms of packaging from the processed food and disposable items they sell. There are other “convenience stores” already in this neighborhood. Dollar General is just another one, it’s not the kind of place that would save you a trip to Auburn or Yuba City. We have plenty of stores like this already in Grass Valley.

People, like myself, choose to live in beautiful Nevada County precisely because it is not full of bargain chain stores. We don’t mind driving a few miles to get our groceries and things we need. We do not want a convenience store, and the blight that comes with it, in every single neighborhood here.
For these reasons I urge you to closely study these issues in the Environmental Impact Report and oppose the construction of 3 more Dollar General stores in our county.

Respectfully,
Jennifer Roberts
Dear Tyler,

Thank you for listening to our neighborhood concerns about the proposed Dollar General Store at the intersection of Rough and Ready Highway and West Drive. My husband and I live on East Drive. There are a number of concerns that I have about this project but I will give you my specific ones. I must first say that I do not see the need for another Dollar General Store and they are proposing three?! This is an old neighborhood and an inappropriate location for one.

Traffic Flow
I do not believe that the traffic study that Dollar General conducted is accurate. It was not done during peak hours and does not take into account the school bus and does not take into account how the traffic will be impacted by the new Yuba Charter School. It also raises concerns about the small children getting on and off the school bus. I am enclosing the site plan with the truck turning template in case you have not seen it. Children play on this street and now they would have to be watching for semi trucks delivering goods. It will drive more traffic down Sunset and East Drive which are narrow streets without a stop sign. It will change up the whole flavor of the neighborhood.

Fire Concerns
In the event of a fire, there will not be sufficient water flow to protect homes and a 9100 square foot commercial building. It is concerning with the homeless camps in the nearby forest without adding this to the problem.

I hope you can see just a few ways this project will threaten our quality of life. Please advocate for us and help us to prevent this project from occurring.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Lisa Spang
Dear Mr. Barrington,

My name is Joseph Spang. I live at 10141 East Drive which parallels West Drive where a Dollar General Store is being proposed. I am concerned about several issues related to the environmental well being of our neighborhood.

Traffic Flow and Safety
The streets in our neighborhood are narrow and are busy enough with children, pedestrians and local traffic. Adding semi trucks for delivery and additional traffic by shoppers will make a hazardous risk in our neighborhood.

Pollution
Besides noise and light pollution which may disrupt our rural neighborhood, there may be additional pollution from trucks and cars coming into the neighborhood.

Water and Fire Risk
It has been called to my attention that there is not enough water flow from NID into our neighborhood to adequately meet the needs of fire protection for the proposed store and the neighborhood.

As citizens of California, we have laws and taxes designed to protect our cherished environment. While some or all of the issues that my neighbors and I have raised may be mitigated, it seems that our value system here would preclude such actions by the Planning Commission. I would suggest that the Planning Commission meet at the proposed site to get a firsthand experience of what their decisions may impact.

Sincerely,
Joseph M Spang
Dear Ms Hankins

I am writing to express several concerns about the proposed Dollar General Store at 12345 Rough and Ready Highway.

My primary concern is that a 9,000 square foot building is very much out of character with this residential area. It is zoned commercial, but the business previously occupying the site was a true neighborhood store. I would love to be able to walk to a neighborhood store for staples (I live a few blocks away), but Dollar General does not carry the kind of merchandise I buy. As a result, having the store in this location does not enhance the walkability of my neighborhood.

My second concern is economic. Many of the largest businesses on Rough and Ready Highway have had to close—Rough and Ready Market, the Annapurna Restaurant site, and the business at 12345 Rough and Ready Highway. My question is that while there is a lot of exposure of a commercial business to local traffic, that it would seem none of the ones relying on foot traffic can make an economic go of it. An out of business hulk of a building would be worse than the current opportunity.

My third concern is that the traffic analysis failed to consider the impact on a major, famous local bicycling route, called the LeMond loop after Greg LeMond. That route goes from Old Downieville Highway, down Newton Rd, Bitney Springs, Rough and Ready Highway, and Ridge Road. All of these would be major feeders to Dollar General, but the traffic analysis has failed to consider risks to bicyclists associated with increased traffic. There is some discussion about adding traffic lights at two intersections to handle increased traffic. Traffic lights do not help mitigate the impact on bicycle traffic unless there are dedicated bike lanes, and switches which enable riders to trigger lights and flow through intersections without doing the go-left-one-street-at-a-time shuffle. These systems are common in bike friendly cities. If you have ever ridden a road bike, you know this can be risky because stopping and starting with feet clipped into pedals puts you at risk for falling over—into traffic. In addition, the Ridge Rd/ Rough and Ready Highway intersection would require a means for cyclists to merge left and then turn. The only way to mitigate the risks increased traffic poses to bicycles on this major route is to widen both Rough and Ready Highway and Bitney Springs and Ridge Rd to include bike lanes that connect with ones already present.

I would happily walk to a local commercial venture akin to a British Pub or farm stand, but have no desire to consume more cheap junk and would greatly prefer a county that does not have more of them.

Regards

Kim Taylor
10231 Mills Rd
Grass Valley, CA 95945
Hello,

My name is Nicole. My 5 year old daughter and I live on the corner of Sunset Ave and West Drive. This is a very peaceful residential area. I feel that there is no need for a Dollar General Store to be located here. Grass Valley is just a few minutes away as well as 2 other general stores that are under 5 minutes away. The Dollar General and all the other chain stores are less than 10 minutes away in the Brunswick Basin. Our children play in this neighborhood and I feel very unsafe thinking about all of the new traffic this will create not to mention the overwhelming light pollution and loitering. Another problem would be the blocking of our entrance and exit of West Drive, due to multiple freight trucks constantly delivering there. Some other negative environmental impacts have also been brought to my attention that I am extremely concerned with.

My bottom line is that I don't feel that a Dollar General is needed in this area and would definitely not be welcome by any members of the neighborhood for various reasons. It seems like a waste of money and resources and would be an unsound environmental decision to boot. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Nicole Teller
Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170  
Nevada City, California 95959  

RE: Proposed Dollar General at R&R Highway and West Drive  

Dear Mr. Barrington:  

I am writing to inform you that I am opposed to the building of a Dollar General store at this site. My concerns and reasons for this opposition are as follows:  

I am very concerned about the intersection of West Drive and R&R highway. I have called CHP on this intersection 3 times in the past. CHP does their best to patrol this area but that doesn't always solve the problem. Sometimes it is very difficult to enter and exit West Drive.  

I am very concerned about clients at the Boyle House crossing RR Hiway to shop at this store.  

I am concerned with the proposed entrance on West Drive with the school bus stops and the county bus transportation stop at the end of West Dr. A lot of clients from the shelter use this stop for pickup.  

I am also concerned about the amount of traffic that could use Sunset Avenue and East Drive as another route to Dollar General. We don't need or want more traffic in our residential area.  

How will delivery trucks enter and exit safely.  

I have concerns about fire in the area and water pressure and supplies with this extra need for such a building.  

I do not want or need the extra lighting that will be needed at this site, nor want to hear the AC and refrigeration units running 24/7 all year round.  

What will this do my property values? I am sure it won't help mine.  

There are at least three family homes next to this site and this makes it not acceptable. There are others across RR Hiway and West Drive.  

Where will all of the storm drain off go? Will this affect the NID water ditch across the highway? We do not need oil or waste contamination in this area.  

I do not feel that we need this store in our area. It is about 5-6 miles to the store
on Nevada City Hlway. I do not shop at that store. This store will be too large for our area. The small store at Alta St. and Ridge Road and the market at Squirrel Creek solve any emergency needs. I can guarantee that I most likely will NOT be shopping at this proposed store. I know lot of my neighbors feel the same way. I am not against business in this area but this proposed business is NOT what we need or want in our residential area.

Thank your for consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Julia A. Toney
530-273-5771

CC: Jessica Hankins, Senior Planner
Dan Miller, District Supervisor

This is a copy of the email I sent to you.
Ms. Kesler-Wolfson  
Nevada County Planning Department  
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Dear Mrs. Kesler-Wolfson:

I am writing regarding building a Dollar General Store at the corner of West Drive and Rough and Ready Hiway.

I live at 12282 Sunset Avenue, Grass Valley and use the West Drive intersection with Rough and Ready Highway all of the time. I am very concerned about the added traffic at the above intersection. I have called CHP about this intersection twice. I was in the left hand turn lane waiting for my turn to enter West Drive, had a car going down the hill to my right and a car coming up the hill in the eastbound lane. A car was passing in the uphill left hand turn lane and could have caused a head on accident. There was no where for me to go, but wait and hope the illegal passing car was able to pull back in the east bound lane. Luckily there was no accident and all were safe. I know of at least one accident at this intersection in the last few years. Some of my neighbors have complained of the same situation.

I am also very concerned about possible residents of the Boyle House (family homeless shelter run by the Salvation Army) just down the hill from West Drive walking to the Dollar General Store. There are NO crosswalks nor sidewalks in the area and it is in the bend in the road, so that could be VERY unsafe for those residents.

Traffic and safety for all are my MAIN concern about this future building site.
of local residents and future clients of this business. I do not feel that this is an appropriate business for this site. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Julia A. Toney

CC: Dan Miller, District Supervisor
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: Julia A. Toney
Address: 12282 Sunset Ave., Grass Valley, CA 95945

Comments:
See attached letter.

# This is a copy of the email I sent to you!
Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, California 95959

RE: Proposed Dollar General at R&R Highway and West Drive

Dear Mr. Barrington:

I am writing to inform you that I am opposed to the building of a Dollar General store at this site. My concerns and reasons for this opposition are as follows:

I am very concerned about the intersection of West Drive and R&R highway. I have called CHP on this intersection 3 times in the past. CHP does their best to patrol this area but that doesn’t always solve the problem. Sometimes it is very difficult to enter and exit West Drive.

I am very concerned about clients at the Boyle House crossing RR Hiway to shop at this store.

I am concerned with the proposed entrance on West Drive with the school bus stops and the county bus transportation stop at the end of West Dr. A lot of clients from the shelter use this stop for pickup.

I am also concerned about the amount of traffic that could use Sunset Avenue and East Drive as another route to Dollar General. We don’t need or want more traffic in our residential area.

How will delivery trucks enter and exit safely?

I have concerns about fire in the area and water pressure and supplies with this extra need for such a building.

I do not want or need the extra lighting that will be needed at this site, nor want to hear the AC and refrigeration units running 24/7 all year round.

What will this do to my property values? I am sure it won’t help mine.

There are at least three family homes next to this site and this makes it not acceptable. There are others across RR Hiway and West Drive.

Where will all of the storm drain off go? Will this affect the NID water ditch across the highway? We do not need oil or waste contamination in this area.

I do not feel that we need this store in our area. It is about 5-6 miles to the store
on Nevada City Hiway. I do not shop at that store. This store will be too large for our area. The small store at Alta St. and Ridge Road and the market at Squirrel Creek solve any emergency needs. I can guarantee that I most likely will NOT be shopping at this proposed store. I know lot of my neighbors feel the same way. I am not against business in this area but this proposed business is NOT what we need or want in our residential area.

Thank your for consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Julia A. Toney
530-273-5771

CC: Jessica Hankins, Senior Planner
    Dan Miller, District Supervisor
Ms. Kesler-Wolfson  
Nevada County Planning Department  
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Dear Mrs. Kesler-Wolfson:

I am writing regarding building a Dollar General Store at the corner of West Drive and Rough and Ready Hiway.

I live at 12282 Sunset Avenue, Grass Valley and use the West Drive intersection with Rough and Ready Highway all of the time. I am very concerned about the added traffic at the above intersection. I have called CHP about this intersection twice. I was in the left hand turn lane waiting for my turn to enter West Drive, had a car going down the hill to my right and a car coming up the hill in the eastbound lane. A car was passing in the uphill left hand turn lane and could have caused a head on accident. There was no where for me to go, but wait and hope the illegal passing car was able to pull back in the east bound lane. Luckily there was no accident and all were safe. I know of at least one accident at this intersection in the last few years. Some of my neighbors have complained of the same situation.

I am also very concerned about possible residents of the Boyle House (family homeless shelter run by the Salvation Army) just down the hill from West Drive walking to the Dollar General Store. There are NO crosswalks nor sidewalks in the area and it is in the bend in the road, so that could be VERY unsafe for those residents.

Traffic and safety for all are my MAIN concern about this future building site.
of local residents and future clients of this business. I do not feel that this is an appropriate business for this site.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Julia A. Toney

CC: Dan Miller, District Supervisor
TO: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner  
Planning Department  
Community Development Agency  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 170  
Nevada City, CA  95959  
email:  tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us  

FROM:  Robin Voigt  
12304 Rough and Ready Hwy.  
Grass Valley, CA  95945  
email:  ravoigt@earthlink.net  

RE: Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store  
Project Draft EIR  

Following are my main concerns to include in you EIR regarding Dollar General on the proposed Rough and Ready site.  

Incompatibility with the neighborhood:  

People of Nevada County are very concerned that urban sprawl is invading our beautiful foothill setting. The Dollar General that exists in Grass Valley has not been there long enough to determine whether it can thrive well enough to add additional stores. Although your Impact Report does not deal with market value, your report should consider the impact of change inherent to the destruction of wildlife habitat, the loss of aesthetics and neighborhood quality, and the type of business that can replace the possibility of a failed business.  

Habitat Destruction: Because this is a rural setting, there are many variety of bird species present in this area. Hawks, owls, western bluebirds, and bluejays have been spotted on the proposed site recently. Deer and turkey have been seen using this site as well. Developing this property as proposed would permanently delete this habitat, and species that could adapt would be starlings and pigeons. (Referring to the Alta Sierra site, it is inexcusable to destroy old growth areas, particularly when there are neighbors against it.)
Property Better Suited for Local Businesses: Only the south side of the highway is zoned "commercial". Historically, the type of businesses that were here were "mom and pop" types. The bar across the street from the proposed site is now a residence. "Sunset Market" has been closed for over 20 years and is now a quiet studio/workroom for the owner/tenant. Forty years ago, the building on the proposed site was once "The Midget Kitchen" restaurant but has since been reclaimed as a quiet office, with the owners as neighbors who live nearby. Hence, this commercial area has been reclaimed by both nature and the neighborhood. Development on this property would be more acceptable for a business more suitable to the rural environment. There are other nearby convenient stores that already serve this neighborhood: Alta Market and Oak Market. Because the town of Grass Valley is only two miles away, it's hard to rationalize the need for another especially large convenience store. The Dollar General in Grass Valley is only three miles away.

Neighborly: We live directly on Rough and Ready Hwy. It's amazing how many people drive by who wave or stop because they know us. With added traffic on this highway, I doubt that this would continue. A chain convenience store that has a bad reputation for employee treatment and pay, stock market ploys to beef up their stock price by building as many stores as they can, and throwing enough money at property owners "offering a price they can't refuse" is not the kind of development that is conducive to this rural neighborhood. People love the Sunset area because it is rural, quiet, friendly, and has beautiful sunsets. Neighbors in this area are generally in agreement that another kind of business would be better suited for this site.

Noise, Air Pollution, and Activity:
The higher level of noise and added air pollution is a BIG concern:
- More traffic, more noise and pollution make it harder to enjoy backyard activities. The highway itself is very noisy between the hours of 6 am to 10 pm. So added noise and air pollution would be detrimental to the residences already here.
- Large semi delivery trucks (during and reportably AFTER business hours, which means after 10pm, normally quiet time in residential areas). How
many deliveries are expected? How many are reasonable and during what hours? Please address this adequately in your report.

- Trash hauling (typically very early morning before business hours for commercial customers) This can be very annoying to hear the trash truck come at unreasonably early hours.
- Car doors opening, people talking, more litter
- Higher risk for collisions (this site is between two bends of the highway)
- Can the large delivery trucks get in and out of the property WITHOUT using East Drive and/or West Drive???? It seems implausible that the trucks can make the tight turns to/from Rough and Ready Hwy. as proposed on the site drawing. Please, please check this twice!
- Crosswalks are necessary. Many neighbors have expressed this concern. Please hear them!
- Store and street lighting would be unwelcome intrusion to our current quality of life.
- Widening the road would impact greatly on the residences already here. The highway would be more heavily used, and the wear and tear of the road by the trucks would impact the highway.
- Home values could be lowered due to the commercial activity of a Dollar General and the greater use of the highway by big commercial trucks. Would YOU buy a house next to or across the street from a Dollar General?

**Water and Septic**

- There is concern that planned drainage is insufficient, and there could be water runoff, along with trash, into the water systems that exist. This must be addressed adequately in your report.
- Is the septic system that is proposed adequate?
- Would houses be deficient in water should a fire break out because of Dollar General? We neighbors are very protective of our water. This must be addressed adequately in your report.

Thank you for hearing our concerns.
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Feb 8th before 5pm

Name: Valerie Anthony
Address: 12115 Sunset Ave Grass Valley 95945

Comments:

   Our street is narrow and needs asphalt already.

2. Rough & Ready Hwy is very busy - Traffic of Yuba River Charter School - Twin Cities - Penn Valley Traffic - Speeding cars - People and Semi-Trucks will alternatively use Sunset Ave.

3. Water Pressure is not adequate for fire emergency. A pump will take the water away from the neighborhood. So what about our water pressure (neighborhood) in an emergency and it is all taken away with Dollar General pump.

4. Drainage pipe 4" is not adequate to take a reasonable drainage of oil & grease from a parking lot that large - So over-flow yuck drainage will go where?

5. IF requires 49 parking spaces - AND ONLY have 29 spaces...
6 We Do Not Agree with traffic Report
It is Incomplete!
Yuba River Charter School -
Children's Bus Stops—
Busy and speed on Rough & Ready Hwy
will Semi trucks and traffic and parking

use our Narrow "old" Residential Street
on Sunset Ave- west Dr. for parking
& traffic & Semi trucks—
The Environmental Impact on our Neighborhood
is very unsafe and undesirable and
 tearing up our streets with big trucks—
Our Asphalt is already failing —
Also Crime & Theft may possibly be Heightened.
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: Daniel M. Coughlin
Address: 10268 West Dr., NV 89524

Comments:

1. I am concerned about the lighting staying all night.

2. Congested traffic would be another concern.

3. The Septic field is kitty corner to my property. Could this be a problem in the future?

4. Future effects on the water pressure—
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: E.L. Lightfoot
Address: 2705 Ridge Rd

Comments:
- I am concerned about car/truck lights/street/parking lot lights after hours.
- I am interested in the applicant's plan for mitigating bad weather:
  - Torrential rains
  - Snow/ice
  Where or what will they do with the excess and how will that impact the properties down hill?
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: Bob Brien (bobbrien@cw-net.com)
Address: 10258 Traquair Lane, Rough & Ready 95975

Comments:

There is a lot of foot & bicycle traffic along the highway at this point. This safety is a very important concern.

This would be putting a commercial building right in the middle of a rural neighborhood.
From: Matt Preszler
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 5:19 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Attachments: rough and ready hwy dollar general.pdf

Scoping mtg comment form
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: 
Address: Rough & Ready

Comments:

1. Is there a need in this County for another of this type of store.
2. Not appropriate in current residential area.
3. Water situation serious. What about leaks, particularly the situation re: Horse (large forest in that area). He was put out of business as a result of the conflict with NID.
January 20, 2016
Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store
Project Draft EIR
Scoping Meeting Comment Form

Please provide your comments on the contents of the analysis of potential physical environmental effects of the project that should be discussed in the environmental impact report for the Rough and Ready Highway Dollar General Store Project. You can provide this form with your written comments to staff at this meeting or mail or email your comments to:

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

Name: Alycia Weiss
Address: 12359 Sunset Ave, Grass Valley CA 95945

Comments:

- Concerns about increased foot traffic (bike traffic) dangerous
- Concerns about assembly streets West & Rough Ready
- Increased traffic on Sunset Ave & West drive residential area
- Light pollution Input
- Concerns about septic systems, poor drainage
- Concerns about noise pollution in residential area
- Traffic study done year ago, traffic has increased significantly since then
- Electrical pole traffic concern
  Corner of West & Rough Ready

[Additional comments continued on the next page]
Dollar General 3ea New Buildings R&R

About this petition

This is in opposition to the building of a new Dollar General Store at Rough & Ready Hwy. and West Dr Grass Valley. This is a completely residential area with one commercial property. That was annexed many years ago as commercial property it is the former site of the midget kitchen ,for those that are long-term residents.PLEASE ADD YOUR ADDRESS TO COMMENTS AS REQUESTED BY Nevada County Planning Dept.

We have till February 8th 2016

Remembering to add a comment of how this has an environmental impact on our area or on you personally. Voice your concerns! I will forward every day so long as the list grows keep talking,reminder everyone can go to sunset neighborhood Facebook page to easily find the petition to sign. Or search Rick Stent post on Facebook it’s so easy. If they don’t have internet access let them use your smart phone etc. so long as they post there name AND ADDRESS in comments or email address with their own comments.
Signatures

1. Name: Sarah Hatten  on 2016-01-23 23:30:45
   Comments:

2. Name: Andrew Walls  on 2016-01-24 00:01:04
   Comments:

3. Name: Jane Lee    on 2016-01-24 00:30:58
   Comments: I oppose the proposed Dollar General Store at Rough & Ready Hwy and West Dr., Grass Valley. It is a residential community and not a commercial area.

4. Name: Joe Morphee  on 2016-01-24 01:59:56
   Comments: No on dollar general

5. Name: Julia Toney   on 2016-01-24 02:13:54
   Comments: I oppose the proposed Dollar General at the Rough and Ready and West Dr. site due to many safety problems---traffic, school bus stop/public transportation bus stop, homeless shelter clients crossing highway at unsafe area to name a few

6. Name: Michele Hendricks  on 2016-01-24 03:34:47
   Comments: Don't ruin this residential neighborhood with a Dollar Gen. How very offensive !!!

7. Name: roger belding on 2016-01-24 08:43:31
   Comments: would probably cause a severe traffic problem in what is an essentially a residential neighborhood

8. Name: Patricia Gerula  on 2016-01-24 14:37:18
   Comments:

   Comments: These made-in-China stores have no place in our locally sustainable rural economy.

10. Name: Dia Gix        on 2016-01-25 02:07:32
    Comments: I oppose the proposal to place a Dollar General store at the corner of Rough &Ready highway and West Dr. This is a rural residential neighborhood and does not need an almost 10,000 sq ft store at that location.

    Comments:

12. Name: Norma Moore     on 2016-01-26 00:55:57
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name: Jane Sinclair</th>
<th>Date: 2016-01-26 03:19:05</th>
<th>Comments: One Dollar General in Grass Valley is sufficient.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Name: Bruce Doan</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-26 13:06:32</td>
<td>Comments: We do not need more competition for our local businesses. Shop local, bank local, keep your money in Nevada County. Support our community before it is overrun by corporate sameness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Name: Joanna Gear</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-26 21:53:40</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Name: Shawn Hall</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-26 22:31:59</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Name: Jennifer Roberts</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-26 23:16:46</td>
<td>Comments: This rural, residential neighborhood is a completely inappropriate place for a chain store. This road is not designed for pedestrians - no sidewalks or crosswalks, creating dangers to people accessing the store and drivers. We have plenty of dollar stores and convenience stores in this community. I am completely opposed to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Name: Cricket Noyes</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-26 23:22:17</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Name: Abe Miessler</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-27 02:11:00</td>
<td>Comments: Terrible idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Name: Sebastian Robers</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-27 02:13:27</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Name: Cally Simpson</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-27 03:36:39</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Name: Nicole bratt-Maloney</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-27 04:02:30</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Name: Rebecca Laidley</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-27 05:52:18</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Name: Deborah Wandro</td>
<td>Date: 2016-01-27 07:09:14</td>
<td>Comments: We don't need another cheaply made items store in our county, why in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Lori Lachman</td>
<td>2016-01-27 15:24:47</td>
<td>This would be a disaster for the neighborhood and the neighbors. Can you imagine 24 hour lights on in your neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Valerie Anthony</td>
<td>2016-01-27 17:09:47</td>
<td>I have environmental concerns of water pressure in the event of fire for the residence. Traffic concerns of our residential neighborhood. Also This type of business is not of character with the desires of our neighborhood. The space is better suited for a fruit-veggie-nut-and-berry stand. Or a Hotdog cart or Mexican food wagon. Kept nicely. Or a park for our children and dogs... Or Antique sales. Sincerely concerned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Shanan Manuel</td>
<td>2016-01-27 17:41:38</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Kathy Laible</td>
<td>2016-01-27 18:29:38</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Carla Bonetti</td>
<td>2016-01-27 19:13:02</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Barbara Jensen</td>
<td>2016-01-27 20:12:16</td>
<td>No room for that store. Traffic will be a nightmare. Just say NO!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Sherri Osorio</td>
<td>2016-01-27 21:14:29</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Kelley Johnson</td>
<td>2016-01-27 21:19:16</td>
<td>I live on east drive! This is not welcome in my neighborhood. I will never buy one thing from this outrageous misplaced eye sore!!.SMILEYFACE.LAUGHING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Elisa Parker</td>
<td>2016-01-28 02:14:37</td>
<td>Comments: It's difficult to imagine how our community can support another box grocery story (especially when the eye sore Dollar General Store at Brunswick seems to be struggling).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Michael Logue</td>
<td>2016-01-28 05:09:41</td>
<td>Comments: Enough is enough!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 36. | Name: Bryan Roberts  
on 2016-01-28 14:46:16  
Comments: |
| 37. | Name: Eleanore MacDonald  
on 2016-01-28 20:28:31  
Comments: |
| 38. | Name: Sasha Hughes  
on 2016-01-28 20:29:11  
Comments: |
| 39. | Name: Lora hansen  
on 2016-01-28 20:33:15  
Comments: We already have one in town. Just 5 minutes away |
| 40. | Name: Ryan Cubillo  
on 2016-01-28 20:33:30  
Comments: Don't Roseville Nevada county. |
| 41. | Name: Nicole Ragin  
on 2016-01-28 20:38:44  
Comments: |
| 42. | Name: Jennifer headrick  
on 2016-01-28 20:42:40  
Comments: Do not need another |
| 43. | Name: Patricia Carballar  
on 2016-01-28 20:44:16  
Comments: |
| 44. | Name: Barbara Jones  
on 2016-01-28 20:48:42  
Comments: Do not trash our rural community with another scrappy store. I have not, nor Willie ever, go to the dollar General in the Brunswick basin. NC residents are not PWT...we deserve quality shopping in quality, conscience communities. |
| 45. | Name: Erin Dettner  
on 2016-01-28 21:00:24  
Comments: |
| 46. | Name: Darlene  
on 2016-01-28 21:01:55  
Comments: |
| 47. | Name: Vance Grossie  
on 2016-01-28 21:06:11  
Comments: |
| 48. | Name: Karen Gobert  
on 2016-01-28 21:14:24  
Comments: This business is so out of place, unwanted, and unnecessary. It would turn into a blight on the community. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date &amp; Time</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nicole Teller</td>
<td>2016-01-28 21:27:30</td>
<td>We do not need another Dollar General in this town, especially in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>predominantly residential area. Thank You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lisa Spang</td>
<td>2016-01-28 21:36:19</td>
<td>We already have one in town where they belong. It is entirely inappropriate in this rural neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Barbara Lowe</td>
<td>2016-01-28 21:37:13</td>
<td>Our beautiful mountain community does not need, or want another Dollar General Store. One is already to many. Please keep your stores in the city!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Gail Redmond</td>
<td>2016-01-28 21:39:39</td>
<td>There's one in Grass Valley, don't need anymore. The parking is always empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jen Abrahamson</td>
<td>2016-01-28 22:15:02</td>
<td>It is a disservice to the citizens of Nevada County to bring these low quality stores into our community. The location choice is also questionable. Another Dollar store is not what I support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Matt Berry</td>
<td>2016-01-28 22:35:00</td>
<td>We do not need another not dollar store!! Keep R&amp;R wild!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Christiane Bourgault</td>
<td>2016-01-28 22:40:20</td>
<td>We do not need another junk store in our pretty town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Richard spring</td>
<td>2016-01-28 22:47:26</td>
<td>NO, NO, we do n't need any more traffic, etc!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Heather Rae</td>
<td>2016-01-28 23:16:49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Moriah blue</td>
<td>2016-01-28 23:32:23</td>
<td>I strongly oppose having a dollar general at the end of my street, I moved to west drive to have a safe quiet neighborhood for my family and our 2.5 year old son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Kristen Adams</td>
<td>2016-01-28 23:52:45</td>
<td>3 Dollar stores in town is 2 too many. We certainly don't need or want more!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Kim Ryan</td>
<td>2016-01-29 00:22:51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments: No more $ stores we have 3 already!!!

61. Name: Amy Smith-Acuaviva on 2016-01-29 00:23:51
   Comments:

62. Name: Janice Currie on 2016-01-29 00:29:57
   Comments: I can find no justification for this project. Please don't do it.

63. Name: Matthew Margulies on 2016-01-29 00:30:31
   Comments:

64. Name: Brianna McKinley on 2016-01-29 00:31:48
   Comments: Please stop this insanity. I NEVER shop at the store already in Grass Valley and NO ONE I know does either. It's all crap made from China and not even that inexpensive. WE don't NEED, WANT, or will PUT UP with these companies coming in and ruining our town!

65. Name: Autumn Barr on 2016-01-29 00:37:15
   Comments:

66. Name: karen jarvis on 2016-01-29 00:42:01
   Comments: No!

67. Name: shelley mckinley on 2016-01-29 00:48:45
   Comments: Do not want merchandise from China or overseas

68. Name: DeeDee Vierra on 2016-01-29 00:54:38
   Comments:

69. Name: Sonia cervantez on 2016-01-29 00:58:46
   Comments: We don't need another one of these terrible stores in our community

70. Name: Janis Anderson on 2016-01-29 01:07:20
   Comments:

71. Name: jayme elliott on 2016-01-29 01:34:17
   Comments: 15797 names drive grass valley, ca 95949

72. Name: Rick Stent on 2016-01-29 01:36:08
   Comments: 12209 Sunset Ave. Grass Valley California
   There are no sidewalks to protect bicyclists and pedestrians there is not adequate enough water in the time of a fire the entryway for a semi truck pulling into the proposed location is a traffic and safety hazard my concerns also include that of additional traffic
through our neighborhood on Sunset Avenue. I have a visually impaired granddaughter who lives with me and I am concerned with this additional traffic for her safety. Her exercise consists of walking up and down the hill on Sunset Avenue on a already narrowed street. This presents a safety hazard for not only her but other children in the neighborhood and walking adults some of which are in their elderly years.

73. Name: Odilia Gix 10058 West Drive GV on 2016-01-29 01:38:09
Comments: Resigning, Original did not have address. Opposed to Dollar General Rough & Ready Highway due to traffic, public safety, noise, septic, Fire protection water shortage concerns. This is Residential neighborhood with no room for such a large store.

74. Name: Margaret Hughes on 2016-01-29 01:46:52
Comments: Please NO

75. Name: Loraine Webb on 2016-01-29 01:46:54
Comments:

76. Name: Loraine Webb on 2016-01-29 01:49:21
Comments: Planning Dept. Please do your job and protect local small businesses from more toxic garbage from China! I'm a long-time resident at: 11110 White Oak Way Nevada City

77. Name: Valerie Anthony on 2016-01-29 01:59:10
Comments: Traffic, environmental, Safety, water pressure, drainage, and we do not support such a tacky over sized store in our residential neighborhood! We want a fruit market or a park for the kids or a mom and pop business.

78. Name: Carolyn Ayers on 2016-01-29 02:01:23
Comments:

79. Name: Sierra Cameron on 2016-01-29 02:04:08
Comments:

80. Name: Brianna Milbauer on 2016-01-29 02:43:42
Comments:

81. Name: Savanna Prieto on 2016-01-29 02:44:18
Comments:

82. Name: Victoria chinberg on 2016-01-29 02:47:13
Comments:
83. Name: Wendy Hylinski  on 2016-01-29 02:49:30
   Comments:

84. Name: Josh pascarella  on 2016-01-29 02:54:01
   Comments:

85. Name: amy steele cubillo  on 2016-01-29 02:54:03
   Comments: NO DOLLAR GENERAL!

86. Name: Joe morphew  on 2016-01-29 02:56:06
   Comments:

87. Name: Maxx Hermann  on 2016-01-29 03:01:10
   Comments:

88. Name: Michelle Rasmussen  on 2016-01-29 03:02:21
   Comments:

89. Name: Cynthia Harding  on 2016-01-29 03:28:04
   Comments: I absolutely oppose this from happening.

90. Name: Jessica McGregor  on 2016-01-29 03:39:18
   Comments: I do not support development of that area.

91. Name: Cammy  on 2016-01-29 03:46:55
   Comments: Keep are community small
                We already have 3 dollar stores

92. Name: Alisa Wood  on 2016-01-29 03:49:32
   Comments: This will be damaging to the environment as well as dangerous as the roads
              are not made for that type of increased traffic.

93. Name: Jonette Walter  on 2016-01-29 03:52:04
   Comments:

94. Name: Shirley Bozzo  on 2016-01-29 03:54:42
   Comments:

95. Name: Heather McKenzie  on 2016-01-29 03:57:50
   Comments:

96. Name: Steven Petersen  on 2016-01-29 03:59:42
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97. Name: phizannah abraham  on 2016-01-29 04:01:07  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Name: Desiree Ince  on 2016-01-29 04:08:46  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Name: Louise bock  on 2016-01-29 04:11:04  Comments: no one wants/needs a store like this in this location!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Name: Dennis  on 2016-01-29 04:12:46  Comments: Out of all the stores in Nevada County that Grass Valley has shot down there considering another dollar store absolutely ridiculous !!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Name: Adam Szwarc  on 2016-01-29 04:16:59  Comments: Enough is enough!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Name: Catherine Ardagh  on 2016-01-29 04:20:08  Comments: Why? We absolutely do not need this store there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Name: Ryan Ince  on 2016-01-29 04:20:13  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Name: Shelly allen  on 2016-01-29 04:43:33  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Name: Abhi ardagh  on 2016-01-29 04:49:56  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Name: Elizabeth Collins  on 2016-01-29 05:11:23  Comments: The Dollar General is the wrong kind of store for this community. I would be very surprised if it had any chance of success. I have visited the one that is already here &amp; it was awful! The prices are not good, the layout is awkward, and I will not be returning!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Name: Kristi bradanini  on 2016-01-29 05:30:41  Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. Name: Ben miller  on 2016-01-29 05:39:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name: Zachary Mowen on 2016-01-29 09:12:37
Comments: The last thing this area needs is another dollar store that sells cheap garbage that nobody wants. The Dollar General in Brunswick is always empty. Why would anyone think there needs to be more here?

Name: Suzona Pitkin on 2016-01-29 11:48:36
Comments:

Name: Wanda Way on 2016-01-29 11:53:40
Comments: I own residential property in the Sunset District for 36 years now. We don't need a Dollar General or want one. We have Oak Supermarket to fill our needs just fine.

Name: Delphi Whittle on 2016-01-29 13:17:15
Comments: We do not want or need a Dollar General Store!!!

Name: Ashlie Evans on 2016-01-29 13:19:29
Comments:

Name: jeanna inman on 2016-01-29 14:41:23
Comments:

Name: Lee Ridenour on 2016-01-29 14:45:13
Comments: From what I understand there is suppose to be one going in down in Penn Vally not to far from Taco Shell. I don't understand the need for one in Sunset area when just less than three miles you will possibly be having another. Isn't one on each end of Grass Valley enough?

Name: DOTTIE Lively on 2016-01-29 14:46:50
Comments: NO to a Dollar General in our neighborhood!

Name: Richard Baker on 2016-01-29 14:49:54
Comments: No!

Name: Lydie Russell on 2016-01-29 14:51:54
Comments: There is NO need for this in our area!

Name: Robyn Caywood on 2016-01-29 14:58:44
Comments: Our small town does not need another Dollar General. There is already one in Grass Valley (and at least 2 other dollar stores) to serve the community who are interested in having one. The rest of us would much rather they stay far away from our quaint town and instead support open green space and mom and pop shops.

Name: m mickelson on 2016-01-29 15:01:59
Comments:
134. Name: Crystal Griffin  on 2016-01-29 15:49:25
Comments: 13938 Golden Star Rd. GRASS Valley, CA 95949, I think our area is far to rural to introduce the 3 proposed stores. We don't need them, especially in the areas in question.

135. Name: Penelope St Claire  on 2016-01-29 15:52:59
Comments: PO Box 173
North San Juan, CA 95960

136. Name: David Bock  on 2016-01-29 15:58:57
Comments: We don't need a junk store or any more retail outlets on this side of town.

137. Name: Danielle Thomas  on 2016-01-29 16:51:38
Comments: Just because there is space there to put something doesn't mean there needs to be anything. I believe it's a bad place to put another dollar general, dollar store or whatever. This town is not huge. There are 3 of these type stores in town and there is no need for another. The folks in the area don't mind driving to town to shop. Now another little breakfast/lunch diner would more likely be welcome.

138. Name: Jane Schluter  on 2016-01-29 17:02:34
Comments: I have never even been to the one in town, we sure don't one here!

139. Name: barbara  on 2016-01-29 18:25:03
Comments:

140. Name: Beth Ann Wilson  on 2016-01-29 18:30:42
Comments: NO MORE DOLLAR GENERAL

141. Name: Jonathan Hurst  on 2016-01-29 19:39:54
Comments:

142. Name: Patricia Chambers  on 2016-01-29 20:13:27
Comments: NO... to building a Dollar General Store in any of these 3 areas, esp. Rough & Ready.
This is a rural, residential neighborhood!
Rough & Ready Hwy is a beautiful country road.
It is the only road into town for many residents and it already has enough traffic, school busses, pedestrians and cyclists.
This type of store is inappropriate and a slap in the face for Nevada County Residents and Local Business Owners.
Planning Dept. Tyler Barrington, please do not allow this. Protect NC residents and business owners.
I strongly oppose.
14533 Rough and Ready Hwy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Martin</td>
<td>Name: Cynthia Martin on 2016-01-29 20:57:30 Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gina Ross</td>
<td>Name: Gina Ross on 2016-01-29 21:46:57 Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Gallus</td>
<td>Name: Jeremy Gallus on 2016-01-29 22:18:51 Comments: Environmentally there's an issue because there's not enough water volume for the proposed stores fire sprinkler. Read the articles on the county website but there has not been any new recommendations on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina bernheimer</td>
<td>Name: Marina bernheimer on 2016-01-29 22:52:57 Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Selletti</td>
<td>Name: Stephanie Selletti on 2016-01-29 23:22:20 Comments: That's a really weird spot for a store like this! Makes no sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Clark</td>
<td>Name: Mary Clark on 2016-01-29 23:25:00 Comments: I live on Mooney Flat Road. I am opposed to any more Dollar General Stores in Nevada County!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Petersen</td>
<td>Name: Suzanne Petersen on 2016-01-29 23:30:11 Comments: 12251 Sunset Ave. Grass Valley, Ca. 95945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOAN KREMMER</td>
<td>Name: JOAN KREMMER on 2016-01-30 00:17:47 Comments: my address is: 275 Hazel Lane Grass Valley, CA 95945 I strongly oppose this business for the increased traffic and the sprawl it will bring to this area. It will significantly detract from the rural quality which R &amp;R retains, and I believe there is no way to measure in dollars and cents, the loss of the rural character of a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaye Blazer</td>
<td>Name: Shaye Blazer on 2016-01-30 03:17:49 Comments: Hell no!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Barrios</td>
<td>Name: Susan Barrios on 2016-01-30 05:10:31 Comments: This is not needed in Rough &amp; Ready. This town is an historical district. Is not conducive with how the town looks or the personality of it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
154. Name: Marie Wolfe on 2016-01-30 07:54:15
Comments: Please please please...do not allow this to happen. For the money the county will receive for this store to come in, think of the destruction of the natural beauty. Why invite in all the traffic, lights, noise just to sell more chinese produced junk. We already have dollar stores in our business districts. Keep the business districts for business and the rural areas for living, relaxing and community. thank you

155. Name: Haley on 2016-01-30 08:00:01
Comments:

156. Name: Jennifer Knapp on 2016-01-30 08:09:28
Comments:

157. Name: Sharon Morrison on 2016-01-30 08:29:39
Comments: I strongly oppose. We do not need another Dollar General..we already have one plus 2 Dollar stores. Adding 3 more makes that 6 Dollar stores within 10 miles. I don't shop Dollar General and never will it's junk. Enough is enough.

158. Name: Barbara Brooks on 2016-01-30 15:57:54
Comments:

159. Name: Lauren wagner on 2016-01-30 16:01:10
Comments: opposed

160. Name: Mike Mooers on 2016-01-30 21:28:29
Comments: This is not at all appropriate. It clashes with our historic atmosphere, rural beauty, and the potential for a healthy economic future. It will drain services, send local dollars out of the region, and create traffic, noise and negatively impact property values.

161. Name: Laura Sloan on 2016-01-31 00:07:23
Comments:

162. Name: Judith Hill-Weld on 2016-01-31 00:14:31
Comments:

163. Name: Tracy Favilla on 2016-01-31 00:25:47
Comments: 536 whiting street apartment 31 mailing address 12209 sunset ave Grass Valley 95945. A Dollar General Store has no business being there, or any other store for that matter. There are many reasons on many levels: more traffic on residential streets where kids play, like my daughters, along with other kids in the neighborhood, and disturbing other residents in and around the neighborhood, not to mention all of the environmental changes and demands that will occur.
Name: Pat on 2016-01-31 02:14:07
Comments: I live on Squirrel Creek this would add too much additional traffic to Ridge Rd and R&R highway. A school has also been approved at Adams and R&R highway that will add way to many cars and buses to our rural area going towards R&R.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sarah Hatten</td>
<td>1/23/2016 23:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andrew Walls</td>
<td>1/24/2016 0:01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jane Lee</td>
<td>1/24/2016 0:30</td>
<td>I oppose the proposed Dollar General Store at Rough &amp; Ready Hwy and West Dr., Grass Valley. It is a residential community and not a commercial area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joe Morphee</td>
<td>1/24/2016 1:59</td>
<td>No on dollar general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Julia Toney</td>
<td>1/24/2016 2:13</td>
<td>I oppose the proposed Dollar General at the Rough and Ready and West Dr. site due to many safety problems—traffic, school bus stop/public transportation bus stop, homeless shelter clients crossing highway at unsafe area to name a few.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Michele Hendricks</td>
<td>1/24/2016 3:34</td>
<td>Don't ruin this residential neighborhood with a Dollar Gen. How very offensive !!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Roger Belding</td>
<td>1/24/2016 8:43</td>
<td>Would probably cause a severe traffic problem in what is an essentially a residential neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patricia Gerula</td>
<td>1/24/2016 14:37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Loraine Webb</td>
<td>1/24/2016 21:28</td>
<td>These made-in-China stores have no place in our locally sustainable rural economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dia Gix</td>
<td>1/25/2016 2:07</td>
<td>I oppose the proposal to place a Dollar General store at the corner of Rough &amp; Ready highway and West Dr. This is a rural residential neighborhood and does not need an almost 10,000 sq ft store at that location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ann Deden</td>
<td>1/25/2016 7:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Norma Moore</td>
<td>1/26/2016 0:55</td>
<td>Not a good location for a retail store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jane Sinclair</td>
<td>1/26/2016 3:19</td>
<td>One Dollar General in Grass Valley is sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bruce Doan</td>
<td>1/26/2016 13:06</td>
<td>We do not need more competition for our local businesses. Shop local, bank local, keep your money in Nevada County. Support our community before it is overrun by corporate sameness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Joanna Gear</td>
<td>1/26/2016 21:53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Shawn Hall</td>
<td>1/26/2016 22:31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jennifer Roberts</td>
<td>1/26/2016 23:16</td>
<td>This rural, residential neighborhood is a completely inappropriate place for a chain store. This road is not designed for pedestrians - no sidewalks or crosswalks, creating dangers to people accessing the store and drivers. We have plenty of dollar stores and convenience stores in this community. I am completely opposed to this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Cricket Noyes</td>
<td>1/26/2016 23:22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe Miessler</td>
<td>1/27/2016 2:11</td>
<td>Terrible idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Robers</td>
<td>1/27/2016 2:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cally Simpson</td>
<td>1/27/2016 3:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole bratt-Maloney</td>
<td>1/27/2016 4:02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebeccah Laidley</td>
<td>1/27/2016 5:52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Wandro</td>
<td>1/27/2016 7:09</td>
<td>We don’t need another cheaply made items store in our county, why in the world would we?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Lachman</td>
<td>1/27/2016 15:24</td>
<td>This would be a disaster for the neighborhood and the neighbors. Can you imagine 24 hour lights on in your neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Hammitt</td>
<td>1/27/2016 15:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Anthony</td>
<td>1/27/2016 17:09</td>
<td>I have environmental concerns of water pressure in the event of fire for the residence. Traffic concerns of our residential neighborhood, and drainage concerns. Also This type of business is out of character with the desires of our neighborhood. The space is better suited for a fruit-veggie-nut-and berry stand. Or a Hotdog cart or Mexican food wagon. Kept nicely. Or a park for our children and dogs. .. Or Antique sales. Sincerely concerned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanan Manuel</td>
<td>1/27/2016 17:41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Laible</td>
<td>1/27/2016 18:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Bonetti</td>
<td>1/27/2016 19:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Jensen</td>
<td>1/27/2016 20:12</td>
<td>No room for that store. Traffic will be a nightmare. Just say NO!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherri Osorio</td>
<td>1/27/2016 21:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley johnson</td>
<td>1/27/2016 21:19</td>
<td>I live on east drive! This is not welcome in my neighborhood i will never buy one thing from this outrageous misplaced eye sore!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisa Parker</td>
<td>1/28/2016 2:14</td>
<td>It's difficult to imagine how our community can support another box grocery story (especially when the eye sore Dollar General Store at Brunswick seems to be struggling).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Logue</td>
<td>1/28/2016 5:09</td>
<td>Enough is enough!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Roberts</td>
<td>1/28/2016 14:46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanore MacDonald</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha Hughes</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora Hansen</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:33</td>
<td>We already have one in town. Just 5 minutes away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Cubillo</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:33</td>
<td>Don't Roseville Nevada county.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole Raglin</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer headrick</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:42</td>
<td>Do not need another</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Patricia Carballar</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:44</td>
<td>Do not trash our rural community with another scrappy store. I have not, nor Willie ever, go to the dollar General in the Brunswick basin. NC residents are not PWT...we deserve quality shopping in quality, conscience communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Barbara Jones</td>
<td>1/28/2016 20:48</td>
<td>This business is so out of place, unwanted, and unnecessary. It would turn into a blight on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Erin Dettner</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:00</td>
<td>We do not need another Dollar General in this town, especially in a predominantly residential area. Thank You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Darlene</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:01</td>
<td>We already have one in town where they belong. It is entirely inappropriate in this rural neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Vance Grossie</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:06</td>
<td>Our beautiful mountain community does not need, or want another Dollar General Store. One is already to many. Please keep your stores in the city!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Karen Gobert</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:14</td>
<td>We do not need another Dollar General in this town, especially in a predominantly residential area. Thank You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Nicole Teller</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:27</td>
<td>This business is so out of place, unwanted, and unnecessary. It would turn into a blight on the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lisa Spang</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:36</td>
<td>We already have one in town where they belong. It is entirely inappropriate in this rural neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Barbara Lowe</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:37</td>
<td>Our beautiful mountain community does not need, or want another Dollar General Store. One is already to many. Please keep your stores in the city!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Gail Redmond</td>
<td>1/28/2016 21:39</td>
<td>There’s one in Grass Valley, don’t need anymore. The parking is always empty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jen Abrahamson</td>
<td>1/28/2016 22:15</td>
<td>It is a disservice to the citizens of Nevada County to bring these low quality stores into our community. The location choice is also questionable. Another Dollar store is not what I support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Matt Berry</td>
<td>1/28/2016 22:35</td>
<td>We do not need another not dollar store!! Keep R&amp;R wild!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Christiane Bourgault</td>
<td>1/28/2016 22:40</td>
<td>We do not need another junk store in our pretty town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Richard spring</td>
<td>1/28/2016 22:47</td>
<td>NO,NO, we do n,t need any more traffic, etc!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Heather Rae</td>
<td>1/28/2016 23:16</td>
<td>I strongly oppose having a dollar general at the end of my street, I moved to west drive to have a safe quiet neighborhood for my family and our 2.5 year old son.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Moriah blue</td>
<td>1/28/2016 23:32</td>
<td>3 Dollar stores in town is 2 too many. We certainly don't need or want more!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Kristen Adams</td>
<td>1/28/2016 23:52</td>
<td>3 Dollar stores in town is 2 too many. We certainly don't need or want more!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Kim Ryan</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:22</td>
<td>No more $ stores we have 3 already!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Amy Smith-Acuaviva</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:23</td>
<td>I can find no justification for this project. Please don't do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Janice Currie</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:29</td>
<td>I can find no justification for this project. Please don't do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Matthew Margulies</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:30</td>
<td>I can find no justification for this project. Please don't do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Brianna McKinley</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:31</td>
<td>Please stop this insanity. I NEVER shop at the store already in Grass Valley and NO ONE I know does either. It's all crap made from China and not even that inexpensive. WE don't NEED, WANT, or will PUT UP with these companies coming in and ruining our town!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Autumn Barr</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:37</td>
<td>No!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>karen jarvis</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:42</td>
<td>No!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>shelley mckinley</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:48</td>
<td>Do not want merchandise from China or overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>DeeDee Vierra</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sonia cervantez</td>
<td>1/29/2016 0:58</td>
<td>We don't need another one of these terrible stores in our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Janis Anderson</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Jayme elliott</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:34</td>
<td>15797 names drive grass valley, ca 95949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Rick Stent</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:36</td>
<td>12209 Sunset Ave. Grass Valley California There are no sidewalks to protect bicyclists and pedestrians there is not adequate enough water in the time of a fire the entryway for a semi truck pulling into the proposed location is a traffic and safety hazard my concerns also include that of additional traffic through our neighborhood on Sunset Avenue. I have a visually impaired granddaughter who lives with me I am concerned with this additional traffic for her safety. Her exercise consist of walking up and down the hill on Sunset Avenue on a already narrowed street this presents a safety hazard for not only her but other children in the neighborhood and walking adults some of which are in their elderly years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Odilia Gix 10058 West Dr</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:38</td>
<td>Resigning, Original did not have address. Opposed to Dollar General Rough &amp; Ready Highway due to traffic, public safety, noise, septic, Fire protection water shortage concerns. This is Residential neighborhood with no room for such a large store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Margaret Hughes</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:46</td>
<td>Please NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Lorraine Webb</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:46</td>
<td>Planning Dept.. Please do your job and protect local small businesses from more toxic garbage from China! I'm a long-time resident at: 11110 White Oak Way Nevada City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Lorraine Webb</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:49</td>
<td>Planning Dept.. Please do your job and protect local small businesses from more toxic garbage from China! I'm a long-time resident at: 11110 White Oak Way Nevada City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Valerie Anthony</td>
<td>1/29/2016 1:59</td>
<td>Traffic, environmental, Safety, water pressure, drainage, and we do not support such a tacky over sized store in our residential neighborhood ! We want a fruit market or a park for the kids or a mom and pop business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Carolyn Ayers</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Cameron</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brianna Milbauer</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savanna Prieto</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria chinberg</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy Hylinski</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Pasquarella</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Steele Cubillo</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:54</td>
<td>NO DOLLAR GENERAL!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Morphew</td>
<td>1/29/2016 2:56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxx Hermann</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Rasmussen</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Harding</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:28</td>
<td>I absolutely oppose this from happening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica McGregor</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:39</td>
<td>I do not support development of that area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cammy</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:46</td>
<td>Keep are community small We already have 3 dollar stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Wood</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:49</td>
<td>This will be damaging to the environment as well as dangerous as the roads are not made for that type of increased traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonette Walter</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Bozzo</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather McKenzie</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Petersen</td>
<td>1/29/2016 3:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phizannah Abraham</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiree Ince</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Bock</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:11</td>
<td>No one wants/needs a store like this in this location!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:12</td>
<td>Out of all the stores in Nevada County that Grass Valley has shot down there considering another dollar store absolutely ridiculous !!!!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Szwarc</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:16</td>
<td>Enough is enough!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Ardagh</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:20</td>
<td>Why? We absolutely do not need this store there!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Ince</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelly Allen</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhi Ardhagh</td>
<td>1/29/2016 4:49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Collins</td>
<td>1/29/2016 5:11</td>
<td>The Dollar General is the wrong kind of store for this community. I would be very surprised if it had any chance of success. I have visited the one that is already here &amp; it was awful! The prices are not good, the layout is awkward, and I will not be returning!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Flecksteiner</td>
<td>1/29/2016 5:18</td>
<td>I refuse to shop at any Dollar General.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Kristi Bradanini</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Ben Miller</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>5:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Monique Hanson</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>5:40 No more Dollar Stores anywhere in our community!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>William Fingerson</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>5:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Brandy Sanders</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>5:46 No Dollar General in our neighborhood!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Stephanie Harvey-Statler</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:03 NO to Dollar General!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Jason Statler</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:04 NO Dollar General!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Katherine White</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Kristi Bradanini</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:09 12194 Martin Way Grass Valley CA 95949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Jim Bradanini</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:10 12194 Martin Way Grass Valley CA 95949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Jan Hayward</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:40 This is a beautiful rural area- not only is Dollar General completely unnecessary, it would be a blight in our area. No!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Jed Emrich</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>6:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Jan Crowell</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>7:06 Do not want any more dollar General stores. The one inn the Brunswick basin is sufficient. Or community does not need, not want four of these as proposed!!!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Lori Davis</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>7:47 No! The roads are not made for a business of this size. And dollar generals are terrible stores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Zachary Mowen</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>9:12 The last thing this area needs is another dollar store that sells cheap garbage that nobody wants. The Dollar General in Brunswick is always empty. Why would anyone think there needs to be more here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Suzona Pitkin</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>11:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Wanda Way</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>11:53 I own residential property in the Sunset District for 36 years now. We don't need a Dollar General or want one. We have Oak Supermarket to fill our needs just fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Delphi Whittle</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>13:17 We do not want or need a Dollar General Store!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Ashlie Evans</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>13:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Jeanna Inman</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>14:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Lee Ridenour</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>14:45 From what I understand there is suppose to be one going in down in Penn Vally not to far from Taco Shell. I don't understand the need for one in Sunset area when just less than three miles you will possibly be having another. Isn't one on each end of Grass Valley enough?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>DOTIE Lively</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>14:46 NO to a Dollar General in our neighborhood!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Richard Baker</td>
<td>1/29/2016</td>
<td>14:49 No!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Lydie Russell</td>
<td>1/29/2016 14:51</td>
<td>There is NO need for this in our area!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Robyn Caywood</td>
<td>1/29/2016 14:58</td>
<td>Our small town does not need another Dollar General. There is already one in Grass Valley (and at least 2 other dollar stores) to serve the community who are interested in having one. The rest of us would much rather they stay far away from our quaint town and instead support open green space and mom and pop shops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>m mickelson</td>
<td>1/29/2016 15:01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Crystal Griffin</td>
<td>1/29/2016 15:49</td>
<td>13938 Golden Star Rd. GRASS Valley, CA 95949, I think our area is far to rural to introduce the 3 proposed stores. We don't need them, especially in the areas in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Penelope St Claire</td>
<td>1/29/2016 15:52</td>
<td>PO Box 173 North San Juan, CA 95960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>David Bock</td>
<td>1/29/2016 15:58</td>
<td>We don't need a junk store or any more retail outlets on this side of town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Danielle Thomas</td>
<td>1/29/2016 16:51</td>
<td>Just because there is space there to put something doesn't mean there needs to be anything. I believe it's a bad place to put another dollar general, dollar store or whatever. This town is not huge. There are 3 of these type stores in town and there is no need for another. The folks in the area don't mind driving to town to shop. Now another little breakfast/lunch diner would more likely be welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Jane Schluter</td>
<td>1/29/2016 17:02</td>
<td>I have never even been to the one in town, we sure don't one here!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>barbara</td>
<td>1/29/2016 18:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Beth Ann Wilson</td>
<td>1/29/2016 18:30</td>
<td>NO MORE DOLLAR GENERAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Jonathan Hurst</td>
<td>1/29/2016 19:39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Patricia Chambers</td>
<td>1/29/2016 20:13</td>
<td>NO... to building a Dollar General Store in any of these 3 areas, esp. Rough &amp; Ready. This is a rural, residential neighborhood! Rough &amp; Ready Hwy is a beautiful country road. It is the only road into town for many residents and it already has enough traffic, school busses, pedestrians and cyclists. This type of store is inappropriate and a slap in the face for Nevada County Residents and Local Business Owners. Planning Dept. Tyler Barrington, please do not allow this. Protect NC residents and business owners. I strongly oppose. 14533 Rough and Ready Hwy. Rough and Ready, CA 95975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Cynthia Martin</td>
<td>1/29/2016 20:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Gina Ross</td>
<td>1/29/2016 21:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Jeremy Gallus</td>
<td>1/29/2016 22:18</td>
<td>Environmentally there's an issue because there's not enough water volume for the proposed stores fire sprinkler. Read the articles on the county website but there has not been any new recommendations on this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Marina Bernheimer</td>
<td>1/29/2016 22:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Stephanie Selletti</td>
<td>1/29/2016 23:22</td>
<td>That's a really weird spot for a store like this! Makes no sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Mary Clark</td>
<td>1/29/2016 23:25</td>
<td>I live on Mooney Flat Road. I am opposed to any more Dollar General Stores in Nevada County!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>JOAN KREMMER</td>
<td>1/30/2016 0:17</td>
<td>My address is: 275 Hazel Lane Grass Valley, CA 95945 I strongly oppose this business for the increased traffic and the sprawl it will bring to this area. It will significantly detract from the rural quality which R &amp; R retains, and I believe there is no way to measure in dollars and cents, the loss of the rural character of a place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Shaye Blazer</td>
<td>1/30/2016 3:17</td>
<td>Hell no!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Susan Barrios</td>
<td>1/30/2016 5:10</td>
<td>This is not needed in Rough &amp; Ready. This town is an historical district. Is not conducive with how the town looks or the personality of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Marie Wolfe</td>
<td>1/30/2016 7:54</td>
<td>Please please please...do not allow this to happen. For the money the county will receive for this store to come in, think of the destruction of the natural beauty. Why invite in all the traffic, lights, noise just to sell more chinese produced junk. We already have dollar stores in our business districts. Keep the business districts for business and the rural areas for living, relaxing and community. thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Haley</td>
<td>1/30/2016 8:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Jennifer Knapp</td>
<td>1/30/2016 8:09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Sharon Morrison</td>
<td>1/30/2016 8:29</td>
<td>I strongly oppose. We do not need another Dollar General..we already have one plus 2 Dollar stores. Adding 3 more makes that 6 Dollar stores within 10 miles. I don't shop Dollar General and never will it's junk. Enough is enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Barbara Brooks</td>
<td>1/30/2016 15:57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Lauren Wagner</td>
<td>1/30/2016 16:01</td>
<td>Opposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Mike Mooers</td>
<td>1/30/2016 21:28</td>
<td>This is not at all appropriate. It clashes with our historic atmosphere, rural beauty, and the potential for a healthy economic future. It will drain services, send local dollars out of the region, and create traffic, noise and negatively impact property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Laura Sloan</td>
<td>1/31/2016 0:07</td>
<td>kö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Judith Hill-Weld</td>
<td>1/31/2016 0:14</td>
<td>kö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Tracy Favilla</td>
<td>1/31/2016 0:25</td>
<td>S36 whiting street apartment 31 mailing address 12209 sunset ave Grass Valley 95945. A Dollar General Store has no business being there, or any other store for that matter. There are many reasons on many levels: more traffic on residential streets where kids play, like my daughters, along with other kids in the neighborhood, and disturbing other residents in and around the neighborhood, not to mention all of the environmental changes and demands that will occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>1/31/2016 2:14</td>
<td>I live on Squirrel Creek this would add too much additional traffic to Ridge Rd and R&amp;R highway. A school has also been approved at Adams and R&amp;R highway that will add way to many cars and buses to our rural area going towards R&amp;R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Christine Savage</td>
<td>2/1/2016 7:14</td>
<td>Protect our Mom and Pops!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Pierre Reynes</td>
<td>2/2/2016 21:27</td>
<td>Alta Street Grass Valley, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Jaede Miloslavich</td>
<td>2/2/2016 21:31</td>
<td>Dollar General has been successful for years in poor urban neighborhoods. This mega-corporation told their shareholders on March 12, 2015, they are going to aggressively expand their blight into unsuspecting rural areas they believe have been hit by the recession. In 2016, DG plans to add 900 stores - that is more than two a day. 550+ BBB complaints. Many wage and labor lawsuits. Minimum wage jobs. Chinese-made cheap goods. Don't let Nevada County fall for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Teri Personeni</td>
<td>2/2/2016 22:36</td>
<td>we don't need another Dollar General. There is one in the commercial district. The proposed areas are rural and small community areas. The Dollar General would be out of place and in my opinion out of compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Nancy Wilbourne</td>
<td>2/2/2016 22:37</td>
<td>No need in Penn Valley either!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Jan Crowell</td>
<td>2/3/2016 0:42</td>
<td>Please stop these monstrosities from being built. We do not need four of these in our community. The existing one is barly visited it seems by the parking lot....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Jacquelyn Mattoon</td>
<td>2/3/2016 1:09</td>
<td>Don't do it!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>2/3/2016 7:39</td>
<td>kö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Adella Albiani</td>
<td>2/3/2016 16:11</td>
<td>I would like to see a different business in this area. We already have too many junk and chinese made stuff here in this area. IMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Leslie Schoradt</td>
<td>2/3/2016 19:49</td>
<td>kö</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Linea Speer</td>
<td>2/4/2016</td>
<td>5:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Anna Morris</td>
<td>2/4/2016</td>
<td>22:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Patrick Speer</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>0:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Anita Barfield</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>2:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Suzie Saldana</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>14:53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Cathi Mayo</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>15:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Miranda Rivers</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>15:33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Lorrie stowe</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>16:08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Donna graham</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>16:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Dayleen Johnson</td>
<td>2/5/2016</td>
<td>21:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Susan Barrios</td>
<td>2/6/2016</td>
<td>3:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Jane Filimonov</td>
<td>2/7/2016</td>
<td>3:52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1.0-E
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Tyler Barrington
Nevada County Planning Department
Community Development Agency
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

COMMENTS TO REQUEST FOR REVIEW FOR THE NOTICE OF PREPARATION FOR THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, DOLLAR GENERAL PROJECT, SCH# 2016012009, NEVADA COUNTY

Pursuant to the State Clearinghouse’s 6 January 2016 request, the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Central Valley Water Board) has reviewed the Request for Review for the Notice of Preparation for the Draft Environment Impact Report for the Dollar General Project, located in Nevada County.

Our agency is delegated with the responsibility of protecting the quality of surface and groundwaters of the state; therefore our comments will address concerns surrounding those issues.

I. Regulatory Setting

Basin Plan
The Central Valley Water Board is required to formulate and adopt Basin Plans for all areas within the Central Valley region under Section 13240 of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act. Each Basin Plan must contain water quality objectives to ensure the reasonable protection of beneficial uses, as well as a program of implementation for achieving water quality objectives with the Basin Plans. Federal regulations require each state to adopt water quality standards to protect the public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act. In California, the beneficial uses, water quality objectives, and the Antidegradation Policy are the State’s water quality standards. Water quality standards are also contained in the National Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.36, and the California Toxics Rule, 40 CFR Section 131.38.

The Basin Plan is subject to modification as necessary, considering applicable laws, policies, technologies, water quality conditions and priorities. The original Basin Plans were adopted in 1975, and have been updated and revised periodically as required, using Basin Plan amendments. Once the Central Valley Water Board has adopted a Basin Plan amendment in noticed public hearings, it must be approved by the State Water Resources
Control Board (State Water Board), Office of Administrative Law (OAL) and in some cases, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Basin Plan amendments only become effective after they have been approved by the OAL and in some cases, the USEPA. Every three (3) years, a review of the Basin Plan is completed that assesses the appropriateness of existing standards and evaluates and prioritizes Basin Planning issues.

For more information on the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins, please visit our website: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/.

**Antidegradation Considerations**

All wastewater discharges must comply with the Antidegradation Policy (State Water Board Resolution 68-16) and the Antidegradation Implementation Policy contained in the Basin Plan. The Antidegradation Policy is available on page IV-15.01 at:
http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalleywater_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr.pdf

In part it states:

>*Any discharge of waste to high quality waters must apply best practicable treatment or control not only to prevent a condition of pollution or nuisance from occurring, but also to maintain the highest water quality possible consistent with the maximum benefit to the people of the State.*

*This information must be presented as an analysis of the impacts and potential impacts of the discharge on water quality, as measured by background concentrations and applicable water quality objectives.*

The antidegradation analysis is a mandatory element in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System and land discharge Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) permitting processes. The environmental review document should evaluate potential impacts to both surface and groundwater quality.

**II. Permitting Requirements**

**Construction Storm Water General Permit**

Dischargers whose project disturb one or more acres of soil or where projects disturb less than one acre but are part of a larger common plan of development that in total disturbs one or more acres, are required to obtain coverage under the General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activities (Construction General Permit). Construction General Permit Order No. 2009-009-DWQ. Construction activity subject to this permit includes clearing, grading, grubbing, disturbances to the ground, such as stockpiling, or excavation, but does not include regular maintenance activities performed to restore the original line, grade, or capacity of the facility. The Construction General Permit requires the development and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.
For more information on the Construction General Permit, visit the State Water Resources Control Board website at:

**Phase I and II Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permits**
The Phase I and II MS4 permits require the Permittees reduce pollutants and runoff flows from new development and redevelopment using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent practicable (MEP). MS4 Permittees have their own development standards, also known as Low Impact Development (LID)/post-construction standards that include a hydromodification component. The MS4 permits also require specific design concepts for LID/post-construction BMPs in the early stages of a project during the entitlement and CEQA process and the development plan review process.

For more information on which Phase I MS4 Permit this project applies to, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

For more information on the Phase II MS4 permit and who it applies to, visit the State Water Resources Control Board at:

**Industrial Storm Water General Permit**
Storm water discharges associated with industrial sites must comply with the regulations contained in the Industrial Storm Water General Permit Order No. 2014-0057-DWQ.

For more information on the Industrial Storm Water General Permit, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

**Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit**
If the project will involve the discharge of dredged or fill material in navigable waters or wetlands, a permit pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act may be needed from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE). If a Section 404 permit is required by the USACOE, the Central Valley Water Board will review the permit application to ensure that discharge will not violate water quality standards. If the project requires surface water

---

1 Municipal Permits = The Phase I Municipal Separate Storm Water System (MS4) Permit covers medium sized Municipalities (serving between 100,000 and 250,000 people) and large sized municipalities (serving over 250,000 people). The Phase II MS4 provides coverage for small municipalities, including non-traditional Small MS4s, which include military bases, public campuses, prisons and hospitals.
drainage realignment, the applicant is advised to contact the Department of Fish and Game for information on Streambed Alteration Permit requirements.

If you have any questions regarding the Clean Water Act Section 404 permits, please contact the Regulatory Division of the Sacramento District of USACOE at (916) 557-5250.

**Clean Water Act Section 401 Permit – Water Quality Certification**

If an USACOE permit (e.g., Non-Reporting Nationwide Permit, Nationwide Permit, Letter of Permission, Individual Permit, Regional General Permit, Programmatic General Permit), or any other federal permit (e.g., Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act or Section 9 from the United States Coast Guard), is required for this project due to the disturbance of waters of the United States (such as streams and wetlands), then a Water Quality Certification must be obtained from the Central Valley Water Board prior to initiation of project activities. There are no waivers for 401 Water Quality Certifications.

**Waste Discharge Requirements – Discharges to Waters of the State**

If USACOE determines that only non-jurisdictional waters of the State (i.e., "non-federal" waters of the State) are present in the proposed project area, the proposed project may require a Waste Discharge Requirement (WDR) permit to be issued by Central Valley Water Board. Under the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, discharges to all waters of the State, including all wetlands and other waters of the State including, but not limited to, isolated wetlands, are subject to State regulation.

For more information on the Water Quality Certification and WDR processes, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/help/business_help/permit2.shtml

**Dewatering Permit**

If the proposed project includes construction or groundwater dewatering to be discharged to land, the proponent may apply for coverage under State Water Board General Water Quality Order (Low Risk General Order) 2003-0003 or the Central Valley Water Board’s Waiver of Report of Waste Discharge and Waste Discharge Requirements (Low Risk Waiver) R5-2013-0145. Small temporary construction dewatering projects are projects that discharge groundwater to land from excavation activities or dewatering of underground utility vaults. Dischargers seeking coverage under the General Order or Waiver must file a Notice of Intent with the Central Valley Water Board prior to beginning discharge.

For more information regarding the Low Risk General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:


For more information regarding the Low Risk Waiver and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at:

**Regulatory Compliance for Commercially Irrigated Agriculture**

If the property will be used for commercial irrigated agricultural, the discharger will be required to obtain regulatory coverage under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. There are two options to comply:

1. **Obtain Coverage Under a Coalition Group.** Join the local Coalition Group that supports land owners with the implementation of the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program. The Coalition Group conducts water quality monitoring and reporting to the Central Valley Water Board on behalf of its growers. The Coalition Groups charge an annual membership fee, which varies by Coalition Group. To find the Coalition Group in your area, visit the Central Valley Water Board’s website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/irrigated_lands/app_approval/index.shtml; or contact water board staff at (916) 464-4611 or via email at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

2. **Obtain Coverage Under the General Waste Discharge Requirements for Individual Growers, General Order R5-2013-0100.** Dischargers not participating in a third-party group (Coalition) are regulated individually. Depending on the specific site conditions, growers may be required to monitor runoff from their property, install monitoring wells, and submit a notice of intent, farm plan, and other action plans regarding their actions to comply with their General Order. Yearly costs would include State administrative fees (for example, annual fees for farm sizes from 10-100 acres are currently $1,084 + $6.70/Acre); the cost to prepare annual monitoring reports; and water quality monitoring costs. To enroll as an Individual Discharger under the Irrigated Lands Regulatory Program, call the Central Valley Water Board phone line at (916) 464-4611 or e-mail board staff at IrrLands@waterboards.ca.gov.

**Low or Limited Threat General NPDES Permit**

If the proposed project includes construction dewatering and it is necessary to discharge the groundwater to waters of the United States, the proposed project will require coverage under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. Dewatering discharges are typically considered a low or limited threat to water quality and may be covered under the General Order for *Dewatering and Other Low Threat Discharges to Surface Waters* (Low Threat General Order) or the General Order for *Limited Threat Discharges of Treated/Untreated Groundwater from Cleanup Sites, Wastewater from Superchlorination Projects, and Other Limited Threat Wastewaters to Surface Water* (Limited Threat General Order). A complete application must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board to obtain coverage under these General NPDES permits.
For more information regarding the Low Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0074.pdf

For more information regarding the Limited Threat General Order and the application process, visit the Central Valley Water Board website at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/adopted_orders/general_orders/r5-2013-0073.pdf

If you have questions regarding these comments, please contact me at (916) 464-4644 or Stephanie.Tadlock@waterboards.ca.gov.

[Signature]

Stephanie Tadlock
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse unit, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, Sacramento
From: matt archer <mattarcher10@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 9:44 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No dollar general.

I am strongly opposed to all 3 possible locations for Dollar General. The rough and ready location is totally inappropriate for that area. We have no need for more of this kind of small junky retail items.
John m archer
530 902 1311
13668 mckitrick ranch rd
Nevada city.
Please add my NO vote to more dollar stores. They are full of cheap merchandise which takes dollars away from all the nice stores we do have in this area.

Thank you

Colleen Carson
Hello,

My name is Mary Clark. My address is 11967 Mooney Flat Road.

I have been a resident of Nevada County for 48 years.

I am opposed to building anymore Dollar General Stores in Nevada County. I would rather see us supporting the businesses we already have in the area.

Sincerely, Mary Clark
Dear Mr Barrington,

Your email was published on a local Facebook page regarding the proposed addition of multiple locations for Dollar General stores. Though I do not support additional locations in Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready, I do support one being built in Penn Valley.

I reside in between Penn Valley and Smartsville, so getting little things that are similar to those to that Dollar General offers, requires about a 30 +/- minute drive into either Grass Valley or Yuba City. Honestly, we usually end up taking our tax dollars into Yuba City because for the additional 5 minute drive, our purchases along with gas save us a significant amount (typically 300%!) However, I can forsee less need to go "down the hill" having a Dollar General just a few miles away.

That being said. I would prefer the long drive vs some gawd awful looking eyesore in this small sleepy town of Penn Valley!

Sincerely, Gwen Fackrell
Mr. Barrington,

I just wanted to voice my support for a Dollar General in the Penn Valley/Rough&Ready area. It would be nice to have a general store that is open 7 days a week to get odds and ends without having to go "up the hill" all the time. And to be honest, usually we go "down the hill" to the Walmart in Linda. It is just 10 minutes more than Grass Valley and there is FAR more selection. A Dollar General here locally would keep more tax revenue in Nevada County and be an improved convenience for those of us who feel especially forgotten in Penn Valley.

Thanks,

Heather Featherston
We do not need THREE more Dollar General stores in our community. They sell cheap items from China and are not the kind of retail store we need in Nevada County. We already have three dollar stores in our community - isn't that enough?
Dear Mr. Barrington,

I strongly object to the idea that more Dollar General stores are being considered for our community. I have visited the store in Brunswick Basin and see absolutely no need for this type of store for our area. To add more of these stores seems ludicrous. Please reject any applications from this corporation.

Sincerely yours,
Ruth Franklin
530-265-0245
Hi there,

I am all for growth but have to wonder why we need three more Dollar General stores when the one we already have is never busy. I have yet to see the parking lot full. I do not think we need them. Just a thought.

May your day be filled with greatness,
Sarah Herbert

Home Office (530) 272-4912
Cell (530) 615-9537

Sarah Herbert Virtual Services
www.shvservices.com
Herbert's Overhead Maintenance
www.homaintenance.com
We don't need Dollar General. I'm sure you guys at the "planning" office are looking at tax revenue, but at what cost? We already have the Dollar Store and The Dollar Tree. I've been to Dollar General in town and it is full of overpriced crap. Overlooking what the residents don't want is not right. Do yourself and us a great service - don't cave in to corporate greed. The almighty dollar needs to know some limits.

Pamela Raschke
Grass Valley
This community doesn't want more cheap stuff and bad jobs. No more dollar generals.
Dear Sir or Madam,
I'm a local homeowner asking you to reject all Dollar General development plans. This beautiful community does not need any more businesses slinging cheap plastic imports and paying employees poverty wages. Thank you for considering my point of view in this matter.
Sara Holden
15874 Retrac Way
Grass Valley
Please please please STOP the progression of Dollar General building ANY more stores in Nevada County. The one we have is more than enough.

Thank you!
Barbara Jensen
barbara.alegra@gmail.com
Dear Sir,

I am writing to say I am against the building of three Dollar General stores in Western Nevada County. As a resident of the county I don't see the point in adding another cheap discount store when we already have so many great ones.

Thank you.

Corinna Kirkland-Caplan
12737 Rattlesnake Rd
GV, CA 95945
2/16/2016

Please do not approve any additional Dollar General stores in our community. One is enough. They are overpriced for many cheaply made items. It says "dollar" but most items are more than that. Dollar Tree is a much more honest store where everything is a dollar. Dollar General's hype is dishonest.

As a 27 year resident of Nevada County I hate to see our landscape "littered" with this corporate take over our our community. Dollar General does not add to Nevada County, it takes away the feeling of locally-owned stores which are apart of our community. It lowers our county.

Please do not approve. One is enough.

Sincerely,

Heather Macdonald
Roger Stevens
27689 Tablemeadow Rd.
Auburn, CA 95602
(530) 269-0966
Mr. Barrington, We already have one Dollar General across from the Fowler Center and I have yet to see the parking area full of cars. We do not need any more of these stores in the general area. We would rather shop at the mom and pop stores. I am not sure who is trying to put "box stores" of any size in the Grass Valley area, but we do not need any more. Please, forget about Penn Valley, Alta Sierra, or anywhere else. No more Dollar General stores, please. Thank you, Diana Malley
From: Cynthia Martin <momcynthia@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 12:16 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar store in Nevada County

My understanding is that you want input in regards to the three proposed Dollar Stores in Nevada County, I want to make my option known. I am in every way opposed to any more Dollar stores coming into the community. Rough and Ready and Penn Valley locations especially seem completely out of place. I haven't heard one single person who would welcome a Dollar Store in either of these locations. Having lived here for my entire life, I know a lot of people evolved in the community and no one I've talked to thinks this is a positive addition.

Either we are a community that is proud of our history and work on making that more attractive and a place for tourists to come and enjoy it or, we compromise and become a homeless, drug filled lower class wreck of a town on the way to the Sierras.

What good do I feel my objection or anyone's else's objection will make? Absolutely none. I've seen it before. Money speaks loader than a thousand residents words.

This town is not getting better in the last few years. My children are the forth generation here but, there are days it seems we have lost the fight for a small, beautiful, safe place to live.

Sincerely,
Cynthia Martin
Tyler Barrington

From: carmen mateo <carmenmateo59@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, January 29, 2016 12:58 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: new mega store project

Tyler,

just a quick note here, as a resident of Nevada County, I wish to inform you that in my opinion we don’t need/want more of the same giant box stores/parking that destroy the landscape of the community. We live here because we like our trees and rolling hills, as do our tourists. Personally I never ever shop at stores such as K-Mart or Dollar, or any corporate giant, rather go out of my way to support small local businesses, co-op, farmers markets.
be well, concerned resident
Carmen Mateo
Dollar General information and comments made by neighbors

On April 30, 2001, Dollar General Corp was liable for making false statements or failing to disclose adverse facts about the company's financial results,[19] and paid $162,000,000 for settlement.

On April 30, 2001, Dollar General announced to restate its earnings for the past three fiscal years, due to accounting irregularities including allegations of fraudulent behavior.[20]

On March 3, 2005, Dollar General announced to restate its results for 2000 through 2003, due to a clarification of lease-accounting matters issued by the SEC.[21]

In November 2014, Dollar General was fined $51,700 by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration following an inspection of a Brooklyn branch of the store. The statement from OSHA notes that Dollar General has had repeated health and safety violations: "Since 2009, OSHA has conducted 72 inspections of Dollar General nationwide. Of those inspections, 39 have resulted in citations."[22]

Dollar General EIR Scoping Session (EIR15-004).

Alta Sierra site: 10166 Alta Sierra Drive, Grass Valley, CA 95949
Penn Valley site: 17652 Penn Valley Drive, Penn Valley, CA 95946
Rough & Ready Highway site: 12345 Rough & Ready Highway, Grass Valley, CA 95945

Project Planner: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner. (530) 470-2723

Being someone who will be right behind the store if it goes in my concerns are traffic and safety (children crossing to get ice creams or candy, large delivery and garbage trucks in/out and parking in our little neighborhood), fire protection water, septic, but also it is my understanding that the Dollar General is only committing to a lease of the building. What happens when they decide to pull out because of an over saturation of their own stores in the area and we are left with an almost 10,000 sq. ft. Vacant box on the corner? This is a rural residential area, they should stick to the commercial areas.

These chain stores saturate an area and drive out local businesses. Buy local, bank local, support our community

If you don't like traffic at Brunswick adding a store at this location is going to add to snarled traffic and then when The already approved Yuba Charter School Goes up double our existing Traffic
Much of what you buy at this type of store is of inferior quality...you get what you pay for. I, for one, don't want the increased traffic. And why do we need this store in our rural area?

Sent from my iPhone
SUPPORT

YES PLEASE.

DOLLAR GENERAL IS A NEEDED ASSET.

THANK YOU
If I am correct in this matter, as I believe I am, it is of economic benefit to Dollar General and the Developers whether or not it makes money or loses money. Which means what actually happens with the business is of little to no concern to them...because they obviously have no interest in it or how it impacts our community (negative or positive)

It also makes me wonder if they planned to operate at a loss all along.

Sherill Parker
this is rediculous, like you are fucking kidding right!!! this cannot happen there is already three in this part of
the county...do not allow anymore, dont roseville nevada county
I do NOT support another dollar store in Nevada County. I have lived here for 17 years. Don't shop at the ones that are here and don't think we need another one. I do not think we have the population to support another Dollar sStore. I think it's a bad idea and bad investment by $ Store people. We don't need another empty building with shattered glass and boarded up windows when store doesn't work.

Rosanne Stratigakes  Please vote no on another dollar store.
Greetings. I am the former executive director of the ERC and founder of Sierra Commons. I believe that opening these stores will negatively impact our local economy. Please take this into consideration.

Robert Trent

Sent from mobile
I am adamantly opposed to the proposed building of 3 more Dollar general stores in Penn Valley, rough and Ready and Alta Vista.

Yvette Trevorrow

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Tyler Barrington,

I strongly disagree with the building of the three proposed Dollar General Stores. It could ruin the business success of lots of Mom and Pop stores in our area. We need people to shop locally, but in stores that local people own.

These stores are corporations selling merchandise made in China and sold at rock bottom prices. They don't pay their employees a living wage, and give them a huge workload.

Please don't allow anymore of these corporations to move here and compete with our local shops.

Thanks

Denise van Kriedt
P.O. box 726
NSJ, Ca 95960
913-1225