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1.0 INTRODUCTION
This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) was prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15132). The County of Nevada (County) is the lead agency for the environmental review of the proposed Dollar General Stores (projects) and has the principal responsibility for approving the projects. This Final EIR summarizes the expected environmental impacts resulting from approval of the projects and associated impacts from subsequent development of the projects, as well as responds to comments received on the Draft EIR.

1.1 BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE EIR

OVERVIEW OF CEQA REQUIREMENTS FOR PREPARATION OF AN EIR

Nevada County, serving as the lead agency, has prepared this EIR to provide the public and responsible and trustee agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed projects. As set forth in the provisions of CEQA and implementing regulations, public agencies are charged with the duty to consider the environmental impacts of proposed development and to minimize these impacts where feasible while carrying out an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social factors.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15121(a) states that an EIR is an informational document for decision-makers and the general public which analyzes the significant environmental effects of a project, identifies possible ways to minimize significant effects, and describes reasonable alternatives to the projects that could reduce or avoid its adverse environmental impacts. Public agencies with discretionary authority are required to consider the information in the EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making decisions on the project.

CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact report prior to approving any project which may have a significant effect on the environment. For the purposes of CEQA, the term “project” refers to the whole of an action that has the potential for resulting in a direct physical change or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15378[a]). With respect to the Dollar General Stores, the County has determined that the proposed projects are a “project” within the definition of CEQA.

BACKGROUND OF ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS OF THE PROJECT

The following is an overview of the environmental review process for the projects that led to the preparation of this Final EIR:

Notice of Preparation and Initial Study

In accordance with Section 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, Nevada County prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR on January 6, 2016. The County was identified as the lead agency for the proposed projects. The purpose of the notice was to solicit comments on the proposed projects; therefore, the NOP was circulated to interested parties as well as to public, local, state, and federal agencies. The January 2016 NOP and the comments received in response to the NOP are presented in Appendix 1.0 of the Draft EIR.

Draft EIR

The Draft EIR contains a description of the project, description of the environmental setting, identification of project impacts, and mitigation measures for impacts found to be significant, as well as an analysis of project alternatives. The Draft EIR was circulated for a 45-day public review.
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period on December 14, 2016, to elicit public and agency comments about the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was provided to interested public agencies and the public and was made available for review at the Nevada County Planning Department. A public meeting was held before the Nevada County Planning Commission on January 26, 2017, to receive comments on the Draft EIR.

Final EIR

Following the close of the public review period, the County received comment letters from agencies, interest groups, and the public regarding the Draft EIR. These written comments and a transcript of oral comments provided at the Planning Commission meeting regarding the projects are included herein. As required by CEQA, this document responds to the comments received. This document also contains minor edits to the Draft EIR. This Final EIR and the Draft EIR, as amended herein, constitute the EIR.

Certification of the Final EIR/Project Consideration

The County will review and consider the Final EIR. If the County finds that the Final EIR is “adequate and complete,” the County may certify the Final EIR at a public hearing. The rule of adequacy generally holds that the EIR can be certified if: (1) shows a good faith effort at full disclosure of environmental information; and (2) provides sufficient analysis to allow decisions to be made regarding the projects in contemplation of its environmental consequences.

Upon review and consideration of the Final EIR, the County may take action to approve, revise, or reject the projects. A decision to approve the projects would be accompanied by written findings in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 and Section 15093. Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 also requires lead agencies to adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program to describe measures that have been adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.

1.2 TYPE OF DOCUMENT

The CEQA Guidelines identify several types of EIRs, each applicable to different project circumstances. This EIR has been prepared as a project EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15161. The analysis associated with a project EIR focuses primarily on the changes in the environment that would occur as a result of project implementation and examines all phases of the projects (i.e., planning, construction, and operation). Although each Dollar General store represents a separate project under CEQA, the County has determined that all three stores should be analyzed in a single EIR to ensure that the cumulative impacts associated with all three stores are adequately considered.

Ultimately, the EIR is used by the County as a tool in evaluating a proposed project’s environmental impacts and can be further used to modify, approve, or deny approval of a proposed project based on the analysis in the EIR.

1.3 INTENDED USES OF THE EIR

This EIR is intended to evaluate the environmental impacts of the projects to the greatest extent possible. This EIR, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, should be used as the primary environmental document to evaluate all County planning and permitting actions associated with the project. These actions include, but are not limited to, the following:
• Development Permit
• Lot Line Adjustment (Penn Valley site)
• Aquatic Resources Management Plan (Penn Valley site)
• Oak Management Plan (Alta Sierra site)
• Certificate of Compliance (Penn Valley site)
• Building Permit
• Grading Permit
• Encroachment Permit

In addition to the above County actions, each of the projects may require approvals, permits, and entitlements from other public agencies for which this EIR may be used, including, without limitation, the following:

• California Department of Transportation, District 3
• California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 2
• Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (Region 5)
• Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District
• State Water Resources Control Board
• US Army Corps of Engineers
• US Fish and Wildlife Service

1.4 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE OF THE FINAL EIR

This document is organized in the following manner:

SECTION 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

Section 1.0 provides an overview of the EIR process to date and what the Final EIR is required to contain.

SECTION 2.0 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project and provides a summary of the projects' environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures.

SECTION 3.0 – COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Section 3.0 provides a list of commenters, copies of written comments (coded for reference), and the responses to those written comments made on the Draft EIR.

SECTION 4.0 – REVISIONS TO THE DRAFT EIR

Section 4.0 consists of revisions to the Draft EIR that are a result of responses to comments, as well as minor staff edits that do not change the intent or content of the analysis or mitigation measures.
This page intentionally left blank.
2.0 Executive Summary
This section provides an overview of the project and the environmental analysis. For additional
detail regarding specific issues, please consult the appropriate chapter of Sections 4.0 through
15.0 (Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures) of the Draft Environmental Impact
Report (Draft EIR or DEIR).

2.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This Environmental Impact Report provides a reasonably thorough analysis of the potential
environmental effects associated with the implementation of the Dollar General Stores (projects),
pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

This EIR analysis focuses on potential environmental impacts that could result from construction
and operation of the projects. The EIR adopts this approach in order to provide a credible worst-
case scenario of the impacts resulting from project implementation.

2.2 PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

Each Dollar General store would have the same building square footage and would be similar in
total developed area. Table 2.0-1 summarizes the attributes for each project.

Table 2.0-1
OVERVIEW OF PROJECT ATTRIBUTES

<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>Proposed 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>34</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>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

While the footprints of the proposed buildings are the same for each of the stores, the exterior
design elements differ slightly. The exterior design of each of the buildings is based on a western
motif. Proposed parking also differs at each site depending on the lot size and configuration and
building layout. As allowed by Nevada County Land Use and Development Code Section L-II
4.2.9.F.12, for those sites that provide less than the required parking of 46 spaces (Alta Sierra and
Rough and Ready Highway sites), the project applicant has provided a parking study prepared
by a registered traffic engineer which demonstrates that the proposed parking would meet
demand. Lighting for the proposed projects would be designed in accordance with the Nevada
County Code. Landscaping would be provided for each of the projects. Each of the proposed
projects would set aside a portion of the respective project site as permanent open space in
accordance with the Nevada County Code.

Potable water for all three sites would be provided by the Nevada Irrigation District (NID). Off-site
construction within the existing roadway is necessary to connect the Alta Sierra site to water
infrastructure. No off-site construction for connection to water infrastructure is necessary for the
Penn Valley and Rough and Ready Highway sites.
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Wastewater treatment and disposal would be provided through septic systems at the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites. The Penn Valley site would connect to the Nevada County Sanitation District-Penn Valley sewer system through existing sewer lines within Penn Valley Drive adjacent to the site.

Storm drainage for each of the sites would include on-site detention, which would ultimately flow into off-site storm drainage ditches or washes. Each project would be designed to maintain post-project surface drainage flows at pre-project levels.

2.3 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

Concerns in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) were considered during the preparation of the Draft EIR, and all comments received during the Draft EIR public review period have been addressed in this Final EIR in accordance with CEQA requirements. Comments on the Draft EIR are provided in Section 3.0 of this Final EIR, along with the County’s responses to those comments. Major issues addressed in the project comments are summarized below.

ALTA SIERRA PROJECT

- Aesthetics (height, design, retaining wall, nighttime lighting) and overall visual compatibility with surroundings
- Loss of oak trees on the site and effects on wildlife
- Consistency with land use designations
- Noise and diesel fumes from delivery trucks
- Traffic congestion and hazards related to site access, size of delivery trucks, and truck turning movements on Alta Sierra Drive
- Stormwater runoff and water quality impacts on existing drainage systems
- Project alternatives
- Economic impact on community

PENN VALLEY PROJECT

- Potential impacts on Squirrel Creek
- Impact of noise on adjacent Creekside Mobile Home Park
- Truck turning movements on Penn Valley Drive
- Testing for hazardous materials contamination

ROUGH AND READY HIGHWAY PROJECT

- Aesthetics (design, height, nighttime lighting) and overall visual compatibility with surroundings
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- Land use compatibility with surrounding rural residential development
- Noise from delivery trucks and customer parking lot
- Water pressure and availability of water to nearby residences in case of fire
- Effect on groundwater from septic system
- Stormwater runoff and water quality impacts on existing drainage systems
- Traffic congestion and hazards related to site access, size of delivery trucks, truck turning movements, and potential conflicts with pedestrian and bicycle traffic on Rough and Ready Highway
- Potential for trucks to use adjacent residential neighborhood roadways
- Economic and quality of life impacts

2.4 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project and reduce the degree of environmental impact. DEIR Section 16.0, Project Alternatives, provides a qualitative analysis of a No Project Alternative and three other scenarios that include:

- Alternative 1a – No Project/No Build Alternative
- Alternative 1b – No Project/Other Commercial Development Alternative
- Alternative 2 – Reduced Project Alternative
- Alternative 3 – Off-Site Alternative

2.5 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Tables ES-2, ES-3, and ES-4 present a summary of project impacts and proposed mitigation measures that would avoid or minimize potential impacts for the Alta Sierra, Penn Valley, and Rough and Ready Highway projects, respectively. In the tables, the level of significance is indicated both before and after the implementation of mitigation measures. For detailed discussions of all mitigation measures and policies that would provide mitigation for each type of environmental impact addressed in this Draft EIR, refer to the appropriate environmental topic section (i.e., Sections 4.0 through 15.0). Minor revisions made to the DEIR impact and mitigation measures are identified below in underline/strikeout format.
### Table 2.0-2
**ALTA SIERRA PROJECT: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td></td>
<td>MM AS-4.1.1a The proposed building design shall be modified to better comply with the Western Nevada County Design Guidelines to create greater visual interest and to break up the mass of building and the roofline. Design modifications could include the incorporation of structural bays, roof overhangs, awnings, and other details along the buildings eastern and southern exterior walls as well as varying the roofline so that it transitions from the height of adjacent buildings to the maximum height of the proposed building and articulating the flat roofline with cornices. No windows shall be added to the buildings eastern or southern exterior walls.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.1.1(AS)** Development of the Alta Sierra project site as proposed would convert vacant land to commercial development. Such a conversion would fundamentally alter the visual character of the site.

---

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the trees to be retained have been properly marked in the field and protected during the first grading inspection. Construction personnel shall be made aware of these protected trees and the significance of the field markings and protection measures by the general contractor prior to commencing construction activities to minimize potential direct and indirect impacts. <strong>MM AS-4.1.1c</strong> To minimize potential conflicts between the commercial use of this site and existing residential uses east of Little Valley Road, the developer shall revise project plans to either (1) add a third six foot tall split block face wall designed consistently with other existing walls in the area that will fill the gap shown on the preliminary plans or (2) connect the two proposed screen walls to completely screen the parking lot area. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall verify in the field that the wall has been constructed consistent with the approved plans. <strong>MM AS-4.1.1d</strong> The developer shall revise project plans and elevations to include the use of channel letter signage. Cabinet-style signage shall be prohibited. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall verify in the field that project signage is consistent with the approved plans.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.1.2(AS)** Development of the Alta Sierra project site as proposed would introduce new sources of light and glare.

---

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact  

*Dollar General Stores*  
*Final Environmental Impact Report*  
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### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>light fixtures of lesser wattage and/or providing additional screening of those features. Additionally, for the northern parking lot lighting, similar or alternative methods, such as reducing the wattage of the lighting fixture or moving the pole farther into the interior of the site, shall be utilized to ensure all new lighting and glare is kept on site. The developer shall install and maintain all lighting consistent with the approved Final Site Lighting Plan. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site visit, during the dark hours, to verify that the installed lighting does not trespass onto neighboring roads or properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.4.1 (AS)</td>
<td>The Alta Sierra project site is located in a largely developed rural commercial center surrounded by rural residential development and a highway. Cumulative development in the area would substantially alter the existing visual character of the area and generate substantial new light or glare.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>None available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1.1(AS)</td>
<td>Construction activities associated with the Alta Sierra site such as clearing, excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would temporarily affect local air quality for adjacent land uses.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-5.1.1a The Alta Sierra construction contractor shall submit to the NSAQMD for approval an Off-Road Construction Equipment Emission Reduction Plan prior to ground breaking demonstrating the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• All off-road equipment (portable and mobile) meets or is cleaner than Tier 2 engine emission specifications unless prior written approval for any exceptions is obtained from the NSAQMD. Note that all off-road equipment must meet all applicable state and federal requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Emissions from on-site construction equipment shall comply with NSAQMD Regulation II, Rule 202, Visible Emissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes when not in use (as required by California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• Existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators shall be utilized rather than temporary power generators (i.e. diesel generators), where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• Deliveries of construction materials shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to avoid the peak hours of 7:00–9:00 AM and 4:00–6:00 PM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•</td>
<td>• The primary contractor shall use architectural coatings for the proposed structure that have a volatile organic compound (VOC) content no greater than 50 grams per liter of VOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM AS-5.1.1b** To reduce impacts of short-term construction, the applicant shall obtain NSAQMD approval of a Dust Control Plan (DCP) which shall include, but not be limited, to, the standards provided below to the satisfaction of the NSAQMD. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developer shall provide a copy of the approved DCP to the County Planning and Building Department and shall include the requirements of DCP as notes on all construction plans. The Building Department shall verify that the requirements of the DCP are being implemented during grading inspections. Alternatives to open burning of vegetation material on the project site shall be used by the project applicant unless deemed infeasible to the Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). Among suitable alternatives is chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel. 1. The applicant shall implement all dust control measures in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction. 2. All material excavated, stockpiled or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated or converted to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. Watering should occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage. 3. All areas (including unpaved roads) with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have dust palliative applied as necessary for regular stabilization of dust emissions. 4. All land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities on a project shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 mph. 5. All on-site vehicle traffic shall be limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>All inactive disturbed portions of the development site shall be covered, seeded or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, the applicant shall be responsible for applying non-toxic soil stabilizers to all inactive construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Paved streets adjacent to the project shall be swept or washed at the end of each day, or as required to removed excessive accumulation of silt and/or mud which may have resulted from activities at the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If serpentine or ultramafic rock is discovered during grading or construction, the District must be notified no later than the next business day and the California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 9315 applies.</td>
<td><strong>MM AS-5.1.1c</strong> To ensure that the project will not result in the significant generation of VOCs, all architectural coatings shall utilize low-VOC paint (no greater than 50g/L VOC). Prior to building permit issuance, the developer shall submit their list of low-VOC coatings to the NSAQMD for review and approval. The developer shall then provide written verification from NSAQMD that all architectural coatings meet NSAQMD thresholds to be considered “low-VOC.” Finally, all building plans shall include a note documenting which low-VOC architectural coatings will be used in construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Resulting Level of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1.2(AS) The Alta Sierra project would not result in long-term operational emissions that could violate or substantially contribute to a violation of federal and state standards.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-5.1.2 The project applicant shall obtain an Authority to Construct Permit from NSAQMD for any source of air contaminants that exist after construction that is not exempt from District permit requirements. All requirements of this permit shall be incorporated into standard operating procedure manuals or materials for the project. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the developer shall submit written proof (i.e. a letter from NSAQMD and a copy of the permit) to the County Planning and Building Department documenting that they have obtained said permit from NSAQMD.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1.3(AS) The Alta Sierra project would not contribute to localized concentrations of mobile-source carbon monoxide that would exceed applicable air quality standards.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1.4(AS) The proposed Alta Sierra project would not result in increased exposure of existing sensitive land uses to construction-source pollutant concentrations that would exceed applicable standards.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1.5(AS) Operation of the Alta Sierra project would not result in increased exposure of existing or planned sensitive land uses to operational-source toxic air contaminant emissions (i.e., diesel PM).</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.1.6(AS) The proposed Alta Sierra project would not include sources that could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people or expose new residents to existing sources of odor.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.4.1 The proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the Mountain Counties Air Basin, would contribute to cumulative increases in emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants (ROG and NOx) and PM10 that could contribute to future concentrations of ozone and PM10, for which the region is currently designated nonattainment.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: Implement mitigation measure MM AS-5.1.1a. Penn Valley project: Implement mitigation measure MM PV-5.2.1a. Rough and Ready Highway project: Implement mitigation measure MM RR-5.3.1a.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.1.1(AS)</strong> The Alta Sierra project site does not provide suitable habitat for any special status plant species that may occur in the vicinity.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.1.2(AS)</strong> Project-related activities could result in loss of habitat for northern goshawk, other nesting raptors, and migratory birds.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-6.1.2 If construction is proposed during the breeding season (February–August), a focused survey for raptors and other migratory bird nests shall be conducted within 14 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. This 500-foot construction prohibition zone may be reduced based on consultation with and approval by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Trees containing nests or cavities that must be removed as a result of project implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to January). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. To the extent feasible, necessary tree removal should occur outside of the typical nesting season to minimize or avoid adverse effects to all nesting birds.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.1.3(AS)</strong> Project-related activities could result in loss of landmark oak groves and landmark oak trees.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-6.1.3a Construction activities, such as grading, shall avoid impacts to existing mature trees and other native vegetation to the maximum extent possible. Mature trees and native vegetation shall be marked as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) and the project site should be designed to avoid these areas where feasible. All ESAs shall be fenced with orange fencing and maintained until project completion. In addition, any tree and native vegetation that is to be retained shall be shown on the final landscaping plans.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NI* – no impact  
*LS* – less than significant impact  
*PS* – potentially significant impact  
*S* – significant impact  
*SU* – significant and unavoidable impact  
*LCC* – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
*CC* – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MM AS-6.1.3b Seventeen trees (10 oaks and 7 pines) are to be retained. The developer shall flag the trees to ensure their protection. The Building Department shall verify the trees to be retained have been properly marked and construction personnel should be made aware of these trees in order to minimize direct and indirect impacts. In addition, a note shall be included on all plans and specifications stating that “The existing ground surface within 6 feet of the drip line of any oak tree and within 10 feet of the dripline of any landmark oak tree to be preserved shall not be cut, filled, compacted or pared.” A qualified biologist, botanist, professional forester, or certified arborist shall be consulted prior to any excavation that will occur adjacent to any oak tree that is to be retained to ensure that there will be no damage to the root system. Exceptions may be approved by the Nevada County Planning Department based on consultation with a qualified professional resulting in reasonable assurance that they tree will not be damaged. | MM AS-6.1.3c For oak trees that are to be retained on any of the three parcels, the following measures shall be taken to prevent impacts during and after construction activities.  
1. Plans and specifications shall clearly state protection procedures for oaks on the project site. The specification shall also require contractors to stay within designated work areas and shall include provisions for penalties if the retained oak trees are damaged;  
2. Protective fencing not less than 4 feet in height shall be placed at the limits of the protective root zone of any individual oak tree or stand to remain, whether it is a Landmark oak or a small cluster of oak trees within 50 feet of the grading. |
### Impact | Level of Significance Before Mitigation | Mitigation Measure | Resulting Level of Significance
---|---|---|---

1. Limits, and shall be inspected by the contractor prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, and shall remain in place until construction is completed;

2. Damage to oak trees during construction shall be immediately reported to the Nevada County Planning Department. The contractor shall be responsible for correcting any damage to oak trees that will be retained on the property in a manner specified by a qualified professional.

3. Equipment damage to limbs, trunks, and roots of all retained trees shall be avoided during project construction and development. Even slight trunk injuries can result in susceptibility to long-term pathogenic maladies.

4. Grading restrictions near protective root zones shall limit grade changes near the protected root zone of any oak tree to be retained. Grade changes can lead to plant stress from oxygen deprivation or oak root fungus at the root collar of oaks. Minor grade changes further from the trunk are not as critical but can negatively affect the health of the tree if not carefully monitored by a County approved professional.

5. The root protective zone grade shall not be lowered or raised around the trunks (i.e. within the protective zone) of any oak tree to be retained. A County approved professional shall supervise all excavation or grading proposed within the protective zone of a tree, and/or the excavation, or clearance of vegetation within the protective zone of an oak tree shall be accomplished by the use of hand tools or small hand-held power tools. Any major roots encountered shall be conserved to the greatest extent feasible.
## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extent possible and treated as recommended by the professional.</td>
<td>7. Utility trenches shall not be routed within the protective zone of an oak tree unless no feasible alternative locations are available, and shall be approved by a County approved professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. No storage of equipment, supplies, vehicles, or debris shall be permitted within the protective root zone of any retained tree.</td>
<td>9. No dumping of construction wastewater, paint, stucco, concrete, or any other cleanup waste shall occur within the protective zone of an oak tree.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. No temporary structures shall be placed within the protective zone of any retained oak tree.</td>
<td>11. Necessary drains shall be installed according to County specifications so as to avoid harm to the oak trees due to excess watering.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Wires, signs, and other similar items shall not be attached to the oak trees.</td>
<td>MM AS-6.1.3d Prior to the start of construction activities, a qualified biologist, botanist, registered forester or certified arborist (qualified professional) shall schedule a field meeting to inform the construction personnel where all protective zones are and the importance of avoiding encroachment into the protective zones. A signed affidavit documenting the meeting shall be provided prior to the issuance of project permits. Additionally, a qualified professional shall periodically monitor on-site construction activities to ensure that damage to retained oak trees does not occur. Prior to scheduling final inspection for the grading, pipe trenching, septic placement, retaining walls, and building foundation, the developer shall provide a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brief report from the qualified professional documenting the findings in the monitoring.</td>
<td>MM AS-6.1.3e Prior to the issuance of any grading or improvement permits for the project, the applicant shall pay $42,900 in mitigation costs to the Bear Yuba Land Trust (BYLT) for replanting, management, and restoration of black oak habitat on the Clover Valley Preserve Property located on the eastern side of the Alta Sierra subdivision 2 air miles from the project site. The BYLT shall implement the restoration plan consistent with the approach outlined in the Appendix B of the Oak Resources Management Plan (Appendix 6.0-AS), which includes but is not limited to planting approximately 220-250 black oak seedlings with a goal of a 60% survival rate; monitoring for the first 5 years following replanting; and restoration of the existing oak woodlands. Prior to issuance of grading or improvement permits, the developer and the BYLT shall also enter into a contractual agreement that must be reviewed and approved by the Nevada County Planning Department prior to finalization. Once finalized, the agreement shall be submitted to the Nevada County Planning Department and will be kept on file. The contractual agreement shall outline the specific steps of the Restoration Project that will occur, consistent with Appendix B of the Oak Tree Management Plan, including a clause to trigger the attachment of a conservation easement on the property if the BYLT should ever transfer the property to non-land trust ownership. In addition, the contractual agreement shall provide specific steps for annual monitoring of the success of the project and reporting to the County Planning Department by a qualified professional.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.1.4(AS)</strong> The proposed Alta Sierra project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Impact 6.1.5(AS)** Development of the project site could result in the loss of landmark oak trees and groves, which could conflict with the Nevada County General Plan. | PS | **MM AS 6.1.5** Prior to issuance of a tree-removal or grading permit, a Habitat Management Plan for high-canopy coverage (landmark) oak woodlands shall be submitted and approved by County staff. Specifications of the Habitat Management Plan shall not conflict with provisions of fire protection plans, but shall include the following compensatory mitigation and habitat protection actions:  
• Because the project site is not capable of supporting replacement trees on-site, restoration of oak woodland shall be completed by paying into the Nevada County Tree Preservation Fund. Fund monies received in lieu of replacement trees shall be used for the planting and maintenance of trees on publicly owned property, or for the purchase of replacement habitat at a ratio of 2:1 for all acreage of landmark oak grove that is removed from the project site. Restoration shall be implemented in areas of existing non-native grassland that are suitable for the regeneration of high-canopy coverage oak woodland and that are selected to be appropriate to enhance the overall ecological values of the adjoining habitats. The majority of the restoration areas shall be selected with a preference for regeneration of black oak woodland.  
• Implementation of habitat management actions that will minimize the likelihood that wildfire will completely destroy the protected oak stands and preclude rapid natural regeneration. The purpose of active management (fuel reduction) is to reduce ground level, understory, and  | PS |
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### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower canopy fuels sufficiently that the intensity of inevitable future wildfire is sufficiently reduced so that the post-fire regeneration is relatively rapid. This shall be achieved without removal of all smaller trees, which would prevent recruitment of new trees to the canopy and would ultimately eliminate the desired values for which the area is being preserved. None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative development of the proposed projects could affect biological resources.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: Implement mitigation measures MM AS-6.1.3a through MM AS-6.1.3e Penn Valley project: Implement mitigation MM PV-6.2.4. Rough and Ready Highway project: None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No historic properties would be affected by development of the Alta Sierra project site or septic site.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Alta Sierra project site or the associated septic site could inadvertently damage previously undiscovered archaeological or tribal cultural resources.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-7.1.2 In the event cultural materials or human remains are discovered during project construction, the construction contractor shall halt work and contact the appropriate agencies. All equipment operators and persons involved in any form of ground disturbance at any phase of project improvements shall be advised of the possibility of encountering subsurface cultural resources. If such resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted immediately within 200 feet of the suspected resource and the Nevada County</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
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### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Department shall be contacted. A professional archaeologist shall be retained by the developer and consulted to access any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment. If bones are encountered and appear to be human, California Law requires that the Nevada County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission be contacted and, if Native American resources are involved, Native American organizations and individuals recognized by the County shall be notified and consulted about any plans for treatment. A note to this effect shall be included on the grading and construction plans for the project.</strong></td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measure <strong>MM AS-7.1.2.</strong></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 7.4.1</strong> Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative cultural resource impacts.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geology and Soils

**Impact 8.1.1(AS)** The Alta Sierra project site is located in an area that would be subject to seismic hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MM AS-8.1.1a</strong> Prior to grading permit issuance, the project applicant shall provide a final Geotechnical Engineering Report to the Nevada County Building and Planning Departments that reflects the final site plan. The Building Department shall be responsible for reviewing the final site plan and final Geotechnical Engineering Report to ensure that they are consistent with both local and building code requirements.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM AS-8.1.1b Prior to grading or building permit issuance, the developer shall include the grading and structural improvement design criteria recommendations of the Final Geotechnical Engineering Report as noted on improvement plans and incorporate those recommended actions into the final project design. The Nevada County Building Department shall verify that the recommendations are being implemented during the plan review and inspection stages of the permit process.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.1.2(AS) Development of the Alta Sierra site could result in temporary erosion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- NI – no impact
- LS – less than significant impact
- PS – potentially significant impact
- S – significant impact
- SU – significant and unavoidable impact
- LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact
- CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sediment Control, Tracking Control, Wind Erosion Control, Waste Management and Materials Pollution Control and shall be provided to the Nevada County Planning, Building and Public Works Departments prior to issuance of grading permits or approval of improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Topsoil that will be used as fill material shall be removed and stockpiled for later reuse prior to excavation activities. Topsoil shall be identified by the soil-revegetation specialist who will identify both extent and depth of the topsoil to be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Upon completion of grading, stockpiled topsoil shall be combined with wood chips, compost and other soil amendments for placement on all graded areas. Revegetation shall consist of native seed mixes only. The primary objectives of the soil amendments and revegetation is to create site conditions that keep sediment on site, produce a stable soil surface, resist erosion and are similar to the surrounding native ecosystem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Geo-fabrics, jutes or other mats may be used in conjunction with revegetation and soil stabilization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.1.3(AS)</td>
<td>The Alta Sierra site may include soils that may be subject to expansion potential.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM AS-8.1.1a and MM AS-8.1.1b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.1.4(AS)</td>
<td>Wastewater treatment and disposal at the Alta Sierra site would rely through a septic system. The Alta Sierra site may have soils incapable of supporting a septic system.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.4.1</td>
<td>Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative geologic and soils impacts.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact LS – less than significant impact PS – potentially significant impact S – significant impact SU – significant and unavoidable impact LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 9.1.1(AS)</strong> The Alta Sierra project would generate greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 10.1.1(AS)</strong> Construction and occupancy of the Alta Sierra site would involve the use of hazardous materials.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 10.1.2(AS)</strong> Development of the Alta Sierra site would not encounter known hazardous materials contamination.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 10.1.3(AS)</strong> Development of the Alta Sierra site would not affect emergency response plans.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 10.1.4(AS)</strong> Development of the Alta Sierra site would result in a new building in a high fire hazard severity zone.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-10.1.4 Prior to issuance of grading and building permits for the project, the County shall ensure the following is completed: 1. The applicant shall provide written verification to the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District of 1,500-gallons-per-minute (gpm) fire flow. A fire hydrant shall be installed on-site to supplement the existing hydrant on Alta Sierra Drive. The location of the hydrant shall be shown on project plans and shall be subject to Nevada County Consolidated Fire District approval. 2. An approved fire sprinkler system shall be installed throughout the entire building to achieve the 1,500 gpm fire flow and shall be monitored by an approved fire alarm system. 3. If alternative means of providing necessary fire flow are necessary, the applicant shall submit a plan to the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District for review and approval, and the County shall ensure project design incorporates the approved features.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## Impact

### Impact 10.4.1

Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: None required. Penn Valley project: None required. Rough and Ready Highway project: Implement mitigation measures MM RR-10.3.2a and MM RR-10.3.2b.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hydrology and Water Quality

### Impact 11.1.1(AS)

Development of the Alta Sierra site would result in an increase in the rate and amount of stormwater runoff and would contribute urban pollutants to stormwater runoff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Alta Sierra site would result in an increase in the rate and amount of stormwater runoff and would contribute urban pollutants to stormwater runoff.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-11.1.1a The construction and grading permits shall comply with the applicable NPDES regulations. Prior to grading permit issuance, obtain a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the construction activity and provide a copy of the permit to the County Planning, Building and Public Works Departments. Grading plans shall include verification that an NPDES permit, issued by the State Water Resources Board, has been issued for this project. To protect water quality, the contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after construction. These measures include, but are not limited to, the following: 1. At no time shall heavy equipment operate in flowing water. 2. Disturbed areas shall be graded to minimize surface erosion and siltation; bare areas will be covered with mulch; cleared areas will be revegetated with locally native erosion control seed mix. 3. The contractor shall exercise every reasonable precaution from adding pollution to offsite waterways with fuels, oils, bitumen, calcium chloride, and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and pollutants such as oil, cement, and washwater shall be prevented</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from discharging into the offsite drainages and shall be collected and removed from the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Erosion control measures shall be applied to all disturbed slopes. No invasive non-native grasses shall be used for erosion control, such as velvet grass or orchard grass. A combination of rice straw wattles, a mulch of native straw or certified weed-free straw, and a planting of native plant species is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Silt fencing (or filter fabric) shall be used to catch any short-term erosion or sedimentation that may inadvertently occur. Silt-fencing should be installed well above the offsite drainages and extend beyond the construction zone if necessary. The use of standard straw is prohibited to avoid introduction of noxious weeds, such as star thistle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>To minimize water quality impacts to Rattlesnake Creek or other offsite drainages after the project is complete, no direct discharge of runoff from newly constructed impervious surface will be allowed to flow directly to the drainage. Runoff from surfaces should be directed through storm water interceptors constructed at discharge points. These interceptors will remove oil, sediment, and other pollutants that might otherwise flow to downstream waterways.</td>
<td></td>
<td>MM AS-11.1.1b The following measures shall be required to reduce surface water drainage patterns, unless alternatives are approved that are recommended by the project’s geotechnical engineers, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board or the Department of Public Works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that will provide substantially the same or better management of surface drainage:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Slope final grade adjacent to structural areas so that surface water drains away from building pad finish subgrades at a minimum 2 percent slope for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Where interior slabs-on-grade are proposed, the exterior subgrade must have a minimum slope of 4 percent away from the structure for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Additional drainage and slab-on-grade construction recommendations are provided in a geotechnical engineering report outlined in mitigation measure MM AS-8.1.1b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Compact and slope all soil placed adjacent to building foundations such that water is not retained to pond or infiltrate. Backfill should be free of deleterious material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Direct rain-gutter downspouts to a solid collector pipe which discharges flow to positive drainage and away from building foundations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM AS-11.1.1c Drainage facilities for this project shall utilize County Standard Plans and Specifications and be designed by a registered civil engineer. Onsite storm drainage facilities shall be constructed in compliance with the design and analysis provided in the project specific Drainage Report prepared by TTG Engineers dated May 2016, and Sheet C2 date stamped March 30, 2015, which is to be kept on file with the Planning Department. Additionally, measures shall be incorporated into the improvement plans that reduce the offsite drainage flows to pre-project conditions as any additional net increase in stormwater runoff from the project site is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 11.1.2(AS)</strong> Saturated soil and groundwater seepage may be present seasonally at the Alta Sierra site and the site would be served by an existing septic system, but the project would have minimal effect on groundwater amount and quality.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 11.4.1</strong> Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, could affect water quality as a result of stormwater runoff containing pollutants.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 11.4.2</strong> Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, in areas not served by a public wastewater system would result in an increase in the number of septic tanks, which can affect water quality.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 11.4.3</strong> Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, could increase the rate and/or amount of stormwater discharged into local drainage systems and natural waterways, which could increase flood potential.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Use and Planning

**Impact 12.1.1(AS)** Development of the Alta Sierra site would not physically divide the surrounding community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM AS-4.4.1c and MM AS-13.1.1. MM AS-12.1.1 To minimize potential conflicts with existing traffic flow and the general peace and welfare of surrounding residents and commercial businesses, soil export activities are limited to non-peak traffic hours (9 a.m. to 4 p.m.), Monday through Saturday.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 12.1.2(AS)** Development of the Alta Sierra site as proposed would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations and would be compatible with the surrounding uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **NI** – no impact
- **LS** – less than significant impact
- **PS** – potentially significant impact
- **S** – significant impact
- **SU** – significant and unavoidable impact
- **LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact
- **CC** – cumulatively considerable impact

**Dollar General Stores**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

**Nevada County**

**September 2017**
### Impact 12.4.1
Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friday only. Additionally, soil export activities must be completed within 21-day of issuance of the grading permits, unless justifiable unforeseen circumstances occur (e.g., long periods of inclement weather or equipment failure) where an extension to this time frame may be allowed by the Building Department. Following soil export activities, the temporary access on Little Valley Road shall be permanently closed off. Future grading plans shall include a Note that reflects the restricted duration, hours and days for soil export activities as well as the requirement to discontinue the use of the temporary access to Little Valley Road at the completion of soil export activities. Following the completion of the soil export activities, the developer shall notify the Planning Department to conduct a field visit to verify that the access to Little Valley Road has been permanently closed off.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise

**Impact 13.1.1(AS)** Development of the Alta Sierra project site as proposed could expose sensitive receptors to stationary source noise levels in excess of established standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MM AS-13.1.1 To ensure project operational noise levels do not exceed the County’s Noise Standards, the project shall be conditioned to limit all truck deliveries to the Alta Sierra project site to between the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Store management shall be educated regarding these restricted delivery hours and a small non-illuminated sign not to exceed 4 square feet shall be posted in the delivery loading and unloading area outlining these restrictions. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site visit to ensure this mitigation measure has been implemented.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.1.2(AS)</strong> Project construction would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Alta Sierra project site.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><strong>MM AS-13.1.2</strong> The project applicant shall ensure through contract specifications that construction best management practices (BMPs) are implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels. Contract specifications shall be included in the construction document, which shall be reviewed by the County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit (whichever is issued first). The construction BMPs shall include the following:</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and is in good working condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact    LS – less than significant impact    PS – potentially significant impact    S – significant impact    SU – significant and unavoidable impact    LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact    CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 13.1.3(AS) Groundborne vibration levels associated with short-term construction activities at the Alta Sierra project site could exceed the applicable groundborne vibration criterion at adjacent commercial uses.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 13.1.4(AS) Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 13.4.1 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County would result in a cumulative increase in noise. However, compliance with the policies contained in the Noise Element would ensure that noise levels do not exceed applicable County noise standards.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Services and Utilities

| Impact 14.1.1(AS) Development of the Alta Sierra project site as proposed would not substantially increase demand for public safety services and would not trigger the need for any new or expanded facilities. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 14.1.2(AS) The Alta Sierra project would increase demand for water supplies and water treatment capacity and would require construction of on- and off-site water conveyance improvements. | LS | No additional measures required. | LS |
| Impact 14.1.3(AS) The proposed Alta Sierra project includes a septic system, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts. | LS | No additional measures required. | LS |
| Impact 14.1.4(AS) The proposed Alta Sierra project includes an on-site stormwater drainage system, construction of which could result in impacts to the physical environment. | LS | No additional measures required. | LS |
## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.1.5(AS)</strong> Construction and operation of the Alta Sierra project would generate solid waste requiring collection and disposal.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM AS-14.1.5 Prior to issuance of grading or building permits, the following shall be included as a Note on those plans: Toxic waste materials (ammunition, asbestos, biohazards, compressed gas cylinders, explosives, radioactive materials, treated wood waste, and medications) are not accepted at the McCourtney Road Transfer Station and if encountered during construction, shall be properly disposed of in compliance with existing regulations and at appropriate facilities. The County Department of Public Works-Solid Waste Division (organic waste) and Environmental Health Department (industrial toxic waste) are the local agencies with oversight over the disposal of these materials. Should the developer encounter these materials during grading or construction activities, the developer shall consult with these agencies to determine the appropriate methods for disposal and the appropriate facilities where these materials can be disposed.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.4.1</strong> Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County could result in the need to expand or construct new public safety facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.4.2</strong> Sufficient water supplies and water treatment facility capacity would be available to serve projected cumulative growth in western Nevada County.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.4.3</strong> Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, could result in the need to construct new water, wastewater, storm drainage, or solid waste facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.4.4</strong> Existing solid waste transfer and disposal facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated growth in western Nevada County.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 15.1.1(AS)** Implementation of the proposed Alta Sierra project would increase vehicular traffic on the local roadway system, potentially degrading intersection operations.

- **Level of Significance Before Mitigation**: LS
- **Mitigation Measure**: None required.
- **Resulting Level of Significance**: LS

**Impact 15.2(AS)** Development of the Alta Sierra project site could introduce incompatible uses that could affect safety on roadways and could negatively affect emergency access in the project vicinity.

- **Level of Significance Before Mitigation**: PS
- **Mitigation Measure**: MM AS-15.1.2a No objects or vegetation along the project site’s frontage area along the north and south sides of Alta Sierra Drive shall exceed the maximum height of 18 inches to ensure a clear line of sight from the property driveway onto Alta Sierra Drive. The project’s landscape plan shall be reviewed by Nevada County Planning Department staff prior to approval of a building permit to ensure the plan conforms to this restriction.
  - In addition, the project applicant shall perform brush clearing and trimming up or down of trees and shrubs and maintenance within this area to ensure a clear line of sight prior to project operation. The project applicant shall coordinate with the Nevada County Public Works Department regarding the extent of clearing and trimming necessary and shall obtain a standard encroachment permit from the County prior to initiating work within the public right-of-way.
  - MM AS-15.1.2b Unless and until Alta Sierra Drive is designated a STAA route, STAA trucks shall be prohibited from accessing the project site and will be strictly enforced, unless Alta Sierra Drive is designated a STAA route.
  - MM AS-15.1.2c To improve the operational safety of truck delivery and customer access to the site, the developer shall modify their north side curb by either shifting (flaring) it to the north or increasing the curb radius to improve truck turning so that an outbound truck can successfully turn onto Alta Sierra Drive without encroaching into the opposing

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact

LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.1.3(AS)</strong> Development of the Alta Sierra project site as proposed would not result in the need for private or public road maintenance or for new roads.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.1.4(AS)</strong> Development of the Alta Sierra project site would have no effect on existing pedestrian, bicycle, or transit circulation in the area and would not conflict with adopted plans regarding alternative transportation.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.1.5(AS)</strong> Construction at the Alta Sierra project site would not have substantial effects on pedestrian, bicycle, or transit circulation in the area.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><strong>MM AS-15.1.5</strong> Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the Alta Sierra project site, a Construction Traffic Control Plan (CTCP) shall be submitted for review and approval by the Nevada County Public Works Department. The CTCP shall include a schedule of construction, the types of trucks accessing the site, and anticipated methods of handling traffic during construction activities to ensure the safe flow of traffic, pedestrian/bicycle crossing, and adequate emergency access, including maintaining an open lane for motorized and non-motorized travel at all times. All traffic control measures shall conform to County and Caltrans standards, as applicable. Implement mitigation measure <strong>MM AS-12.1.1</strong>.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.4.1</strong> When considered with existing, proposed, planned, and approved development in the region, implementation of the proposed Alta Sierra project would contribute to cumulative traffic volumes. However, this increase would not result in impacts to level of service and operations.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact  
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### TABLE 2.0-3
#### PENN VALLEY PROJECT: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.2.1(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley project site as proposed would convert vacant land to commercial development. Such a conversion would fundamentally alter the visual character of a portion of the site.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.2.2(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley project site as proposed would introduce new sources of light and glare.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-4.2.2a Prior to building permit issuance, the developer shall submit a final Site Lighting Plan/Photometric Detail that demonstrates that all light spill will be retained on the project site. Potential methods for reducing light trespass onto neighboring roads and properties include replacing the 400-watt parking lot light fixtures located on the south and east with light fixtures of lesser wattage, and/or providing additional screening of those features, and/or moving light poles farther into the interior of the site. The developer shall install and maintain all lighting consistent with the approved Final Site Lighting Plan. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site visit, during the dark hours, to verify that the installed lighting does not trespass onto neighboring roads or properties. MM PV-4.2.2b All lighting for advertising must meet the County Lighting and Signage Ordinance requirements. Internally illuminated signage shall be prohibited. All lighting for exterior signage or advertising shall be top mounted light fixtures which shine light downward directly onto the sign. Said lighting shall be fully shielded consistent with International Dark Sky standards. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall submit a final signage plan that eliminates any reference to</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>internally lighted signage and provides details for establishing top mounted lighting for both the monument and wall signs. Additionally, any proposed sign lighting shall be shown and taken into account in the photometric detail in the revised project site lighting plan as required by mitigation measure MM PV-4.2.2a. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site inspection to ensure that the sign lighting is installed consistent with this mitigation measure and the County Zoning Code standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 4.4.2(PV)** The Penn Valley project site is located in an area developed with similar commercial uses along a major corridor. Cumulative development would contribute to the ongoing transition of the area to urban uses. Compliance with existing development standards and applicable design guidelines would reduce cumulative aesthetic and lighting impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

**Impact 5.2.1(PV)** Construction activities associated with the Penn Valley site such as clearing, excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would temporarily affect local air quality for adjacent land uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| PS | MM PV-5.2.1a The construction contractor shall submit to the NSAQMD for approval an Off-Road Construction Equipment Emission Reduction Plan prior to ground breaking demonstrating the following:  
- All off-road equipment (portable and mobile) meets or is cleaner than Tier 2 engine emission specifications unless prior written approval for any exceptions is obtained from the NSAQMD. Note that all off-road equipment must meet all applicable state and federal requirements.  
- Emissions from on-site construction equipment shall comply with NSAQMD Regulation II, Rule 202, Visible Emissions. | | LS |

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes when not in use (as required by California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators shall be utilized rather than temporary power generators (i.e. diesel generators), where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Deliveries of construction materials shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to avoid the peak hours of 7:00–9:00 AM and 4:00–6:00 PM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The primary contractor shall use architectural coatings for the proposed structure that have a volatile organic compound (VOC) content no greater than 50 grams per liter of VOC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM PV-5.2.1b** To reduce impacts of short-term construction, the applicant shall obtain NSAQMD approval of a Dust Control Plan (DCP) which shall include, but not be limited to, the standards provided below to the satisfaction of the NSAQMD. Prior to issuance of grading permits,
### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the developer shall provide a copy of the approved DCP to the County Planning and Building Department and shall include the requirements of DCP as notes on all construction plans. The Building Department shall verify that the requirements of the DCP are being implemented during grading inspections. Alternatives to open burning of vegetation material on the project site shall be used by the project applicant unless deemed infeasible to the Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). Among suitable alternatives is chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel. 1. The applicant shall implement all dust control measures in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction. 2. All material excavated, stockpiled or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated or converted to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. Watering should occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage. 3. All areas (including unpaved roads) with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have dust palliative applied as necessary for regular stabilization of dust emissions. 4. All land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities on a project shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 mph. 5. All on-site vehicle traffic shall be limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved roads.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact
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### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>All inactive disturbed portions of the development site shall be covered, seeded or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, the applicant shall be responsible for applying non-toxic soil stabilizers to all inactive construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Paved streets adjacent to the project shall be swept or washed at the end of each day, or as required to removed excessive accumulation of silt and/or mud which may have resulted from activities at the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>If serpentine or ultramafic rock is discovered during grading or construction the District must be notified no later than the next business day and the California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 9315 applies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM PV-5.2.1c** To ensure that the project will not result in the significant generation of VOCs, all architectural coatings shall utilize low-VOC paint (no greater than 50g/L VOC). Prior to building permit issuance, the developer shall submit their list of low-VOC coatings to the NSAQMD for review and approval. The developer shall then provide written verification from NSAQMD that all architectural coatings meet NSAQMD thresholds to be considered “low-VOC.” Finally, all building plans shall include a note documenting which low-VOC architectural coatings will be used in construction.

---

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact
### 2.0 Executive Summary

| Impact 5.2.2(PV) | The Penn Valley project would not result in long-term operational emissions that could violate or substantially contribute to a violation of federal and state standards. | PS | MM PV-5.2.2 The project applicant shall obtain an Authority to Construct Permit from NSAQMD for any source of air contaminants that exist after construction that is not exempt from District permit requirements. All requirements of this permit shall be incorporated into standard operating procedure manuals or materials for the project. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the developer shall submit written proof (i.e. a letter from NSAQMD and a copy of the permit) to the County Planning and Building Department documenting that they have obtained said permit from NSAQMD. | LS |
| Impact 5.2.3(PV) | The Penn Valley project would not contribute to localized concentrations of mobile-source carbon monoxide that would exceed applicable ambient air quality standards. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 5.2.4(PV) | The proposed Penn Valley project would not result in increased exposure of existing or planned sensitive lands to construction-source pollutant concentrations that would exceed applicable standards. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 5.2.5(PV) | Operation of the Penn Valley project would not result in increased exposure of existing or planned sensitive lands to operational-source toxic air contaminant emissions (i.e., diesel PM). | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 5.2.6(PV) | The proposed Penn Valley project would not include sources that could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people or expose new residents to existing sources of odor. | NI | None required. | NI |
| Impact 5.4.1 | The proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the Mountain Counties Air Basin, would contribute to cumulative increases in emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants (ROG and NOx) and PM10 that could contribute to future concentrations of ozone and PM10, for which the region is currently designated nonattainment. | CC/S | Implement mitigation as follows:  
Alta Sierra project: Implement mitigation measure MM AS-5.1.1a.  
Penn Valley project: Implement mitigation measure MM PV-5.2.1a.  
Rough and Ready Highway project: Implement mitigation measure MM RR-5.3.1a. | LCC |

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact

Dollar General Stores  
Final Environmental Impact Report  
Nevada County  
September 2017
2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.2.1(PV)</strong> The project site does not provide suitable habitat for any special status plant species that may occur in the vicinity.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.2.2(PV)</strong> Project related activities could result in loss of nesting habitat for raptors and other birds protected by the MTBA.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-6.2.2 If construction is proposed during the breeding season (February–August), a focused survey for raptors and other migratory bird nests shall be conducted within 14 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. This 500-foot construction prohibition zone may be reduced based on consultation with and approval by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Trees containing nests or cavities that must be removed as a result of project implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to January). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. To the extent feasible, necessary tree removal should occur outside of the typical nesting season to minimize or avoid adverse effects to all nesting birds.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 6.2.3(PV)</strong> Project-related activities could impact western pond turtle.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-6.2.3 Within 48 hours prior to any disturbance within suitable habitat for western pond turtle, proposed disturbance areas shall be surveyed for this presence of this species by a qualified biologist. Surveys of the area shall be repeated if a lapse in construction activity of two weeks or greater occurs. If the species is detected, individuals shall be relocated to a suitable site within the same drainage by a qualified biologist. If the species is detected during the pre-construction survey, a monitoring biologist will be</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact    LS – less than significant impact    PS – potentially significant impact    S – significant impact    SU – significant and unavoidable impact    LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact    CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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Impact 6.2.4(PV) One stream and associated wetlands that are considered Waters of the U.S. are present onsite. A portion of these features will be impacted by the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| onsight during initiation of construction activities to ensure that no turtles are present during the onset of disturbance activities. If a western pond turtle is encountered during construction, activities shall cease until appropriate corrective measures have been implemented or it has been determined that the turtle will not be harmed. Any trapped, injured, or killed western pond turtles shall be reported immediately to the CDFW. | MM PV-6.2.4 The following measures shall be implemented prior to or during construction, as appropriate.  
- The project applicant shall either obtain a qualified biologist to conduct a preliminary delineation or shall resubmit the expired jurisdictional determination for reverification from the USACE.  
- Prior to initiation of construction activities within jurisdictional features, construction best management practices (BMPs) shall be employed on-site to prevent degradation to on-site and off-site waters of the United States. Methods shall include the use of appropriate measures to intercept and capture sediment prior to entering jurisdictional features, as well as erosion control measures along the perimeter of all work areas to prevent the displacement of fill material. All BMPs shall be in place prior to initiation of any construction activities and shall remain until construction activities are completed. All erosion control methods shall be maintained until all on-site soils are stabilized. BMPs include, but are not limited to: | PS | LS |
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Minimize the number and size of work areas for equipment and spoil storage sites in the vicinity of the stream. Place staging areas and other work areas outside of the 50-foot and 100-foot non-disturbance buffers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The contractor shall exercise reasonable precaution to protect this stream, wetlands, and adjacent non-disturbance buffers from pollution with fuels, oils and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and pollutant such as oil, cement, and wash water shall be prevented from discharging into or near these resources and shall be collected for removal off the site. All construction debris and associated materials and litter shall be removed from the work site immediately upon completion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) No equipment for vehicle maintenance or refueling shall occur within the 50-foot and 100-foot non-disturbance buffers. The contractor shall immediately contain and clean up any petroleum or other chemical spills with absorbent materials such as sawdust or kitty litter. For other hazardous materials, follow the cleanup instruction on the label.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Exposed bare soil along the stream embankment and including non-disturbance buffer should be protected against loss from erosion by the seeding of an erosion control mixture and restored with native grasses and mulching. Non-native species that are known to invade with lands, such as orchard grass, velvet grass, rose clover, winter and spring vetch, and wild oats should not be used as they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Resulting Level of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| displace native species. The contractor shall follow the permit requirements obtained from the USACE and Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board before, during, and after construction. | • Standard staging area practices for sediment-tracking reduction shall be implemented where necessary and may include vehicle washing and street sweeping.  
• All exposed/disturbed areas and access points left barren of vegetation as a result of construction activities shall be restored at the end of construction using locally native grass seeds, locally native grass plugs, and/or a mix of quick-growing sterile non-native grass with locally native grass seeds. Seeded areas shall be covered with broadcast straw and/or jute netted (monofilament erosion blankets are not permitted).  
• Protective silt fencing shall be installed between the adjacent wetland habitats and the construction area limits to prevent accidental disturbance during construction and to protect water quality within the aquatic habitats during construction.  
• The County shall ensure there is no net loss of wetlands or other waters of the United States through impact avoidance, impact minimization, and/or compensatory mitigation, as determined in CWA Section 404 and 401 permits and/or 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement. Evidence of compliance with this mitigation measure shall be provided prior to construction. | | |
### Impact 6.2.5(PV)

The proposed project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 6.2.6(PV)

Development of the project area would not result in the loss of protected trees or landscape grove or conflict with the Nevada County General Plan related to tree protection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 6.2.7(PV)

The proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measure MM PV-6.2.4.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 6.4.1

Cumulative development of the proposed projects could affect biological resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: Implement mitigation measures MM AS-6.1.3a through MM AS-6.1.3e Penn Valley project: Implement mitigation MM PV-6.2.4.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact
### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rough and Ready Highway project: None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 7.2.1(PV)</th>
<th>No historic properties would be affected by development of the Penn Valley project site.</th>
<th>NI</th>
<th>None required.</th>
<th>NI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact 7.2.2(PV)** Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Penn Valley project site could inadvertently damage previously undiscovered archaeological and tribal resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 7.2.2(PV)</th>
<th>Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Penn Valley project site could inadvertently damage previously undiscovered archaeological and tribal resources.</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>MM PV-7.2.2 In the event cultural materials or human remains are discovered during project construction, the construction contractor shall halt work and contact the appropriate agencies. All equipment operators and persons involved in any form of ground disturbance at any phase of project improvements shall be advised of the possibility of encountering subsurface cultural resources. If such resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted immediately within 200 feet of the suspected resource and the Nevada County Planning Department shall be contacted. A professional archaeologist shall be retained by the developer and consulted to access any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment. If bones are encountered and appear to be human, California Law requires that the Nevada County Coroner and the Native American Heritage Commission be contacted and, if Native American resources are involved, Native American organizations and individuals recognized by the County shall be notified and consulted about any plans for treatment. A note to this effect shall be included on the grading and construction plans for the project.</th>
<th>LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Impact 7.2.3(PV)** Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Penn Valley project site could inadvertently disturb human remains. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure proper management of any discovered human remains.

| Impact 7.2.3(PV) | Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Penn Valley project site could inadvertently disturb human remains. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure proper management of any discovered human remains. | PS | Implement mitigation measure MM PV-7.2.2. | LS |

*NI* – no impact  
*LCC* – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
*PS* – potentially significant impact  
*S* – significant impact  
*SU* – significant and unavoidable impact  
*CC* – cumulatively considerable impact  
*NI* – no impact  
*LCC* – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
*PS* – potentially significant impact  
*S* – significant impact  
*SU* – significant and unavoidable impact  
*CC* – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 7.4.1</strong> Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative cultural resource impacts.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 8.2.1(PV)</strong> The Penn Valley project site is located in an area that would be subject to seismic hazards.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-8.2.1a Prior to grading permit issuance, the project applicant shall provide a final Geotechnical Engineering Report to the Nevada County Building and Planning Departments that reflects the final site plan. The Building Department shall be responsible for reviewing the final site plan and final Geotechnical Engineering Report to ensure that they are consistent with both local and building code requirements. MM PV-8.2.1b Prior to grading or building permit issuance, the developer shall include the grading and structural improvement design criteria recommendations of the Final Geotechnical Engineering Report as notes on improvement plans and incorporate those recommended actions into the final project design. The Nevada County Building Department shall verify that the recommendations are being implemented during the plan review and inspection stages of the permit process.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 8.2.2(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley site could result in temporary erosion.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-8.2.2a Prior to issuance of grading permits, all grading and improvement plans shall include a note documenting the approved time of year for grading activities. Specifically, no grading shall occur after October 15 or before May 1 unless standard Building Department requirements are met for grading during the wet season.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact **LS** – less than significant impact **PS** – potentially significant impact **S** – significant impact **SU** – significant and unavoidable impact **LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact **CC** – cumulatively considerable impact
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### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM PV-8.2.2b Prior to issuance of grading permits or improvement plans for all project-related grading including road construction and drainage improvements, all plans shall incorporate, at a minimum, the following erosion and sediment control measures, which shall be implemented throughout the construction phase:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. During construction, Best Management Practices (BMPs) for temporary erosion control shall be implemented to control any pollutants that could potentially affect the quality of storm water discharges from the site. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared in accordance with California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requirements. The SWPPP shall include the implementation of BMPs for Erosion Control, Sediment Control, Tracking Control, Wind Erosion Control, Waste Management and Materials Pollution Control and shall be provided to the Nevada County Planning, Building and Public Works Departments prior to issuance of grading permits or approval of improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Topsoil that will be used as fill material shall be removed and stockpiled for later reuse prior to excavation activities. Topsoil shall be identified by the soil-revegetation specialist who will identify both extent and depth of the topsoil to be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Upon completion of grading, stockpiled topsoil shall be combined with wood chips, compost and other soil amendments for placement on all graded areas. Revegetation shall consist of native seed mixes only. The primary objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact    LS – less than significant impact    PS – potentially significant impact    S – significant impact    SU – significant and unavoidable impact
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact    CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.2.3(PV) Penn Valley site may include soils that may be subject to expansion potential.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM PV-8.2.1a and MM PV-8.2.1b.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4.1 Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative geologic and soils impacts.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.2.1(PV) The Penn Valley project would generate greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1(PV) Construction and occupancy of the Penn Valley site would involve the use of hazardous materials.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.2(PV) Development of the Penn Valley site would not encounter known hazardous materials contamination.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.3(PV) Development of the Penn Valley site would not affect emergency response plans.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2.4(PV) Development of the Penn Valley site would result in a new building in a moderate fire hazard severity zone.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-10.2.4 Prior to issuance of grading and building permits for the project, the County shall ensure the following is completed: 1. The applicant shall provide 180,000 gallons of water to provide the minimum fire flow of 1,500 gallons per minute. Prior to installation, the applicant shall provide a plan to the Penn Valley Fire Protection District for review and approval that demonstrates that minimum fire</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>flow is being met and how any onsite water supply tanks integrate with the Nevada Irrigation District (NID) system to ensure adequate fire flow. Minimum fire flow may be met through a combination of existing NID water, underground water storage tanks with a rated fire pump, hydrant, and post indicator valve for the fire sprinkler system. 2. An approved fire sprinkler system shall be installed throughout the entire building and shall be monitored by an approved fire alarm system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 10.4.1 Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: None required. Penn Valley project: None required. Rough and Ready Highway project: Implement mitigation measures MM RR-10.3.2a and MM RR-10.3.2b.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 11.2.1(PV) Development of the Penn Valley site would result in an increase in the rate and amount of stormwater runoff and would contribute urban pollutants to stormwater runoff.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-11.2.1a The construction and grading permits shall comply with the applicable NPDES regulations. Prior to grading permit issuance, obtain a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the construction activity and provide a copy of the permit to the County Planning, Building and Public Works Departments. Grading plans shall include verification that an NPDES permit, issued by the State Water Resources Board, has been issued for this project. To protect water quality, the contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction. These measures include, but are not limited to, the following:</td>
<td>1. At no time shall heavy equipment operate in flowing water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Disturbed areas shall be graded to minimize surface erosion and siltation; bare areas will be covered with mulch; cleared areas will be revegetated with locally native erosion control seed mix.</td>
<td>3. The contractor shall exercise every reasonable precaution from adding pollution to offsite waterways with fuels, oils, bitumen, calcium chloride, and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and pollutants such as oil, cement, and washwater shall be prevented from discharging into the offsite drainages and shall be collected and removed from the site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Erosion control measures shall be applied to all disturbed slopes. No invasive non-native grasses shall be used for erosion control, such as velvet grass or orchard grass. A combination of rice straw wattles, a mulch of native straw or certified weed-free straw, and a planting of native plant species is recommended.</td>
<td>5. Silt fencing (or filter fabric) shall be used to catch any short-term erosion or sedimentation that may inadvertently occur. Silt-fencing should be installed well above the offsite drainages and extend beyond the construction zone if necessary. The use of standard straw is prohibited to avoid introduction of noxious weeds, such as star thistle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact  **LS** – less than significant impact  **PS** – potentially significant impact  **S** – significant impact  **SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  **CC** – cumulatively considerable impact

*Nevada County*

*September 2017*
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. To minimize water quality impacts to Squirrel Creek or other offsite drainages after the project is complete, no direct discharge of runoff from newly constructed impervious surface will be allowed to flow directly to the drainage. Runoff from surfaces should be directed through storm water interceptors constructed at discharge points. These interceptors will remove oil, sediment, and other pollutants that might otherwise flow to downstream waterways. <strong>MM PV-11.2.1b</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following measures shall be required to reduce surface water drainage patterns, unless alternatives are approved that are recommended by the project’s geotechnical engineers, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board or the Department of Public Works that will provide substantially the same or better management of surface drainage:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Slope final grade adjacent to structural areas so that surface water drains away from building pad finish subgrades at a minimum 2 percent slope for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Where interior slabs-on-grade are proposed, the exterior subgrade must have a minimum slope of 4 percent away from the structure for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Additional drainage and slab-on-grade construction recommendations are provided in a geotechnical engineering report outlined in mitigation measure MM PV-8.2.1b.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Compact and slope all soil placed adjacent to building foundations such that water is not retained to pond or infiltrate. Backfill should be free of deleterious material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Direct rain-gutter downspouts to a solid collector pipe which discharges flow to positive drainage and away from building foundations.  
**MM PV-11.2.1c** Drainage facilities for this project shall utilize County Standard Plans and Specifications and be designed by a registered civil engineer. Onsite storm drainage facilities shall be constructed in compliance with the design and analysis provided in the project specific Drainage Report prepared by TTG Engineers dated March 2016, and Sheet C2 date stamped February 2, 2016, which is to be kept on file with the Planning Department. Additionally, measures shall be incorporated into the improvement plans that reduce the offsite drainage flows to pre-project conditions as any additional net increase in stormwater runoff from the project site is prohibited. Features shall also be incorporated into the plans that minimize the discharge of pollutants in conformance with General Plan Policy 11.6A, which include, but is not limited to, the use of curbs and gutters, and the use of oil, grease and silt traps. County engineering staff shall review future construction plans to verify that the final design meet the requirements of this mitigation measure. | | |

| Impact 11.1.2(PV) Saturated soil and groundwater seepage may be present seasonally at the Penn Valley site, but the project would have minimal effect on groundwater amount and quality. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 11.4.1 Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, could affect water quality as a result of stormwater runoff containing pollutants. | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Impact 11.4.2 Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, in areas not served by a public wastewater system would result in an increase in the number of septic tanks, which can affect water quality. | LCC | None required. | LCC |

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 11.4.3</strong> Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, could increase the rate and/or amount of stormwater discharged into local drainage systems and natural waterways, which could increase flood potential.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 12.2.1(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley site as proposed would not physically divide the surrounding community.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 12.2.2(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley site as proposed would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations and would be compatible with the surrounding uses.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 12.4.1</strong> Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.2.1(PV)</strong> The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to stationary sources of noise in excess of established standards.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-13.2.1 To ensure project operational noise levels do not exceed the County’s Noise Standards, the project shall be conditioned to limit all truck deliveries to the Penn Valley project site to between the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Store management shall be educated regarding these restricted delivery hours and a small non-illuminated sign not to exceed 4 square feet shall be posted in the delivery loading and unloading area outlining these restrictions. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site visit to ensure this mitigation measure has been implemented.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.2.2(PV)</strong> Project construction would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Penn Valley project site.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-13.2.2 The project applicant shall ensure through contract specifications that construction best management practices (BMPs) are implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels. Contract specifications shall be included in the construction document.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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2.0–52
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which shall be reviewed by the County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit (whichever is issued first). The construction BMPs shall include the following:</td>
<td>• Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. No construction is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and is in good working condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent. If the County or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.2.3(PV)</strong> Groundborne vibration levels associated with short-term construction activities at the Penn Valley project site would not exceed the applicable groundborne vibration criterion at adjacent land uses.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.2.4(PV)</strong> Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.4.1</strong> Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County would result in a cumulative increase in noise. However, compliance with the policies contained in the Noise Element would ensure that noise levels do not exceed applicable County noise standards.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Public Services and Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.2.1(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley project site as proposed would not substantially increase demand for public safety services and would not trigger the need for any new or expanded facilities.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.2.2(PV)</strong> The Penn Valley project would increase demand for water supplies and water treatment capacity and would require construction of on- and off-site water conveyance improvements.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>No additional measures required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.2.3(PV)</strong> The proposed Penn Valley project would connect to a public sewer system, but would include an onsite effluent holding tank and associated improvements, the construction of which could result in impacts to the physical environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>No additional measures required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.2.4(PV)</strong> The proposed Penn Valley project includes an on-site stormwater drainage system, construction of which could result in impacts to the physical environment.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>No additional measures required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 14.2.5(PV)</strong> Construction and operation of the Penn Valley project would generate solid waste requiring collection and disposal.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-14.2.5 Prior to issuance of grading or building permits the following shall be included as a Note on those plans: Toxic waste materials (ammunition, asbestos, biohazards, compressed gas cylinders, explosives, radioactive materials,</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact  
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*Nevada County*  
*September 2017*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 14.4.1 Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County could result in the need to expand or construct new public safety facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 14.4.2 Sufficient water supplies and water treatment facility capacity would be available to serve projected cumulative growth in western Nevada County.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 14.4.3 Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, could result in the need to construct new water, wastewater, storm drainage, or solid waste facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 14.4.4 Existing solid waste transfer and disposal facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated growth in western Nevada County.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.2.1(PV)</strong> Implementation of the proposed Penn Valley project would increase vehicular traffic on the local roadway system, potentially degrading intersection operations.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.2.2(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley project site could introduce incompatible uses that could affect safety on roadways and could negatively affect emergency access in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-15.2.2a No objects or vegetation within the site’s frontage along the north side of the Post Office Driveway/project access at Penn Valley Drive shall exceed the maximum height of 18 inches to ensure a clear line of sight. The project applicant shall perform brush clearing and tree trimming within this area in consultation with the Nevada County Public Works and Planning Departments prior to operation. No topping of oak trees shall be permitted. The applicant shall obtain a standard encroachment permit from the County prior to initiating work within the public right-of-way. MM PV-15.2.2b Unless and until Penn Valley Drive is designated a STAA route, STAA trucks shall be prohibited from accessing the project site and will be strictly enforced, unless Penn Valley Drive is designated a STAA route.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.2.3(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley project site as proposed would not result in the need for private or public road maintenance or for new roads.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.2.4(PV)</strong> Development of the Penn Valley project site would have no substantial effects on pedestrian, bicycle, or transit circulation in the area and would not conflict with adopted plans regarding alternative transportation.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.2.5(PV)</strong> Construction at the Penn Valley project site would not have substantial effects on pedestrian, bicycle, or transit circulation in the area.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM PV-15.2.5 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the Penn Valley project site, a Construction Traffic Control Plan (CTCP) shall be submitted for review and approval by the Nevada County Public Works Department. The CTCP shall include a schedule of construction, the types of</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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2.0–56
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 15.5.1(PV)</td>
<td>When considered with existing, proposed, planned, and approved development in the region, implementation of the proposed Penn Valley project would contribute to cumulative traffic volumes that result in impacts to level of service and operations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact

*Nevada County*  
*September 2017*  
*Dollar General Stores*  
*Final Environmental Impact Report*
### Table 2.0-4
**ROUGH AND READY HIGHWAY PROJECT: SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3.1(RR)</strong>  Development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site as proposed would maintain the existing commercial use but at a greater scale. Given the rural residential character of the surrounding area this conversion would be considered to substantially degrade the visual character of the project area.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>None available.</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 4.3.2(RR)</strong>  Development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site as proposed would introduce new sources of light and glare.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><strong>MM RR-4.3.2a</strong> Prior to building permit issuance, the developer shall submit a final Site Lighting Plan/Photometric Detail that demonstrates that all light spill will be retained on the project site. Potential methods for reducing light trespass onto neighboring roads and properties include light fixtures of lesser wattage, and/or providing additional screening of those features, and/or moving light poles farther into the interior of the site. The developer shall install and maintain all lighting consistent with the approved Final Site Lighting Plan. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site visit, during the dark hours, to verify that the installed lighting does not trespass onto neighboring roads or properties. <strong>MM RR-4.3.2b</strong> All lighting for advertising must meet the County Lighting and Signage Ordinance requirements. Internally illuminated signage shall be prohibited. All lighting for exterior signage or advertising shall be top mounted light fixtures which shine light downward directly onto the sign. Said lighting shall be fully shielded consistent with International Dark Sky standards. Prior to</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact 4.4.3(RR) The Rough and Ready Highway project site is located in an area dominated by rural residential development and open space. Cumulative development in the area would substantially alter the existing visual character of the area and generate substantial new light or glare.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>None available.</td>
<td>CC/SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Impact 5.3.1(RR) Construction activities associated with the Rough and Ready site such as clearing, excavation and grading operations, construction vehicle traffic, and wind blowing over exposed earth would generate exhaust emissions and fugitive particulate matter emissions that would temporarily affect local air quality for adjacent land uses. | PS | MM RR-5.3.1a The construction contractor shall submit to the NSAQMD for approval an Off-Road Construction Equipment Emission Reduction Plan prior to ground breaking demonstrating the following:  
• All off-road equipment (portable and mobile) meets or is cleaner than Tier 2 engine emission specifications unless prior written approval for any exceptions is obtained from the NSAQMD. Note that all off-road equipment must meet all applicable state and federal requirements. | LS |
### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emissions from on-site construction equipment shall comply with NSAQMD Regulation II, Rule 202, Visible Emissions.</td>
<td>• Emissions from on-site construction equipment shall comply with NSAQMD Regulation II, Rule 202, Visible Emissions.</td>
<td><strong>NI</strong> – no impact</td>
<td><strong>NI</strong> – no impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained.</td>
<td>• The primary contractor shall be responsible to ensure that all construction equipment is properly tuned and maintained.</td>
<td><strong>LCC</strong> – less than cumulatively considerable impact</td>
<td><strong>LCC</strong> – less than cumulatively considerable impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes when not in use (as required by California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</td>
<td>• Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes when not in use (as required by California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</td>
<td><strong>S</strong> – significant impact</td>
<td><strong>S</strong> – significant impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</td>
<td>• All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</td>
<td><strong>PS</strong> – potentially significant impact</td>
<td><strong>PS</strong> – potentially significant impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators shall be utilized rather than temporary power generators (i.e. diesel generators), where feasible.</td>
<td>• Existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel generators shall be utilized rather than temporary power generators (i.e. diesel generators), where feasible.</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong> – significant and unavoidable impact</td>
<td><strong>SU</strong> – significant and unavoidable impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliveries of construction materials shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to avoid the peak hours of 7:00–9:00 AM and 4:00–6:00 PM.</td>
<td>• Deliveries of construction materials shall be scheduled to direct traffic flow to avoid the peak hours of 7:00–9:00 AM and 4:00–6:00 PM.</td>
<td><strong>NI</strong> – no impact</td>
<td><strong>NI</strong> – no impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary contractor shall use architectural coatings for the proposed structure that have a volatile organic compound (VOC) content no greater than 50 grams per liter of VOC.</td>
<td>• The primary contractor shall use architectural coatings for the proposed structure that have a volatile organic compound (VOC) content no greater than 50 grams per liter of VOC.</td>
<td><strong>NI</strong> – no impact</td>
<td><strong>NI</strong> – no impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM RR-5.3.1b</td>
<td>To reduce impacts of short-term construction, the applicant shall obtain NSAQMD approval of a Dust Control Plan (DCP) which shall include, but not be limited, to, the standards provided below to the satisfaction of the NSAQMD. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the developer shall provide a copy of the approved DCP to the County Planning and Building Department and shall include the requirements of DCP as notes on all construction plans. The Building Department shall verify that the requirements of the DCP are being implemented during grading inspections. Alternatives to open burning of vegetation material on the project site shall be used by the project applicant unless deemed infeasible to the Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). Among suitable alternatives is chipping, mulching, or conversion to biomass fuel. 1. The applicant shall implement all dust control measures in a timely manner during all phases of project development and construction. 2. All material excavated, stockpiled or graded shall be sufficiently watered, treated or converted to prevent fugitive dust from leaving the property boundaries and causing a public nuisance or a violation of an ambient air standard. Watering should occur at least twice daily, with complete site coverage. 3. All areas (including unpaved roads) with vehicle traffic shall be watered or have dust palliative applied as necessary for regular stabilization of dust emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. All land clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities on a project shall be suspended as necessary to prevent excessive windblown dust when winds are expected to exceed 20 mph.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. All on-site vehicle traffic shall be limited to a speed of 15 mph on unpaved roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. All inactive disturbed portions of the development site shall be covered, seeded or watered until a suitable cover is established. Alternatively, the applicant shall be responsible for applying non-toxic soil stabilizers to all inactive construction areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent public nuisance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Paved streets adjacent to the project shall be swept or washed at the end of each day, or as required to removed excessive accumulation of silt and/or mud which may have resulted from activities at the project site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. If serpentine or ultramafic rock is discovered during grading or construction the District must be notified no later than the next business day and the California Code of Regulations, Title 17, Section 9315 applies. | | | MM RR-5.3.1c To ensure that the project will not result in the significant generation of VOCs, all architectural coatings shall utilize low-VOC paint (no greater than 50g/L VOC). Prior to building permit issuance, the

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>developer shall submit their list of low-VOC coatings to the NSAQMD for review and approval. The developer shall then provide written verification from NSAQMD that all architectural coatings meet NSAQMD thresholds to be considered “low-VOC.” Finally, all building plans shall include a note documenting which low-VOC architectural coatings will be used in construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM RR-5.3.2 The project applicant shall obtain an Authority to Construct Permit from NSAQMD for any source of air contaminants that exist after construction that is not exempt from District permit requirements. All requirements of this permit shall be incorporated into standard operating procedure manuals or materials for the project. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the developer shall submit written proof (i.e. a letter from NSAQMD and a copy of the permit) to the County Planning and Building Department documenting that they have obtained said permit from NSAQMD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.3.2(RR) The Rough and Ready project would not result in long-term operational emissions that could violate or substantially contribute to a violation of federal and state standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.3.3(RR) The Rough and Ready project would not contribute to localized concentrations of mobile-source carbon monoxide that would exceed applicable ambient air quality standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.3.4(RR) Implementation of the proposed Rough and Ready project would not result in increased exposure of existing sensitive land uses to construction-source pollutant concentrations that would exceed applicable standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 5.3.5(RR) The Rough and Ready project would not result in increased exposure of existing or planned sensitive land uses to operational-source toxic air contaminant emissions (i.e., diesel PM).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact  
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2.0–63
### 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 5.3.6(RR)</strong> The proposed Rough and Ready project would not include sources that could create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people or expose new residents to existing sources of odor.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 5.4.1</strong> The proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in the Mountain Counties Air Basin, would contribute to cumulative increases in emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants (ROG and NOₓ) and PM₁₀ that could contribute to future concentrations of ozone and PM₁₀, for which the region is currently designated nonattainment.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: Implement mitigation measure MM AS-5.1.1a. Penn Valley project: Implement mitigation measure MM PV-5.2.1a. Rough and Ready Highway project: Implement mitigation measure MM RR-5.3.1a.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Biological Resources

| Impact 6.3.1(RR) The project site does not provide suitable habitat for any special-status plant species that may occur in the vicinity. | NI | None required. | NI |

**Impact 6.3.2(RR)** Implementation of the project-related activities could result in loss of nesting habitat for raptors and other birds protected by the MTBA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM RR-6.3.2 If construction is proposed during the breeding season (February–August), a focused survey for raptors and other migratory bird nests shall be conducted within 14 days prior to the beginning of construction activities by a qualified biologist in order to identify active nests on-site. If active nests are found, no construction activities shall take place within 500 feet of the nest until the young have fledged. This 500-foot construction prohibition zone may be reduced based on consultation with and approval by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Trees containing nests or cavities that must be removed as a result of project implementation shall be removed during the non-breeding season (late September to January). If no active nests are found during the focused survey, no further mitigation will be required. To the extent feasible, necessary tree removal should occur outside of the typical nesting season to minimize or avoid adverse effects to all nesting birds.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM RR-6.3.2</td>
<td>LTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact  LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

### Impact 6.3.3(RR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 6.3.3(RR)</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no riparian habitat, sensitive natural community, or federally protected wetlands within the project site.</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 6.3.4(RR)

- Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with the movement of native resident or migratory wildlife species.
- NI
- None required.
- NI

### Impact 6.3.5(RR)

- Development of the project area will not result in the loss of protected trees or a landmark grove, which could conflict with the Nevada County General Plan.
- NI
- None required.
- NI

### Impact 6.3.6(RR)

- Implementation of the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.
- NI
- None required.
- NI

### Impact 6.4.1

Cumulative development of the proposed projects could affect biological resources.
- **Impact 6.4.1**
- **Level of Significance Before Mitigation**
- **Mitigation Measure**
- **Resulting Level of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 6.4.1</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative development of the proposed projects could affect biological resources.</td>
<td>CC/S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation as follows: Alta Sierra project: Implement mitigation measures MM AS-6.1.3a through MM AS-6.1.3e Penn Valley project: Implement mitigation MM PV-6.2.4. Rough and Ready Highway project: None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 7.3.1(RR)</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The existing building on the Rough and Ready Highway project site has been extensively modified and does not meet any of the criteria for listing as a significant historical resource.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 7.3.2(RR)</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site could inadvertently damage previously undiscovered archaeological and tribal resources.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM RR-7.3.2 In the event cultural materials or human remains are discovered during project construction, the construction contractor shall halt work and contact the appropriate agencies. All equipment operators and persons involved in any form of ground disturbance at any phase of project improvements shall be advised of the possibility of encountering</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact   Nevada County Dollar General Stores Final Environmental Impact Report
### Impact 7.3.3(RR)

**Impact** 7.3.3(RR) | Ground-disturbing construction activities associated with development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site could inadvertently disturb human remains. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure proper management of any discovered human remains.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measure MM RR-7.3.3.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure**

MM RR-7.3.3 | Prior to grading permit issuance, the project applicant shall provide a final Geotechnical Engineering Report to the Nevada County Building and Planning Department.

### Impact 7.4.1

**Impact** 7.4.1 | Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative cultural resource impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure**

None required.

### Geology and Soils

**Impact** 8.3.1(RR) | The Rough and Ready Highway project site is located in an area that would be subject to seismic hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM RR-8.3.1a</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure**

MM RR-8.3.1a | Prior to grading permit issuance, the project applicant shall provide a final Geotechnical Engineering Report to the Nevada County Building and Planning Department.

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MM RR-8.3.1b</td>
<td>Prior to grading or building permit issuance, the developer shall include the grading and structural improvement design criteria recommendations of the Final Geotechnical Engineering Report as notes on improvement plans and incorporate those recommended actions into the final project design. The Nevada County Building Department shall verify that the recommendations are being implemented during the plan review and inspection stages of the permit process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.3.2(RR)</td>
<td>Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site could result in temporary erosion.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM RR-8.3.2a</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permits, all grading and improvement plans shall include a note that documents the approved time of year for grading activities. Specifically, no grading shall occur after October 15 or before May 1 unless standard Building Department requirements are met for grading during the wet season.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM RR-8.3.2b</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permits or improvement plans for all project-related grading including road construction and drainage improvements, all plans shall incorporate, at a minimum, the following erosion and sediment control measures, which shall be implemented throughout the construction phase:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
CC – cumulatively considerable impact  
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### Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. During construction, Best Management Practices (BMPs) for temporary erosion control shall be implemented to control any pollutants that could potentially affect the quality of storm water discharges from the site. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be prepared in accordance with California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) requirements. The SWPPP shall include the implementation of BMPs for Erosion Control, Sediment Control, Tracking Control, Wind Erosion Control, Waste Management and Materials Pollution Control and shall be provided to the Nevada County Planning, Building and Public Works Departments prior to issuance of grading permits or approval of improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Topsoil that will be used as fill material shall be removed and stockpiled for later reuse prior to excavation activities. Topsoil shall be identified by the soil-revegetation specialist who will identify both extent and depth of the topsoil to be removed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Upon completion of grading, stockpiled topsoil shall be combined with wood chips, compost and other soil amendments for placement on all graded areas. Revegetation shall consist of native seed mixes only. The primary objectives of the soil amendments and revegetation is to create site conditions that keep sediment on site, produce a stable soil surface, resist erosion and are similar to the surrounding ecosystem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Geo-fabrics, jutes or other mats may be used in conjunction with revegetation and soil stabilization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact  
LS – less than significant impact  
PS – potentially significant impact  
S – significant impact  
SU – significant and unavoidable impact  
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### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 8.3.3(RR)</th>
<th>The Rough and Ready Highway site may include soils that may be subject to expansion potential.</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM RR-8.3.1a and MM RR-8.3.1b.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.3.4(RR)</td>
<td>Wastewater treatment and disposal at the Rough and Ready Highway site would be provided through septic system.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact 8.4.1</td>
<td>Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative geologic and soils impacts.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

| Impact 9.3.1(RR) | The Rough and Ready project would generate greenhouse gas emissions. | LCC                                     | None required.     | LCC                            |

#### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

| Impact 10.3.1(RR) | Construction and occupancy of the Rough and Ready Highway site would involve the use of hazardous materials. | LS                                      | None required.     | LS                             |

| Impact 10.3.2(RR) | Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site would involve activities that have the potential to encounter hazardous materials. | PS                                      | MM RR-10.3.2a The County shall ensure any grading or improvement plan or building permit includes a condition that if hazardous materials contamination is discovered or suspected during construction activities, all work shall stop immediately and the construction contractor shall notify the County for direction. Signs of potential hazardous materials contamination may include stained soils, discolored or oily, previously unknown underground storage tanks, foul odors, etc. Work shall not resume until a qualified professional has determined an appropriate course of action such as investigation, remediation, or other method to control the potential for hazardous materials contamination to pose a human health or environmental risk. The County shall be responsible for appropriate notification of regulatory agencies such as the Central Valley RWQCB and/or DTSC, as applicable. | LS                             |

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
**PS** – potentially significant impact  
**S** – significant impact  
**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact
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| Impact 10.3.2b | MM RR-10.3.2b | A survey for asbestos-containing building materials, lead-based paint, polychlorinated biphenyl, or other potentially hazardous building materials shall be conducted prior to initiation of demolition or reconstruction of the existing buildings. The results of the survey shall be provided to the Nevada County Building Department prior to any work on the building. If hazardous building materials are present at levels that require special handling and/or disposal, removal of the materials shall be completed by qualified professionals in accordance with applicable laws and regulations (including Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District requirements) prior to any activity that would involve demolition or renovation. |
| Impact 10.3.3(RR) | Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site would not affect emergency response plans or established evacuation routes. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 10.3.4(RR) | Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site would result in a new building in a very high fire hazard severity zone. | PS | MM RR-10.3.4 | Prior to issuance of a grading and building permits for the project, the County shall ensure the following is completed: 1. An automatic fire sprinkler and alarm system approved by the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District shall be included in project design. 2. All improvements to achieve 1,500 gallons per minute fire flow shall be completed prior to any building materials stored on-site. Written verification of adequate fire flow, based on an actual flow test, shall be provided to the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District. | LS |

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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### Impact 10.4.1

Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. The applicant shall install a 48,000-gallon water storage tank. Prior to installation, the applicant shall provide a plan to the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District for review and approval that demonstrates how the tank integrates with the Nevada Irrigation District system to ensure adequate fire flow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If it is determined through flow-testing that the three fire hydrants within 500 feet of the project site are insufficient to meet fire flow requirements, additional on-site hydrants will be required and shall be subject to review and approval by the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The post-indicator valve and fire department connection for the fire sprinkler system should be installed near the fire hydrant located near the northwest corner of the property. Other locations may be proposed; however, they may require the addition of an on-site hydrant, subject to approval by the Nevada County Consolidated Fire District.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implement mitigation as follows:
- Alta Sierra project: None required.
- Penn Valley project: None required.
- Rough and Ready Highway project: Implement mitigation measures MM RR-10.3.2a and MM RR-10.3.2b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NI – no impact</th>
<th>LS – less than significant impact</th>
<th>PS – potentially significant impact</th>
<th>S – significant impact</th>
<th>SU – significant and unavoidable impact</th>
<th>LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact</th>
<th>CC – cumulatively considerable impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nevada County</td>
<td>September 2017</td>
<td>Dollar General Stores</td>
<td>Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
<td>2.0–71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact 11.3.1(RR)** Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site would result in an increase in the rate and amount of stormwater runoff and would contribute urban pollutants to stormwater runoff.

**Level of Significance Before Mitigation**: PS

**Mitigation Measure**: MM RR-11.3.1a The construction and grading permits shall comply with the applicable NPDES regulations. Prior to grading permit issuance, obtain a General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with the construction activity and provide a copy of the permit to the County Planning, Building and Public Works Departments. Grading plans shall include verification that an NPDES permit, issued by the State Water Resources Board, has been issued for this project. To protect water quality, the contractor shall implement standard Best Management Practices during and after construction. These measures include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. At no time shall heavy equipment operate in flowing water.
2. Disturbed areas shall be graded to minimize surface erosion and siltation; bare areas will be covered with mulch; cleared areas will be revegetated with locally native erosion control seed mix.
3. The contractor shall exercise every reasonable precaution from adding pollution to offsite waterways with fuels, oils, bitumen, calcium chloride, and other harmful materials. Construction byproducts and pollutants such as oil, cement, and washwater shall be prevented from discharging into the offsite drainages and shall be collected and removed from the site.

**Resulting Level of Significance**: LS

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Erosion control measures shall be applied to all disturbed slopes. No invasive non-native grasses shall be used for erosion control, such as velvet grass or orchard grass. A combination of rice straw wattles, a mulch of native straw or certified weed-free straw, and a planting of native plant species is recommended.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Silt fencing (or filter fabric) shall be used to catch any short-term erosion or sedimentation that may inadvertently occur. Silt-fencing should be installed well above the offsite drainages and extend beyond the construction zone if necessary. The use of standard straw is prohibited to avoid introduction of noxious weeds, such as star thistle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To minimize water quality impacts to Upper Rough and Ready Ditch or other offsite drainages (e.g., Deer Creek) after the project is complete, no direct discharge of runoff from newly constructed impervious surface will be allowed to flow directly to the drainage. Runoff from surfaces should be directed through storm water interceptors constructed at discharge points. These interceptors will remove oil, sediment, and other pollutants that might otherwise flow to downstream waterways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MM RR-11.3.1b Surface Drainage.** The following measures shall be required to reduce surface water drainage patterns, unless alternatives are approved that are recommended by the project’s geotechnical engineers, the California Regional Water Quality Control Board or the Department of Public Works that will provide substantially the same or better management of surface drainage:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Slope final grade adjacent to structural areas so that surface water drains away from building pad finish subgrades at a minimum 2 percent slope for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Where interior slabs-on-grade are proposed, the exterior subgrade must have a minimum slope of 4 percent away from the structure for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Additional drainage and slab-on-grade construction recommendations are provided in a geotechnical engineering report outlined in mitigation measure MM RR-8.3.1b.</td>
<td>1. Slope final grade adjacent to structural areas so that surface water drains away from building pad finish subgrades at a minimum 2 percent slope for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Where interior slabs-on-grade are proposed, the exterior subgrade must have a minimum slope of 4 percent away from the structure for a minimum distance of 10 feet. Additional drainage and slab-on-grade construction recommendations are provided in a geotechnical engineering report outlined in mitigation measure MM RR-8.3.1b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compact and slope all soil placed adjacent to building foundations such that water is not retained to pond or infiltrate. Backfill should be free of deleterious material.</td>
<td>2. Compact and slope all soil placed adjacent to building foundations such that water is not retained to pond or infiltrate. Backfill should be free of deleterious material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Direct rain-gutter downspouts to a solid collector pipe which discharges flow to positive drainage and away from building foundations.</td>
<td>3. Direct rain-gutter downspouts to a solid collector pipe which discharges flow to positive drainage and away from building foundations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Impact 11.3.2(RR)
Saturated soil and groundwater seepage may be present seasonally at the Rough and Ready Highway site and the site would be served by a new septic system, but the project would have minimal effect on groundwater amount and quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 11.4.1
Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, could affect water quality as a result of stormwater runoff containing pollutants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 11.4.2
Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, in areas not served by a public wastewater system would result in an increase in the number of septic tanks, which can affect water quality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 11.4.3
Cumulative development, including the proposed projects, could increase the rate and/or amount of stormwater discharged into local drainage systems and natural waterways, which could increase flood potential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM RR-4.3.2 and MM RR-13.3.1.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 12.3.1(RR)
Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site would not physically divide the surrounding community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 12.3.2(RR)
Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site as proposed would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations, but would not be compatible with the surrounding uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Implement mitigation measures MM RR-4.3.2 and MM RR-13.3.1.</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact 12.4.1
Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, would not contribute to cumulative land use impacts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>None required.</td>
<td></td>
<td>LCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NI** – no impact  
**LS** – less than significant impact  
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**SU** – significant and unavoidable impact  
**LCC** – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
**CC** – cumulatively considerable impact  
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## 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 13.3.1(RR)</strong> The proposed project could expose sensitive receptors to stationary sources of noise in excess of established standards.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td><strong>MM RR-13.3.1a</strong> Prior to approval of improvements plans, the project design shall be revised to replace the solid privacy fence along the western and southern site boundaries with a 6-foot-high wall constructed of CMU or similar material.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MM RR-13.3.1b</strong> To ensure project operational noise levels do not exceed the County's Noise Standards, the project shall be conditioned to limit all truck deliveries to the Rough and Ready Highway project site to between the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Store management shall be educated regarding these restricted delivery hours and a small non-illuminated sign not to exceed 4 square feet shall be posted in the delivery loading and unloading area outlining these restrictions. Prior to issuance of final occupancy, the Planning Department shall perform a site visit to ensure this mitigation measure has been implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Impact 13.3.2(RR)** Project construction would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Rough and Ready Highway project site. | PS | **MM RR-13.3.2** The project applicant shall ensure through contract specifications that construction best management practices (BMPs) are implemented by contractors to reduce construction noise levels. Contract specifications shall be included in the construction document, which shall be reviewed by the County prior to issuance of a grading or building permit (whichever is issued first). The construction BMPs shall include the following:  
• Construction shall be limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday | LS |

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>through Friday. No construction is permitted on Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays.</td>
<td>• Ensure that construction equipment is properly muffled according to industry standards and is in good working condition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Place noise-generating construction equipment and locate construction staging areas away from sensitive uses, where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use electric air compressors and similar power tools rather than diesel equipment, where feasible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction-related equipment, including heavy-duty equipment, motor vehicles, and portable equipment, shall be turned off when not in use for more than 5 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow for surrounding owners and residents to contact the job superintendent. If the County or the job superintendent receives a complaint, the superintendent shall investigate, take appropriate corrective action, and report the action taken to the reporting party.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

| Impact 13.3.3(RR) | Groundborne vibration levels associated with short-term construction activities at the Rough and Ready Highway project site would not exceed the applicable groundborne vibration criterion at adjacent land uses. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 13.3.4(RR) | Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive noise levels associated with airport operations. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 13.4.1 | Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County would result in a cumulative increase in noise. However, compliance with the policies contained in the Noise Element would ensure that noise levels do not exceed applicable County noise standards. | LCC | None required. | LCC |

### Public Services and Utilities

| Impact 14.3.1(RR) | Development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site as proposed would not substantially increase demand for public safety services and would not trigger the need for any new or expanded facilities. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 14.3.2(RR) | Operation of the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project would increase demand for water supplies as well as water treatment capacity and would require construction of on-water conveyance improvements. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 14.3.3(RR) | The proposed Rough and Ready Highway project includes an on-site septic system, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 14.3.4(RR) | The proposed Rough and Ready Highway project includes on-site storm water drainage improvements, the construction of which could result in environmental impacts. | LS | None required. | LS |
| Impact 14.3.5(RR) | Construction and operation of the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project would generate solid waste requiring collection and disposal services. | LS | MM RR-14.3.5 Prior to issuance of grading or building permits the following shall be included as a Note on those plans: Toxic waste materials (ammunition, asbestos, biohazards, compressed gas cylinders, explosives, radioactive materials, | LS |

NI – no impact   LS – less than significant impact   PS – potentially significant impact   S – significant impact   SU – significant and unavoidable impact   CC – cumulatively considerable impact
| Impact 14.4.1 | Implementation of the proposed project, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County could result in the need to expand or construct new public safety facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels. | LCC | None required. | LCC |
| Impact 14.4.2 | Sufficient water supplies and water treatment facility capacity would be available to serve projected cumulative growth in western Nevada County. | LCC | No additional measures required. | LCC |
| Impact 14.4.3 | Implementation of the proposed projects, in combination with existing, approved, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable development in nearby areas of Nevada County, could result in the need to construct new water, wastewater, storm drainage, or solid waste facilities in order to maintain adequate service levels. | LCC | No additional measures required. | LCC |
| Impact 14.4.4 | Existing solid waste transfer and disposal facilities have sufficient capacity to accommodate anticipated growth in western Nevada County. | LCC | No additional measures required. | LCC |
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## 2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic and Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.3.1(RR)</strong> Implementation of the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project would increase vehicular traffic on the local roadway system, potentially degrading intersection operations.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>MM RR-15.3.1 Occupation or operation of the Rough and Ready Highway project site shall not occur until such time that the traffic signal at the intersection of Rough and Ready Highway and Ridge Road is installed. If the improvements are constructed by the project applicant, they shall be subject to review by the Public Works Department and will be eligible for reimbursement or fee credits for costs that exceed the project’s fair share. If the improvements at this intersection are constructed by the County or by others, payment of the fair share fees are adequate to satisfy the project’s obligation toward this improvement.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact 15.3.2(RR)</strong> Development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site as proposed could introduce incompatible uses that could affect safety on roadways in the area and could negatively affect emergency access in the project vicinity.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>MM RR-15.3.2a No objects or vegetation within the site’s frontage along Rough and Ready Highway shall exceed the maximum height of 18 inches to ensure clear line of sight. The project applicant shall perform brush clearing and tree trimming within this area in consultation with the Nevada County Public Works Department prior to project operation and shall obtain a standard encroachment permit from the County prior to initiating work within the public right-of-way. MM RR-15.3.2b Unless and until Rough and Ready Drive is designated a STAA route, STAA trucks shall be prohibited from accessing the project site and will be strictly enforced, unless Rough and Ready Highway is designated a STAA route.</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.0 Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact 15.3.3(RR) Development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site as proposed would not result in the need for private or public road maintenance or for new roads.</th>
<th>Level of Significance Before Mitigation</th>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Resulting Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS None required.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Impact 15.3.4(RR) Development of the Rough and Ready Highway project site would not have effects on pedestrian, bicycle, or transit circulation in the area and would not conflict with adopted plans regarding alternative transportation. | LS None required. | LS | |

| Impact 15.3.5(RR) Construction of the Rough and Ready Highway project site would have no substantial effects on pedestrian, bicycle, or transit circulation in the study area. | PS MM RR-15.3.5 Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for the Rough and Ready Highway project site, a Construction Traffic Control Plan (CTCP) shall be submitted for review and approval by the Nevada County Public Works Department. The CTCP shall include a schedule of construction and anticipated methods of handling traffic during construction activities to ensure the safe flow of traffic, pedestrian/bicycle crossing, and adequate emergency access, including maintaining an open lane for motorized and non-motorized travel at all times. All traffic control measures shall conform to County and Caltrans standards, as applicable. | LS | |

| Impact 15.6.1(RR) When considered with existing, proposed, planned, and approved development in the region, implementation of the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project would contribute to cumulative traffic volumes that result in impacts to level of service and operations. | CC/S Implement mitigation measure MM RR-5.3.1. | LCC | |

NI – no impact  LS – less than significant impact  PS – potentially significant impact  S – significant impact  SU – significant and unavoidable impact
LCC – less than cumulatively considerable impact  
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3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR
3.1 INTRODUCTION

No new significant environmental impacts or issues, beyond those already covered in the Draft EIR for the Dollar General Stores project, were raised during the public review period for the Draft EIR. Nevada County (County), acting as the lead agency, directed that responses to the comments on the Draft EIR be prepared. Responses to comments received during the comment period do not involve any new significant impacts or “significant new information” that would require recirculation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5.

3.2 LIST OF COMMENTERS

The following individuals and representatives of organizations and agencies submitted comments on the Draft EIR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kevin Yount</td>
<td>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Scott Morgan</td>
<td>State Clearinghouse</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Shannon Wood</td>
<td>Nevada Irrigation District</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Susan M. Davis</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Laurie Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 15, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kim Taylor</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Michael Gregory</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Stacie Jeffery</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scott Campbell</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Melissa Hindt</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 22, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Janis McGregor</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Larry Flint</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Diane Spooner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jan Crowell</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sharon Sanders</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dale E. Epps</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 19, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Craig Stidham</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jean Inglis &amp; Amaryllis Khat</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mike Frasu</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Cyril Gueguen</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Linda &amp; Eric Bickel</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Darlene Reuss</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>JD &amp; Joanie Salyer</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 27, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Damon Hague</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jackie Sponsler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ken Getz</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sylvia Wright</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jeanette Paganetti</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Ronnie Paul</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kobayashi (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 24, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sandi Heilaman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 25, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Darlene Ruess</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jordan Wambaugh</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Gail Rudberg</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 27, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Lori Wilcox</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Jo Hathcock</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nan Spier</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Annette Smith</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sandra Chipchase</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Michelle Carroll</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Kate Dwyer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Shirley Fenile</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Cheryl Gordon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Linda Newman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Peggy Wright</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 26, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Deb Foxen</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 25, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Debra Buddie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 25, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Nancy Rogers</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 24, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Patricia Rose</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 24, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Hasbrookfetter</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 24, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Don Stevens</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 24, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>West Family</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Barbara Wright</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tracey Thompson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Cheryl Cook</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cyndi</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 23, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Arline Young</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 27, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Individual or Signatory</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Margaret Munson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 25, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Elizabeth Kobayashi (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 27, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Cat Davis</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 27, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ellen Sommers</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 27, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Paula Evans</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Kalli &amp; Rob Brzezinski</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Barbara Law</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Edith Miller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Suzie &amp; Rick Nolle</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Phil Northcutt</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Linda Rasmussen</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Sam Perez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mildred Folda</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 28, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Jeanette Carr</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sabrina Zeitler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Rentrow Family</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>December 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Lyndershem</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Laurel Foster</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Gwenneth Cipolla</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>December 30, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Carolyne Moss</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Paula Wittler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 2, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Debbie Mazorra</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Elenita Duelo</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Marlene Bracken</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Barbara Law</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>John Thompson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Cathy Fagan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Michele Lefkowitz</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Patrick Martin</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Terrie Collins</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Vicki Maddox</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Gem Platte</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Bob &amp; Pinky Martin</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Katherine Heuer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Jo Short</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Ann Wright</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Keeth Lawrence</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Sarah McCarthy</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Cheri Merrifield</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>John Sare</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Penn Martin</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Ken Buchanan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Janis Bumgarner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Mary Alvarado</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Maureen Baker</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 3, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Christopher Ward</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Jody Faker</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Yvonne Anast-Erb</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Carla Ford</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>John &amp; Jerri Morello</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Gerry &amp; Stan Cosby</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Meredith Martin</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Dottie Fazio</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Cathy Rado</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Diane Myers</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Nora Nausbaum (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Bradley Dixon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Nora Nausbaum (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 10, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Ray Yedding (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>De Linda Brady</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Bill Douglass</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 11, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Leslie &amp; Richard Jacob</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Jane Markham</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>Larry &amp; Carol Pireiel</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 13, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Donna Soldano</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 14, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>David Holderman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Will Larson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 18, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Holly Rice (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Tim Feller</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Joe Fernandez</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Juanita Marion Hoffman (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Joy Waite</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 19, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Patricia A. Gruwell</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>MG Metropulos</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Bill Haire</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Ray Yedding (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Juanita Hoffman (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 16, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Gene Whitehouse</td>
<td>United Auburn Indian Community of Auburn Rancheria</td>
<td>January 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Lark &amp; Wes Zachary</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Charisse Lolli (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Janet Goodban</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Robert Sproul</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Diane Walker &amp; William Lawrence</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Charmian Railshack (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Padee Black (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>James &amp; Barbara Fiksdal</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Evan L. Peard</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Vivian Malka</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Melinda Filer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Michele Langhorst</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Steve Schulte</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Andrea Bradley</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 25, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Marion Host (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Marion Host (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 20, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Bryan &amp; Pamela Tasnady</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Nadeane Diede</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Mike Mastrodonato &amp; Pam Bivens</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 18, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Katherine Scourtes (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 23, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Weldon &amp; Irene Travis</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Charles Abernathybettis</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 24, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Tina Yedding</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Juanita Hoffman (3)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Charisse Lolli &amp; Brian Wallace</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Beth &amp; Angelo DiVecchio</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Marc Mayfield</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 21, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Mike Mastrodonato</td>
<td>Penn Valley Area Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Lisa Spang</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Nicholas G</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Debbie Gibbs</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Karen Lauterbach</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Julia A. Toney</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Sherill Parker</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Dale &amp; Judy Gurley</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Robyn Buciak</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Charisse Lolli (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Kathleen Galbo</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Martha Burdick-Mohr</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 28, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Sandy Bailey</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Delphi Whittle</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>John Herman &amp; Hilary Barardi</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 27, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>T. Canepa</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Charmian Railsback (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 29, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Jennifer Roberts</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Trina Hunner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Jessica Miessler</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Duncan Linthicum</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Sue Gundred</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Kimberly E. D’Urso</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Nicole Bratt-Maloney</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Susan Egan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Alyssa Orellana</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Stephanie Nix</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signary</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Debra Worth</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Laurie Helm</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Nancy Stevenson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Barbara Jones</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Allie McLachlan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Suzan Lang</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Susan Dyer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Virginia Moran</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>F. Haulman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Lance Goddard</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Lynn Mangel</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Padee Black (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Janice Bedayn</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Janet Vega</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Martha Naythons</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Fraser Hardie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Lisa Boulton</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Aaron Hawkins</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Robin Stoenner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Sharon O’Hara</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Angie Maxson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Alana Flores</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Katie Moorehead</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Linda Valente</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Marina Bernheimer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Megan Woodruff</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Shari Colom Wilson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Chuck Petch</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Keri R. Eagle</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Whitney Triplett</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Kristin Steindorff</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Cori Ove</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Peter Fischer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Phyllis Rooney-Dietz</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Tiffany Netherby</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Jim &amp; Glenda Barrilleaux</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Elisa Parker</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Sarah Hatten</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Julia A. Toney</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Nancy Petty</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Asia Currie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Hank Meals (1)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Karen Chapman</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Terri Harmon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Maria Dicintio</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Shannon Hatton</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Joyce Scott</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Barry &amp; Kenley Jones</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Alicia Frost</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Cindy Crockett</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Alan Caisse</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Roseanne Burke</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Mary Peterson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Joan Goddard</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Bob Mora</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Kent Crockett</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Cathy Jones</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Diana Abrell</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Kathryn Canan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>George Scarmon</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>Ellen Howe</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Chelsea Barker-Switzer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Shari Coats</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Daveretta Heintz</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Betsey Leach</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>Catherine Billheimer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>Pla2day</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>Jay Corey</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Jill Mahanna</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>Sandra Sue Richards</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Marni Marshall</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Jeff Stone</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Rebecca Smith</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Sandra Brown</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>Patricia Montijo</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Sonia Delgadillo</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>John Hensley</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Holly Rice (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Maniko Dru Dadigan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Charlotte Bollinger</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>Sue Boldi</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Victoria Ongie</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Laurie Oberholtzer</td>
<td>Rural Quality Coalition</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Robin Karlstedt</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Karin Meadows</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Carrie Morgan</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Michael Airington</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Tracey Timpone</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Catherine Ione-Perkins</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Brian Conner</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Tyler Jenkins</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Julie Reaney</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 30, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>Carol Meals</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Melissa Seibold</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Katherine Scourtes (2)</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Teena Mcwhirk</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Dan Wheat Sr.</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Wendy Browning</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Maggie McKaig</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>Individual or Signatory</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Laverne Leach</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Joan Dyer</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Dotrik Wilson</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Marilyn Yerkes</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Rosann Mackey</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Maeve Fry</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>January 31, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Nevada County Planning Commission Meeting</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

3.3.1 REQUIREMENTS FOR RESPONDING TO COMMENTS ON A DRAFT EIR

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 requires that lead agencies evaluate all comments on environmental issues received on the Draft EIR and prepare a written response. The written response must address the significant environmental issue raised and must provide a detailed response, especially when specific comments or suggestions (e.g., additional mitigation measures) are not accepted. In addition, the written response must be a good faith and reasoned analysis. However, lead agencies need only to respond to significant environmental issues associated with the project and do not need to provide all the information requested by commenters, as long as a good faith effort at full disclosure is made in the EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204).

CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 recommends that commenters provide detailed comments that focus on the sufficiency of the Draft EIR in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 also notes that commenters should provide an explanation and evidence supporting their comments. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088 also recommends that where the response to comments results in revisions to the Draft EIR, those revisions be noted as a revision to the Draft EIR or in a separate section of the Final EIR.

3.3.2 MASTER RESPONSES

Some subjects were mentioned frequently in comment letters on the Draft EIR. Rather than prepare individual responses for each of these comments, the Final EIR includes a “master response” that discusses the topic based on all of the comments received. By responding in this manner, the County is better able to address all aspects of the topic by simplifying the responses to comments by avoiding unnecessary repetition in individual responses, and addressing issues in a broader context than might be required by individual comments.

When issues are addressed in this broader context, the interrelationships between some of the individual issues raised can be better clarified. It is also possible to provide a single explanation of an issue that is more thorough and comprehensive than would be accomplished by separate, more narrowly focused responses.

The following themes are discussed in the master responses:

1. Septic systems at Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites
2. Significant and unavoidable aesthetic and visual character impacts (Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites)
3. STAA delivery trucks
4. CEQA requirements for comments and responses and EIR adequacy and economic impacts
5. Stormwater drainage
6. Rough and Ready Highway traffic study and impact analysis results
7. Trees at Alta Sierra site
Master Response 1: Septic Systems at Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway Sites

Alta Sierra Site – Use of Off-Site Parcels for Septic System

Some members of the public were of the opinion that the proposed use of off-site parcels for tight lines and leach fields for the Alta Sierra septic system is prohibited, citing, in some cases, the State Water Resources Control Board On-site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) policy, which references Appendix K of the 2007 California Plumbing Code. Concerns were also expressed that the soils testing for the system was performed in a drought year, which would not have accounted for normal or higher than normal precipitation conditions.

Commenters appear to have misinterpreted the Plumbing Code requirements regarding off-site parcels. The code does not state that off-site parcels may never be used. Appendix K Section K-1(G) of the 2007 California Plumbing Code and Section H 101.8 in Appendix H of the 2016 Plumbing Code contain identical language, which states:

No private sewage disposal system, or part thereof, shall be located in any lot other than the lot that is the site of the building or structure served by such private sewage disposal system, nor shall any private sewage disposal system or part thereof be located at any point having less than the minimum distances indicated in Table H 101.8 [Table K-1].

Nothing contained in this code shall be construed to prohibit the use of all or part of an abutting lot to provide additional space for a private sewage disposal system or part thereof where proper cause, transfer of ownership, or change of boundary not in violation of other requirements has been first established to the satisfaction of the Authority Having Jurisdiction. The instrument recording such action shall constitute an agreement with the Authority Having Jurisdiction, which shall clearly state and show that the areas so joined or used shall be maintained as a unit during the time they are so used. Such agreement shall be recorded in the office of the County Recorder as part of the conditions of ownership of said properties and shall be binding on heirs, successors, and assigns to such properties. A copy of the instrument recording such proceedings shall be filed with the Authority Having Jurisdiction.

Both the 2007 and 2016 California Plumbing Codes allow “abutting” parcels to be used for sewage disposal, and there are no prohibitions in place to use non-abutting parcels for this purpose. County codes do not preclude allowing nearby, noncontiguous parcels to be used for sewage disposal. In fact, it is the County’s standard practice to allow this exact use as done with the Harmony Ridge Subdivision and the Buck Mountain Estates Subdivision projects, provided the appropriate easements are in place.

The project applicant has provided a letter of intent to record a septic line/system easement from the property owner of all three properties included in the Alta Sierra project, including a draft Declaration of Easement to be recorded should the project be approved. This information is stated in the Draft EIR on page 8.0-9 in Impact 8.1.3(AS) in Section 8.0, Geology and Soils, and in Impact 14.1.3(AS) on page 14.0-22 in Section 14.0, Public Services and Utilities. Potential impacts resulting from the installation and operation of this septic system were analyzed in the Draft EIR (see Sections 8.0 and 14.0). The project’s conditions of approval would require the finalization and recordation of the easement prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits. The proposed design for the project’s sewage disposal has been reviewed by the Nevada County Department of Environmental Health, which has found that the proposed system is compliant with County sewage disposal regulations. Thus, the proposed project septic system at the Alta Sierra site conforms to applicable regulations.
Soil Testing at Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway Sites

Sections 8.1 and 8.3 and Appendix 8.0 in the Draft EIR provide details regarding soil testing at the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites. The two Dollar General locations where on-site sewage disposal system installation is proposed are the Alta Sierra Drive site and the Rough and Ready Highway site. Soil testing was done at both sites. The Penn Valley site would be served by a County Sanitation District 1 public sewer connection to the Lake Wildwood Wastewater Treatment Facility, so no septic system facilities are proposed at that site.

The Nevada County Department of Environmental Health requirement for wet weather testing for on-site soil evaluation (for sewage disposal feasibility) is guided by departmental awareness of where generally low-lying, poorly drained areas of the county are located. Additionally, if shallow groundwater, or its indicators, is observed in site soil mantle test pits at a particular test event during drier periods of the year, such a site or parcel may be identified as one requiring wet weather testing. A subsequent test pit excavation during a defined wet weather period, or an alternate method (such as the installation and monitoring of piezometers in the test area), to evaluate the presence of persistent shallow standing groundwater at a proposed/intended on-site sewage disposal site would then be required.

County staff reviewed the testing for soil conditions on the Dollar General sites and determined additional soils testing is not required because the existing soil conditions do not warrant concern about wet weather conditions. It can be determined from soils testing, during the dry season or the wet season, how the soil reacts to saturation and whether precipitation events would impact the sewage disposal capacity of the soils. The tested soils demonstrated adequate properties to handle sewage disposal under precipitation events.

Neither the Alta Sierra Drive location nor the Rough and Ready Highway location was considered to be in low-lying, poorly drained areas, nor were conditions observed during the sites’ testing to be especially impacted by shallow groundwater conditions, such that wet weather testing criteria was then determined to be needed. Therefore, the analysis and conclusions in the Draft EIR regarding potential environmental impacts of the Alta Sierra site septic system (which includes the off-site parcels) and the Rough and Ready Highway site are factually correct and supported by substantial evidence (refer also to Master Response 4).

Master Response 2: Significant and Unavoidable Aesthetic and Visual Character Impacts (Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway Sites)

The Draft EIR includes an analysis of the potential environmental impacts related to changes in the character of each project site and how the project would change the overall visual quality of the site and its surroundings. The Alta Sierra site impact is presented in Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in Impact 4.1.1(AS) on pages 4.0-6 through 4.0-9; the Penn Valley site impact is presented in Impact 4.2.1(PV) on pages 4.0-31 through 4.0-32; and the Rough and Ready Highway site impact is presented in Impact 4.3.1(RR) on pages 4.0-35 through 4.0-36. Mitigation measures MM AS-4.1.1a through MM AS-4.1.1c are identified for the Alta Sierra site that require compliance with the Western Nevada County Design Guidelines, retention of some of the existing trees, screening of the parking lot, and changes to signage. Even with implementation of these measures, the Draft EIR concludes that the impact would be significant and unavoidable for the Alta Sierra site.

No mitigation measures were determined to be feasible for the Rough and Ready Highway site, and the Draft EIR concludes that the impact would be significant and unavoidable. The impact for the Penn Valley site was determined to be less than significant without mitigation.
Many commenters reiterated the Draft EIR’s conclusions for the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites, and expressed an opinion that the project at each of those locations should not be approved because a significant and unavoidable impact was identified. Some individuals stated that mitigation measures should have been identified for the Rough and Ready Highway site, but they did not provide suggestions or examples of mitigation that would reduce the aesthetics impact. Similarly, commenters did not provide suggestions as to how the mitigation measures for the Alta Sierra site could be improved to reduce the impact.

With regard to the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites, the Draft EIR fully complies with the requirements for disclosing significant environmental impacts and mitigation measures, consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(a) and Section 15126.4, respectively. The Draft EIR also fully complies with the requirements for describing significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented, as required under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b). In the case of significant and unavoidable impacts, CEQA requires that an explanation be provided, noting where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternate design, and that the EIR should address the implications of those impacts. The Draft EIR meets this requirement. Specifically, for the Alta Sierra site, the Draft EIR (page 4.0-8) states that even with mitigation measures, development of the Alta Sierra site would substantially change the existing visual character of the site, particularly when viewed from the residential area to the east (Little Valley Road). The Draft EIR goes on to note that a reduced-size project would likely be able to reduce the severity of this impact, but this would result in the need for a different design that would be beyond the scope of the Draft EIR. Nonetheless, the Draft EIR includes an analysis of a reduced-size project (Section 6.0, Alternatives, page 16.0-8) and concluded the impact would remain unavoidable. For the Rough and Ready Highway site, the Draft EIR (page 4.0-36) explores the feasibility of a different site design in which increasing the size of the property to result in less land coverage would not be possible due to adjacent land ownership. Blocking views from the roadway would not meet with the commercial nature of the project and the need for visibility to the traveling public. The Draft EIR (page 6.0-21) also evaluates a reduced-size alternative for the Rough and Ready Highway site, but as with the Alta Sierra site, this alternative could reduce but not avoid the aesthetic impact.

Under CEQA, a project can result in a significant and unavoidable impact and still be approved by the lead agency. There is no requirement in CEQA that a project must be denied by the lead agency if a significant and unavoidable impact is identified. The following text, as stated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, Findings, describes the actions that need to occur should significant unavoidable impacts be identified. Under Section 15091(a), “no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding.” In the case of significant and unavoidable impacts, the County will be required to make a finding that “specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provisions of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3)).

The conclusions presented in the Draft EIR for significant and unavoidable aesthetics impacts are factual and unbiased. The purpose of the Draft EIR is to identify the significant impacts of the project, not to recommend whether a project should be approved or denied on the basis of identified significant and unavoidable impacts, as suggested by a few individuals. The decision as to whether the projects should be approved is at the direction of the Nevada County Planning Commission, and the impact analysis in the Draft EIR informs that decision-making. Should the County approve the project at the Alta Sierra and/or Rough and Ready Highway sites, the Planning Commission will be required to make findings described above in connection with its approval of the project(s), despite significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts.
Master Response 3: STAA Delivery Trucks

The Draft EIR, in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, includes an analysis of potential traffic safety hazards for each site, as follows: Alta Sierra (Impact 15.1.2 on page 15.0-11); Penn Valley (Impact on page 15.0-23); and Rough and Ready Highway (Impact 15.3.2 on page 15.0-35). Each of these impact analyses evaluates the size of delivery trucks relative to the size that is currently permitted on the roadways that would be used by trucks to access the sites (Alta Sierra Drive, Penn Valley Drive, and Rough and Ready Highway), along with other impacts. The traffic study for each location assumed a “WB-67 STAA” truck. This is the longest truck that Dollar General uses (73 feet), and this length was used for purposes of depicting truck turning movements into and out of each site to provide a worst-case analysis. This assumption is stated in the traffic study for Alta Sierra (Draft EIR Appendix 15.0-A, page 6) and for Rough and Ready Highway (Draft EIR Appendix 15.0-C, page 7).

None of the traffic studies assume the roadway designations will be changed to accommodate the project, and each noted that only shorter-length trucks are allowed to comply with the County and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) roadway regulations.

As stated on Draft EIR page 15.0-1, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Office of Commercial Vehicle Operations, Legal Truck Access Branch designates routes upon which STAA trucks may legally travel. Alta Sierra Drive, Penn Valley Drive, and Rough and Ready Highway are not STAA truck routes. The Draft EIR identifies this as a potentially significant impact because such use could pose a safety hazard if the trucks operate on roadways on which they are not allowed. The Draft EIR includes mitigation measures for each site (MM AS-15.1.2b, MM PV-15.2.2b, and MM RR-15.3.2b) that expressly prohibit the project applicant from using the 73-foot truck for deliveries unless and until the roadway designations are changed to allow the trucks. There appears to have been some confusion regarding the requirements of the mitigation measures. While the Draft EIR describes that STAA trucks would be allowed on these roadways if Caltrans approves a change in the STAA designation that would allow these longer trucks (see, for example, page 15.0-11, fourth paragraph), the County is not initiating a change of designation of these roadways. Such a change is also not proposed as part of the project. The intent of the mitigation measures is to require the project applicant restrict their use of STAA trucks pursuant to Caltrans roadway regulations in existence at the time of use and to use alternate delivery methods (i.e., use smaller trucks as allowed), until such time that Caltrans approves a change in the STAA designation, if such a change ever occurs. The Draft EIR does not contain any project element, phase, or mitigation measure that prescribes a change in Caltrans roadway designations prior to issuance of building permits or at any time, nor is such a change within the County’s unilateral jurisdiction. Therefore, as such, the Draft EIR does not evaluate potential impacts of said change nor is it required to do so (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126 and 15126.4; Public Resources Code 21002.1 and 21004).

The Draft EIR has been revised, as follows, to clarify that the County is not proposing changes to the designation of these roadways. The mitigation measures are intended to assure decision makers and the public that Caltrans roadway regulations in existence at the time of use must be adhered to by law. These mitigation measures are not intended to, nor can they, re-designate the roads for STAA trucks.

Caltrans maintains authority over California’s transportation networks, and its roadway regulations are enforceable by law. All STAA truck drivers are required, by law, to abide by the regulations in existence at the time of their use, including avoiding those routes not designated for use by STAA trucks. The following measures, as revised in this Draft EIR, are designed to provide assurance that all existing Caltrans roadway regulations will be followed by truck drivers servicing the project sites.
Unless and until Alta Sierra Drive is designated a STAA route, STAA trucks shall be prohibited from accessing the project site and will be strictly enforced, unless Alta Sierra Drive is designated a STAA route.

Unless and until Penn Valley Drive is designated a STAA route, STAA trucks shall be prohibited from accessing the project site and will be strictly enforced, unless Penn Valley Drive is designated a STAA route.

Unless and until Rough and Ready Drive is designated a STAA route, STAA trucks shall be prohibited from accessing the project site and will be strictly enforced, unless Rough and Ready Highway is designated a STAA route.

It should be noted that the measures do not specify a required delivery method or type of truck to allow the applicant to determine the method that is most practically and economically feasible while still complying with the mitigation measures. Implementation of the above mitigation measures will ensure STAA trucks will not utilize roadways not designated for STAA trucks.

Adherence to these mitigation measures will be monitored and enforced by the County throughout the life of the project through its Code Compliance Division as well as by law enforcement patrolling these roadways. It is within the County’s authority to enforce the prohibition and take necessary actions should the project applicant fail to abide by its requirements. Nevada County Code Section L-II 5.5, Development Permits, states, “no person shall fail to comply with any approved Development Permit or any conditions or provisions thereof” (Section 5.5.B.2: Compliance). Section L-II 5.21, Enforcement and Penalty for Violations, sets forth the duties of the Planning Director, Code Enforcement, and law enforcement duties with respect to violations. Section L-II 5.23, Enforcement by Administrative Citation, provides for enforcement and citation in the event of violations and sets forth progressive fines for violations. Section L-II 5.11, Permit Revocation, provides for revocation of the permit for noncompliance with conditions of approval, mitigation measures or the approved site plan, or violation of any law in connection with the permit.

Master Response 4: CEQA Requirements for Responses and Comments, EIR Adequacy and Economic Impacts Lead Agency Response Requirements

A majority of comments received on the Draft EIR relate to the merits of the projects and not the environmental issues raised (e.g., comment expressing support or opposition to the project). These comments are included but do not require evaluation or a response pursuant to CEQA Guidelines. Nonetheless, this master response has been prepared, in part, to help concerned members of the public understand these CEQA requirements. The written response must address the significant environmental issue raised, but comments related to the merits of a project do not require a response. The lead agency need only respond to comments concerning significant environmental issues associated with the project and do not need to provide all the information requested by commenters, as long as a “good faith, reasoned” effort is made in responses and in the EIR for full disclosure (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15088 and 15204).

Public and Agency Comment Requirements

Several comments received on the Draft EIR discuss the inadequacy of environmental analysis but do not provide any reasoned explanation, details, or evidence to support this conclusion. CEQA Guidelines Section 15204 directs commenters to provide detailed comments that focus on the sufficiency of the Draft EIR in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated. CEQA...
Guidelines Section 15204 also notes that commenters should provide an explanation and evidence supporting their comments, such as “data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported by facts in support of the comments.” Comments on the general adequacy of the EIR are allowable, however the most “helpful” comments suggest specific revisions that are “reasonably feasible” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a), (e)).

EIR Adequacy

Several comments received on the Draft EIR discuss the adequacy of the Draft EIR, in general, and suggest the analysis and data used throughout the Draft EIR is flawed, and request additional evaluation. The lead agency is required to respond to valid environmental concerns and comments. However, reviewers should provide a basis for their comments that the data relied upon for the analysis in the EIR is inadequate. Furthermore, a lead agency must respond to comments on significant environmental issues, but they are not required to “to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters” or “provide all information requested by reviewers” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a)). CEQA requires adequate and complete analysis and a good-faith effort at full disclosure in an EIR, but it does not require “technical perfection” (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15003). The Draft EIR was prepared by environmental experts relying upon numerous technical studies in compliance with CEQA Guidelines, and the Draft EIR provides substantial evidence for its conclusions as well as fulfilling the purpose of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15200 and 15384).

Economic Impact

Many commenters expressed concern about economic considerations in regards to the project. Some requested that the Draft EIR include an analysis of the economic and environmental impacts should a Dollar General store fail in its proposed location. Commenters speculated that, in the event of a store failure, the building would remain vacant, which could lead to blight. Others stated that because the County would have approved less parking than typically required under the County Code, if a store site becomes vacant, the site would be “under-parked” for some future commercial use.

California Health and Safety Code Section 33030(b)(1) defines blight as the following:

(b) A blighted area is one that contains both of the following:

(1) An area that is predominantly urbanized, as that term is defined in Section 33320.1, and is an area in which the combination of conditions set forth in Section 33031 is so prevalent and so substantial that it causes a reduction of, or lack of, proper utilization of the area to such an extent that it constitutes a serious physical and economic burden on the community that cannot reasonably be expected to be reversed or alleviated by private enterprise or governmental action, or both, without redevelopment.

CEQA does not require evaluation of speculative future conditions. A CEQA urban blight analysis requires analyzing “reasonably foreseeable” direct and indirect “physical changes in the environment;” CEQA does not require evaluation of speculative future conditions (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064(d)). As noted above, CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(a) states, “CEQA does not require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all research, study, and experimentation recommended or demanded by commenters.” CEQA Guidelines Section 15204(c) states that “reviewers should explain the basis for their comments, and should submit data or references offering facts, reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinion supported
by facts in support of the comments. Pursuant to Section 15064, an effect shall not be considered significant in the absence of substantial evidence.” Commenters did not provide evidence regarding the potential for any of the stores to fail or, with such a failure, that there would then be the potential for physical deterioration such that it meets the criteria set forth in Health and Safety Code Section 33030(b)(1). It should also be noted that economic studies, prepared for each of the stores, determined that the stores will need to capture only a small portion of market area demand to achieve stabilized sales consistent with national store performance standards (See Draft EIR Appendix 12.0-A, and pages 12.0-5 and 12.0-6 in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, under the Urban Decay subheading). In addition, the studies found that the low capture rate in the area, combined with the retail leakage in the area in most sales categories, suggests the retail base can readily absorb the projected Dollar General sales, with little to no impact on existing retailers. Therefore, the potential for failure of the stores that would then result in blight would be low. Considering this data and the criteria for blight given above, the potential for “physical changes in the environment” that could constitute urban blight are not reasonably foreseeable and, therefore, do not need to be assessed in this EIR.

For the record, however, in the case that any of the stores were to fail, any future proposed occupancy of the Dollar General store site by another business would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis through the Tenant Improvement (Building Permit) process. This process would consider the proposed use and ensure that site development standards, such as parking standards and sewage disposal requirements, are met. Under Section L-II 4.2.9 of the Nevada County Land Use and Development Code, uses that would not meet parking standards are not approved unless it can be demonstrated that the provided parking is sufficient for the proposed use. This evidence must be provided in the form of a parking study prepared by a licensed traffic engineer. Therefore, the processes in place during project review would prevent a future use at any of these locations from being approved with a parking shortfall such that it would affect surrounding development.

Master Response 5: Stormwater Drainage

Several commenters expressed concerns that the project (particularly at the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites) would exacerbate existing drainage and overtopping problems along roadway ditches adjoining the sites, where project stormwater runoff would be conveyed. Some individuals described their observations and provided photographs showing excess water in ditches and on roadways. Similar comments were made by the public in response to the Notice of Preparation for the project.

Stormwater runoff and drainage impacts for each of the project sites are evaluated in Draft EIR Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, as follows: Alta Sierra site (Impact 11.1.1(AS) on page 11.0-7); Penn Valley (Impact 11.2.1(PV) on page 11.0-12), and Rough and Ready Highway (Impact 11.3.1 on pages 11.0-17 and 11.0-18). The project applicant provided a drainage study for each site, and the drainage studies were included in the Draft EIR in Appendix 11.0-A (Alta Sierra), Appendix 11.0-B (Penn Valley), and 11.0-C (Rough and Ready Highway). The description of existing conditions, impacts, and proposed drainage facilities presented in the Draft EIR is based on those studies, as stated on page 11.0-6 in Section 11.0. Public input on drainage problems was considered in the analysis. For example, the drainage study for Alta Sierra (page 2) specifically states “as mentioned by the public, runoff flows from the roadside ditch and flows across the street to an existing curb line.” It also notes that the reason for overtopping is a clogged storm pipe (culvert). Appendix 2 in the Alta Sierra drainage study includes photographs of the roadway, ditch, and culvert where runoff poses a problem. The Draft EIR (page 11.0-7) also describes the existing roadway overtopping problem.
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For concerns regarding adequacy of the proposed drainage plan, please see Master Response 4. The drainage studies show no net increase in flows, and the County has reviewed the plans and determined that they meet requirements. While the Draft EIR considers the existing conditions on the site with regard to drainage, the purpose of the Draft EIR is to consider existing conditions in the analysis, but projects are not responsible for mitigating an existing condition. If a project exacerbates an existing condition, it would be responsible for mitigating its contribution to that impact. In this case, however, the project applicant will be required to ensure no net increase in flows from the site(s). Consequently, the projects would not exacerbate the existing conditions at any of the sites.

Master Response 6: Rough and Ready Traffic Study and Impact Analysis Results

Traffic Counts

Some individuals commented that the traffic counts for the Rough and Ready Highway site were taken on a weekend during a holiday period when schools were not in session. Dates referenced by commenters were December 30, 2014, and May 31, 2015. There appears to be some confusion regarding the information presented in Appendix C (Explanation and Calculation of Intersection Delay) of the traffic study, which was included in Appendix 15.0-C in the Draft EIR. These dates correspond to dates when the analysis of traffic data was performed (see Draft EIR Appendix 15.0 [pdf] pages 252 through 253 and 261 through 320, labeled “Analysis Date” or “Date Performed”). The actual traffic counts were performed on Wednesday, December 10, 2014, during the AM peak hour (7 AM to 9 AM) and the PM peak hour (4 PM to 6 PM). The raw data for the weekday, non-school-holiday traffic counts, which show the date, locations, and times where traffic counts were performed, are provided in Appendix B (Traffic Count Worksheets) in the Rough and Ready Highway traffic study (Draft EIR Appendix 15.0 [pdf] pages 237 through 245). As such, the Rough and Ready Highway site traffic analysis is based on traffic count data that are accurate inputs to the analysis for purposes of determining impacts on local intersections and roadways.

Another issue raised by some commenters is that the AM peak-hour traffic counts should have extended until 9:30 AM and the PM peak hour counts begun at 3:30 PM to account for school traffic, particularly from Yuba River Charter School. County staff have reviewed the information in both the Dollar General and Yuba River Charter school traffic studies. Although existing traffic is anticipated to be slightly higher in the school PM peak hour than it is in the PM commuter peak hour (approximately 10 to 20 percent higher traffic counts), operation of the charter school is projected to minimally increase traffic on Rough and Ready Highway west of Ridge Road (about 27 vehicles in the peak PM school hour). Because the projected increase in traffic due to the charter school would be minimal, the inclusion of another one-half hour of traffic counts during AM and PM peak hour in the traffic model would not change the results of the analysis in the Draft EIR.

Sunset Neighborhood Cut-Through Traffic

A number of residents in the Sunset neighborhood asserted the project would substantially increase traffic volumes in the immediate area. Commenters speculated that customers and delivery truck drivers would cut through the neighborhood along Sunset Avenue to drive to and from the store, which could pose a safety hazard that should have been evaluated in the Draft EIR.

The traffic study for the Rough and Ready Highway site (Appendix 15.0-C in the Draft EIR), which was incorporated into subsection 15.3 in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, provided quantified estimates of how traffic conditions would change along Rough and Ready Highway with the project, compared to conditions without the project. Intersections at West Drive and East...
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Drive were evaluated, along with others outside the immediate vicinity. The project’s proposed driveway access points on West Drive and Rough and Ready Highway were also accounted for in the analysis.

The analysis included several approved projects in the vicinity (including Yuba River Charter School and Twin Cities Church, among others), which are listed on page 15.0-29 in the Draft EIR. By comparing the level of service (LOS) and delay results in Table 15.0-8 (Existing Intersection Delay and Level of Service) to those in Table 15.0-11 (Existing Plus Approved Projects Plus Project), the project would increase delay at West Drive from 12.2 seconds to 13.1 seconds (a difference of less than 1 second) in the AM peak hour and from 9.8 seconds to 10.7 seconds (also less than 1 second) in the PM peak hour. At East Drive, the AM peak hour delay would increase from 12.3 seconds to 12.4 seconds (less than 1 second), while the PM peak hour delay would increase from 10.0 seconds to 12.4 seconds (2.4 seconds). These data indicate that traffic volumes would not be substantial. While CEQA does not require evaluation of driver behavior because such evaluation would be speculative, the data suggest that the delays at either intersection for vehicles turning left or right onto Rough and Ready Highway would not be of such magnitude that customers or delivery trucks would intentionally use Sunset Drive to avoid real or perceived congestion at the intersections. Further, delivery trucks would be unlikely to use a local, narrow street through a residential area, such as the Sunset neighborhood, when a major roadway is immediately available. For both passenger vehicles and trucks, there would also sufficient sight distance to the west and east, with mitigation to keep vegetation to a maximum height of 18 inches along the project frontage (Draft EIR pages 15.0-35 and 15.0-36), so that vehicles would not need to travel to East Drive to avoid any real or perceived hazard associated with a clear line of sight.

While no significant impact has been identified, the County will nonetheless condition the project that delivery trucks may not turn right onto West Drive when exiting the project site and that trucks are not permitted to use East Drive. Adherence to this condition of approval will be monitored and enforced by the County throughout the life of the project through its Code Compliance Division. It is within the County’s authority to enforce the prohibition and take necessary actions should the project applicant fail to abide by its requirements. (See also Master Response 2.)

Pedestrian Safety

Some commenters were of the opinion that the analysis of pedestrian hazards was not fully evaluated in the Draft EIR. Non-vehicular circulation is discussed in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, with impact statements for the Rough and Ready Highway site (Impacts 15.3.4(RR) and 15.3.5 (RR). Nevada County staff recently collected both AM and PM peak school hour counts at the intersection of Rough and Ready Highway and West Drive, adjacent to the proposed Dollar General store. Staff also obtained information from the County’s Transit Services Division for bus ridership numbers at the adjacent bus stop. This data was collected to determine the need for crosswalk improvements at the intersection, including the installation of flashing beacons or an in-pavement flashing beacon system crossing Rough and Ready Highway. County staff also reviewed collision history from 2000 to 2017 for the West Drive intersection. During that 17-year period, there were seven collisions within 200 feet of the intersection. One of these collisions was the result of an individual driving under the influence. None of these collisions involved a pedestrian.

An average of eight passenger transit trips occur on the existing transit route each day. It is assumed that roughly half (four passengers) of these trips cross the street throughout the day resulting from transit trips. Both the Grass Valley School District and the Nevada Joint Union High School District also operate a bus stop in this vicinity. During the school pick-up and drop-off periods, County staff observed six children crossing the street at this location. Therefore, the bus activity (school plus transit) generates approximately 10 crossings each day.
While the proposed Dollar General store would generate some additional pedestrian activity at the West Drive intersection, County staff have concluded that the project would not generate enough pedestrian traffic for the County to require a marked pedestrian crosswalk and supplemental pavement flashers, flashing beacons, or rectangular rapid flashing beacon systems. The County’s Department of Public Works will not require the installation of a marked crosswalk at this location or the application of any enhanced pedestrian systems, but if the project applicant wishes to install a marked pedestrian crosswalk with enhanced pedestrian features, the County would recommend the use of a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) system similar to the recent installation performed on Magnolia at Sunset Ridge Road and elsewhere in the state. Any crosswalk installation would also require Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements necessary to comply with state law. However, the County will require an ADA path of travel and ADA intersection improvements on West Drive at Rough and Ready Highway as part of project improvements. These items will be included as conditions of approval for any future permit and will help facilitate transit and school bus pedestrian traffic across West Drive to the Dollar General store.

Master Response 7: Tree Removal at Alta Sierra Site

Commenters questioned how many trees would be removed to accommodate the Alta Sierra project. The Management Plan identified over 100 trees on the project site including ponderosa pine, black oak, and valley oak. The project will impact 85 trees; however, although that impact was discussed in the Management Plan, it was not made clear in the Draft EIR. Therefore, the text in the third paragraph on Draft EIR page 6.0-10 is revised as follows:

A tree survey identified the presence of 85 oak trees on the project site that are proposed for removal, including 71 California black oaks and 3 small valley oaks.

Commenters also questioned how many trees would be preserved on the Alta Sierra site. As noted in mitigation measure MM AS-6.1.3b, 17 trees (10 oaks and 7 pines) would be retained, and measures to protect the remaining trees are included in mitigation measures MM AS-6.1.3a, AS-6.1.3b, and AS-6.1.3c. The measures include fencing, establishing tree protection zones, informing construction personnel where all protective zones are, prohibiting activities such as excavation, trenching, or storage of equipment in drip zones, and periodic monitoring by a qualified professional.

Draft EIR Impacts 6.1.3(AS) and 6.1.5(AS) discuss the project’s potential impacts to landmark oaks and landmark oak groves. With regard to comments questioning the efficacy of the mitigation measures for removed trees, the County’s approach to mitigating the loss of landmark and heritage oaks associated with development projects and its enforcement of the regulations are set forth in Section L-II 4.3.15, Trees, in the Nevada County Land Use and Development Code, summarized on page 6.0-7 in Draft EIR Section 6.0, Biological Resources. The County considers compliance with the ordinance to fully mitigate a project’s impacts. The ordinance requires a Management Plan, which allows for the removal of trees. A Management Plan was prepared for the project and is included in Draft EIR Appendix 6.0-AS. In lieu of replacement trees, code Section L-II 4.3.15(C)(4) allows for payment into a Tree Preservation Fund for the planting and maintenance of trees on publicly owned property, or for purchase of replacement habitat. Mitigation measure MM AS-6.1.3e requires payment of $42,900 in mitigation costs to the Bear Yuba Land Trust (BYLT) for replanting, management, and restoration of black oak habitat on the Clover Valley Preserve Property located 2 air miles from the project site. The measure further requires the developer and the BYLT to enter into a contractual agreement that outlines the specific steps of the Restoration Project that will occur, consistent with Appendix B of the Oak Tree Management Plan, including a clause to trigger the attachment of a conservation easement on the property if the BYLT should ever transfer the property to non-land trust ownership. The contractual agreement must also...
provide specific steps for annual monitoring of the success of the project and reporting to the
County Planning Department by a qualified professional. While the replacement trees would be
smaller than those removed, and the replacement value would not be immediate, the measure
provides for planting of more trees than would be removed and requires long-term maintenance.
For these reasons, implementation of this measure would comply with the County Code for the
protection of trees and ensure the impact is less than significant.

3.3.3 RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Written comments on the Draft EIR and a transcript of comments made during the Planning
Commission hearing for the Draft EIR are included on the following pages, along with responses
to those comments. To assist in referencing comments and responses, the following coding system
is used:

Public agency comment letters are coded by letters and each issue raised in the comment letter
is assigned a number (e.g., Comment Letter A, comment 1: A-1).

Individual and interest group comment letters are coded by numbers and each issue raised
in the comment letter is assigned a number (e.g., Comment Letter 1, comment 1: 1-1).

Where changes to the Draft EIR text result from responding to comments, those changes are
included in the response and demarcated with revision marks (underline for new text, strikeout for
deleted text). See Section 4.0, Revisions to the Draft EIR, of this Final EIR for all revisions made to
the Draft EIR. Revisions made for the Final EIR do not alter the Draft EIR impact conclusions.
January 30, 2017

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

Dollar General Store Projects

Dear Tyler Barrington:

Thank you for including California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) review for Dollar General Store 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 mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

The Dollar General Stores project consists of three projects, each at a different location in western Nevada County. Each project is requesting the approvals necessary to develop and operate a 9,100 square foot Dollar General Store with associated improvements including landscaping, parking, lighting, and other improvements. The three project sites are located within unincorporated Nevada County at 10166 Alta Sierra Drive in Grass Valley, 17652 Penn Valley Drive in Penn Valley, and 12345 Rough and Ready Highway in Grass Valley. The following comments are based on the DEIR received.

VMT

In response to the provisions of Senate Bill 743, we encourage the integration transportation and land use in a way that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by facilitating the provision of more proximate goods and services to shorten trip lengths, as well as achieve a high level of non-motorized travel and transit use. As such, we encourage the evaluation the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications in order to better manage the

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
transportation network, as well as transit service and bicycle or pedestrian connectivity improvements. The Department also seeks to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, as well as provide equitable mobility options for people who are economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged. Therefore, we encourage the evaluation of the project site for access problems, VMT, and service needs that may need to be addressed.

Traffic Operations

The report assumes that the signal will operate like an urban signal with roughly balanced volumes on all legs. However, this is a different situation for the following reasons:

- This intersection is rural, so it is not connected to any other traffic signals. It works alone.
- The traffic volumes on Route 49 are very high compared to the volumes on Alta Sierra Drive.
- Route 49 is on a grade, uphill to the north. The grade impacts how people drive through the intersection.

For these reasons, we operate the signal to provide maximum green time to Route 49 traffic, and only interrupt the highway when there are vehicles queued on Alta Sierra Drive. Our signal timing is well suited to this location; the assumptions about signal timing are invalid.

The following comments pertain to Appendix 15 of the DEIR.

- Figure 4 – Project Trip Distribution (Page 363 of the PDF)
  - This figure shows 5% of trips to Johnson Place. This is unrealistic, as there are few destinations along Johnson Place and the distance is short enough to be an attractive walking trip. The more logical assignment of those 5% is to the south of Alta Sierra Drive. Many people in the Lime Kiln area currently drive south to the Wolf Road/Combie Road intersection for minor shopping, as it is a shorter drive than to Grass Valley. These residents will be drawn to the Alta Sierra Dollar General due to the shorter distance.

- HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary – SR 49 at Alta Sierra Drive
  - Existing Conditions (Pages 392 and 393 of the PDF)
    - The Signal Information section shows a cycle of 35.9 seconds for the AM Peak and 60.0 seconds for the PM Peak. These numbers are not realistic. (See the attached Signal Timing Plan)
    - Our calculations show that the absolute minimum signal cycle length is 44 seconds.
      - When there are higher volumes of southbound left turns, that phase
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can be extended an additional 20 seconds.

- When there are higher volumes on northbound and southbound Route 49, those phases can be extended an additional 60 seconds.
- When there are higher volumes of westbound left turns, that phase can be extended an additional 25 seconds.

  o In both the AM and PM peak hours, there is a steady stream of vehicles on Route 49. Therefore, the maximum extensions for those phases are likely to be reached. Extensions for the other phases are also likely during peak hours, so the overall cycle length will typically be two minutes or longer.

  o These actual cycle lengths correspond to levels of service significantly below LOS A in the AM Peak and LOS B in the PM Peak.

- HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary – SR 49 at Alta Sierra Drive – Existing plus Project Conditions (Pages 401 and 402 of the PDF)
  
  o The Signal Information section shows a cycle of 36.5 seconds for the AM Peak and 58.6 seconds for the PM Peak. These are unrealistic. As the traffic volumes have increased, the signal cycle lengths will need to increase.

- The same issues are apparent in the HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summaries for Year 2035 Without Project (pages 412 and 413 of the PDF) and the HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summaries for Year 2035 With Project (pages 421 and 422 of the PDF).

- An issue that will be exacerbated by the incorrect timing plan is the queue lengths on Alta Sierra Drive. Page 5 of the traffic study (page 352 of the PDF) shows insufficient length for right turns from westbound Alta Sierra Drive to northbound Route 49. This (unamed) table is for the existing condition, and the queue lengths will be longer than were calculated by the inaccurate signal timing assumptions. The queue lengths will increase due the proposed project, and will increase further in future years.

We request that Nevada County require installation of a right-turn overlap at this location as a condition of approval for this development. This will ensure that as many vehicles as possible are able to make westbound-to-northbound right turns on a green arrow. Others will be able to make legal right turns on the red phase, when safe to do so. Those turns, however, are much less efficient and many drivers are unwilling to make them due to the speed of oncoming traffic and the uphill grade to the north. This will help overall signal operations, providing only the necessary green time for westbound-to-southbound turns, which leaves the remaining time for Route 49 operations.
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- The construction of this right-turn overlap will mostly consist of:
  - Replacing one existing three-section signal head with a five-section signal head.
  - Installation of a new five-section signal head on a new Type 1B pole in the northeastern quadrant of the intersection.
  - Tying all the connections into the signal controller box.

Caltrans Signal Operations engineers will review the plans and will assist in making the upgrade operational.

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 David Smith, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Nevada County, by phone (550) 634-7799 or via email to david.j.smith@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

KEVIN YOUNT, North Branch Chief
Office of Transportation Planning
Regional Planning Branch—North

Enclosures

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
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**Letter A Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Configuration Phase Flags**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>2-1-1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>1 2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force/Max</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>2-1-1-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Double Entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest in Walk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest in Red</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Call To Phase (2-1-2-1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Omit On Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flashing Colors (2-1-2-2)**

| Flashing Colors | |
|-----------------|-
| Yellow Flash Phases | |
| Yellow Flash Overlap | |
| Flash In Red Phases | |
| Flash In Red Overlap | |

**Special Operation (2-1-2-3)**

| Operation | |
|-----------|-
| Single Exit Phase | |
| Driveway Signal Phases | |
| Driveway Signal Overlaps | |
| Leading Ped Phases | |

**Pedestrian (2-1-3)**

| Pedestrian | |
|-----------|-
| P1        | |
| P2        | .2 |
| P3        | |
| P4        | |
| P5        | |
| P6        | |
| P7        | |
| P8        | 8 |

**Overlap (2-1-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overlap</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Omit</th>
<th>No Start</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

**California Department of Transportation, California**

**Location:** Nev 49 & Alta Sierra

**TSCP 2.20**

#### Letter A Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase (3-3)</th>
<th>-1-</th>
<th>-2-</th>
<th>-3-</th>
<th>-4-</th>
<th>-5-</th>
<th>-6-</th>
<th>-7-</th>
<th>-8-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk 1 ---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Don’t Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Green</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Limit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Initial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Gap</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Gap</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Per Vehicle</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Gap By</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Every</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Red</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Overlap Timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ped/Bike (2-3)</th>
<th>-1-</th>
<th>-2-</th>
<th>-3-</th>
<th>-4-</th>
<th>-5-</th>
<th>-6-</th>
<th>-7-</th>
<th>-8-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk 2 ---</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay/Early Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Don’t Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike All-Red</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Red Revert

| Max 2 Extension | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|
| Yellow | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Red | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

#### Max Gap Cnt (2-7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All-Red Sec/Min (2-4)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-Red Sec/Min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

### Letter A Continued

**Location:** New 49 & Alta Sierra

**TSCP 2.20**

### Local Plan 1...9 (7-1) Timing Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Multi</th>
<th>Lag Gap</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>-1-</th>
<th>-2-</th>
<th>-3-</th>
<th>-4-</th>
<th>-5-</th>
<th>-6-</th>
<th>-7-</th>
<th>-8-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 4</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 5</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 6</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 7</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 8</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 9</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Plan 1...9 (7-1) Phase Flags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lag</th>
<th>Sync</th>
<th>Hold</th>
<th>Omit</th>
<th>Veh Min</th>
<th>Veh Max</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Bike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Manual Commands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manual Plan (4-1)</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Offset</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Function Override (4-2)</td>
<td># Control</td>
<td># Control</td>
<td>1 NORMAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detector Reset (4-3)</td>
<td>Local Manual (4-4)</td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Local Plan 11...19 (7-2) TIMING DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Multi</th>
<th>Lag Gap</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-6</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 12</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 13</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 14</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 15</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 16</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 17</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 18</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 19</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Plan 11...19 (7-2) PHASE FLAGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lag</th>
<th>Sync</th>
<th>Hold</th>
<th>Omit</th>
<th>Veh Min</th>
<th>Veh Max</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Bike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 12</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 13</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 15</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 17</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 18</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 19</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Plan 21...29 (7-3) TIMING DATA

#### COORDINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Multi</th>
<th>Lag Gap</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>-1-</th>
<th>-2-</th>
<th>-3-</th>
<th>-4-</th>
<th>-5-</th>
<th>-6-</th>
<th>-7-</th>
<th>-8-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 21</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 22</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 23</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 24</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 25</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 26</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 27</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 28</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 29</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Plan 21...29 (7-3) PHASE FLAGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lag</th>
<th>Sync</th>
<th>Hold</th>
<th>Omit</th>
<th>Veh Min</th>
<th>Veh Max</th>
<th>Ped</th>
<th>Bike</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

#### Nevada County Dollar General Stores

September 2017 Final Environmental Impact Report

---

### Letter A Continued

**TSCP 2.20**

**Location:** Nav 46 & Alta Sierra

---

#### DETECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Det</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Lack</th>
<th>Slot</th>
<th>Detectors Configuration (5-2)</th>
<th>Failure Times (6-3)</th>
<th>Failure Override (6-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum On Time</td>
<td>Fail Recall Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detectors 1-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detectors 9-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detectors 17-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detectors 36-32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detectors 33-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Detectors 41-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### CIC Operation (5-6-1)

**Enable in Plans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CIC Values (5-6-2)</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Occupancy</th>
<th>Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiplier**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exponent</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>0.33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Input File Port-Bit Assignments**

332 Cabinet - For Reference Only

---
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### TOD SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 (B-2-1)</th>
<th>Table 2 (B-2-2)</th>
<th>Table 3 (B-2-3)</th>
<th>Table 4 (B-2-4)</th>
<th>Table 5 (B-2-5)</th>
<th>Table 6 (B-2-6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>OS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WEEKDAY ASSIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weekday Table Assignments (B-2-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post Mile: 16-12-21

Page 8

Printed: 12/21/2016
### Holiday Tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>DOW</th>
<th>Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Solar Clock Data (8-6)

- North Latitude: 34°
- West Longitude: 118°
- Local Time Zone: 8

- Sabbatical Clock (8-6)
- Hebrew: Ped Recall
- Sabbath: Holiday
- Daylight Saving (8-6): Enabled - YES

### TOD Functions (9-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOD Functions (9-3)</th>
<th>Action Codes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

**Dollar General Stores Nevada County**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

**California Department of Transportation, Caltrans**

### Letter A Continued

**Location:** Nav 49 & Alta Sierra

**TSCP 2.20**

#### Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>AB3418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit Access</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baud</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Bits</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Bits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS On Time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTS Off Time</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handshaking</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Soft Logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soft Logic (6-2)</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Refer to User’s Manual for Data and OP Codes*

#### Callback Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Callback Numbers (6-3...3)</th>
<th>Line Out</th>
<th>Local Toll</th>
<th>Long Distance</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
<td>AB3418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>27000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Mode</td>
<td>STATIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP Address</td>
<td>0 . 0 . 0 . 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netmask</td>
<td>255 . 255 . 255 . 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast</td>
<td>0 . 0 . 0 . 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway</td>
<td>0 . 0 . 0 . 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

#### Nevada County Dollar General Stores
September 2017 Final Environmental Impact Report

---

### Letter A Continued

**Location:** Nev 49 & Alta Sierra

**TSCP 2.20**

#### Railroad Preemption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Flags (3-1-2)</th>
<th>Pedestrian Flags (3-1-3)</th>
<th>Overlap Flags (3-1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Config (3-2-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit Parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Emergency Vehicle Preemption

### EVA (3-A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preempt Timers</th>
<th>Phase Greens</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Port: Latching
- Phase Termination
- 5.5: NO ADVANCE

### EBY (2-B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preempt Timers</th>
<th>Phase Greens</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Port: Latching
- Phase Termination
- 5.6: NO ADVANCE

### EVO (3-D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preempt Timers</th>
<th>Phase Greens</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Port: Latching
- Phase Termination
- 5.8: NO ADVANCE

---
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### 3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

**Letter A Continued**

**Location:** Nev 49 & Alta Sierra

**TSCP 2.20**

#### Inputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enable</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max ON</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max OFF</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Manual Control (2-1-5-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manual Advance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance Enable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Battery Backup (2-1-5-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>FLASING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cabinet Status (2-1-5-3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flash Bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Ajar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Sense</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Time</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Special Function (2-1-8-4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Y-Coordination (2-1-5-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port C</th>
<th>Port D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outputs

- **Loadswitch Codes:**
  - 51-57 Special Functions
  - 71-72 Seven Wire I/O
  - 1-8 Vehicle 1-8
  - 9-14 Overlap A-F
  - 21-28 Ped 1-8
  - 41-47 Special Functions
  - 41 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 1
  - 43 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 3
  - 45 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 5
  - 47 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 7

- **Middle output of loadswitches 3 and 6 Channel 9 and 10**

#### Loadswitch Assignments (2-1-8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LETTER A CONTINUED

**California Department of Transportation, Caltrans**

**Location:** Nev 49 & Alta Sierra

---

#### TRANSIT PRIORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Green Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 4</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 5</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 6</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 7</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 8</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 9</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 10</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 12</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 13</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 14</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 15</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 16</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 17</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 18</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit Priority Configuration (3-4-5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enable in Plans</th>
<th>Input Type</th>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Go</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1-9</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11-19</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Queue Jump (3-6-E)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Queue Jump Type</th>
<th>Hold Phase</th>
<th>Free Plan (3-6-E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>Hold Phase</td>
<td>Max Grn Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Hold Phase</td>
<td>Hold Phase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access Utilities (3-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input Type</th>
<th>Password</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### YELLOW YIELD COORDINATION

**Force-Offs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y-Coord Plans (7-0-D)</th>
<th>Long Grn</th>
<th>No Grn</th>
<th>Offset</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-6</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>-8</th>
<th>Coord</th>
<th>Lag</th>
<th>Min Recall</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan A</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan B</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### TRUCK PRIORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truck Priority (3-F)</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>CarryOver</th>
<th>Clearance</th>
<th>Next Priority</th>
<th>Phase Green</th>
<th>Det 2 Port</th>
<th>Det 3 Port</th>
<th>Det 4 Port</th>
<th>Sign Output</th>
<th>Slave In</th>
<th>Slave Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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From: Smith, David J@DOT <David.J.Smith@dot.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 3:30 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Cc: State.Clearinghouse@opr.ca.gov
Subject: Dollar General Stores_03-NEV-2016-00026 SCH#2016012009
Attachments: Comment Letter.pdf; Alta Sierra Signal Timing Plan.pdf

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Thank you for including California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) review for Dollar General Store 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 mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

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.

Please reply to this email to confirm receipt of the attached comments.

If you should have any questions concerning these comments or require additional information, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you,

DAVID SMITH
TRANSPORTATION PLANNER - NORTH
CALTRANS - DISTRICT 3
703 B STREET
MARYSVILLE, CA 95901
(530) 634-7799
Letter A – Kevin Yount, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

Response A-1: The Alta Sierra project access point has been evaluated in the focused traffic analysis dated May 20, 2015 (Appendix 15.0-A, Alta Sierra Dollar General Focused Traffic Analysis (Revised), in the Draft EIR). The provisions of Senate Bill 743 require the State Office of Planning and Research to evaluate alternative measures of performance other than Level of Service for incorporation into updated CEQA guidelines. Previously released draft guidelines indicate some form of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) measurement will be used; however, final guidelines are unknown and methods, tools, and thresholds for such analysis have not been established by the State or the County. Thus, there is no standardized method of VMT analysis available at this time. The rural character of the study area and project scale are such that transit service is not practical (see Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, in the Draft EIR). Additionally, Caltrans and County traffic study guidelines do not provide methodologies for analysis of transit services.

Response A-2: Based on the actual signal timing provided by Caltrans, it is concluded that operations at the intersection of SR-49 Golden Chain Highway at Alta Sierra Drive are safer and more efficient with longer green times on SR 49 than were proposed in the traffic study. Regardless, safety is more important than operational efficiency. Based on research at Lime Klin Road, a signalized four-legged intersection about two miles south of Alta Sierra Drive, Caltrans determined that the signal timing plan which was set to be very responsive to vehicles approaching either leg of Lime Klin Road resulted in a high collision rate. Retiming the signal to provide reasonable flows on the highway which allowed short queues to develop on Lime Klin Road, improved operations substantially and decreased the collision rate to be more in line with the statewide average. Fewer interruptions to the flow of traffic on the highway has proven to reduce collisions and improve operations. Thus, the current signal timing plan at the SR 49/Alta Sierra Drive intersection, which provides maximum green time to SR 49 is considered to be well suited to this intersection and should not be altered to reduce projected queue lengths on Alta Sierra Drive (see Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, in the Draft EIR for more details).

The Kunzman, Inc. report (page 5 in Appendix 15.0-A, Alta Sierra Dollar General Focused Traffic Analysis (Revised), in the Draft EIR) shows insufficient length for right turns from westbound Alta Sierra Drive to northbound SR 49 under existing conditions. In order to ensure adequate space for queueing vehicles on Alta Sierra Drive, the County has chosen to require installation of a right-turn overlap at this location as a condition of approval for the Alta Sierra project. This improvement will ensure that as many vehicles as possible are able to make westbound-to-northbound right turns on a green arrow. Others will be able to make legal right turns on the red phase, when safe to do so. Those turns, however, are much less efficient and many drivers are unwilling to make them due to the speed of oncoming traffic and the uphill grade to the north. This will help overall signal operations, providing only the necessary green time for westbound-to-southbound turns, which leaves the remaining time for SR 49 operations.
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

The construction of this right-turn overlap will consist of: (1) replacing one existing three-section signal head with a five-section signal head; (2) installation of a new five-section signal head on a new Type 1B pole in the northeast quadrant of the intersection; and, (3) tying all connections into the signal controller box. These improvements would be completed within the existing public right-of-way and would not result in any potential environmental impacts not previously disclosed in the Draft EIR.

**Response A-3:**

The trip distributions for the proposed development, including the 5 percent on Johnson Place (see Appendix 15.0-A, Alta Sierra Dollar General Focused Traffic Analysis (Revised), in the Draft EIR), was approved via a series of scoping discussions with County of Nevada Transportation Department staff. This distribution reflects interaction with the commercial/office land uses located along Johnson Place. To put this in perspective, 5 percent is 1 inbound and 1 outbound trip during the morning peak hour and 2 inbound and 2 outbound trips during the evening peak hour. Changing the trip distribution forecast in accordance with the comment would not result in any appreciable changes to the findings of the analysis.

**Response A-4:**

See Response A-2 regarding the signal timing used in the focused traffic analysis. Kunzman recalculated the peak hour analysis using signal timing data provided by Caltrans (Kunzman 2017). The phase timing provided by Caltrans (Max Green 1) was used in this analysis. For phase 1 (southbound left) a maximum green of 20 seconds was used with a yellow time of 3 seconds and a red time of 0.5 seconds. For phase 2 (northbound through/right) a maximum green of 60 seconds was used with a yellow time of 5 seconds and a red time of 1.5 seconds. For phase 6 (southbound through) a maximum green of 60 seconds was used with a yellow time of 5 seconds and a red time of 1.5 seconds. For phase 8 (westbound left/right) a maximum green of 25 seconds was used with a yellow time of 3 seconds and a red time of 1.0 seconds. This corresponds to a 119 second cycle phase (approximately 2 minutes).

With these parameters, the morning peak hour delay and Level of Service is 24.1-C. The optimized morning peak hour delay and Level of Service as shown in the focused traffic analysis is 9.0-A. The evening peak hour delay and Level of Service is 31.7-C. The optimized evening peak hour delay and Level of Service as shown in the focused traffic analysis is 10.5-B. Therefore, using Caltrans signal timing, the typical motorist will experience an average delay during the morning peak hour that is 15.1 seconds longer than the optimal signal timing. During the evening peak hour the typical motorist will experience an average delay that is 21.2 seconds longer than the optimal signal timing. The Caltrans signal timing values have been analyzed using the HCS 2010 Streets Version 6.65 software.

The intersection analysis is based on peak hour volumes and thus spread uniformly over the peak hour. For instance, the southbound left turning movement volumes may be higher for one cycle phase and less for the subsequent phase, thus the need for more seconds of allocation needed for the first phase and less for the second. With actuation, the average delay per cycle would be lower than specified.
Levels of Service in both peak hours are significantly below the optimized Levels of Service as analyzed in the report; this is a result of Caltrans using a less-than-optimal signal timing that precludes the intersection from operating at the lowest average delay possible. Thus, seconds of signal timing are being allocated to movements that do not need it, while being taken away from movements that do need it. It is in essence creating a less than optimal timing based on the existing traffic count data used in the analysis.


Response A-6: The intersection was analyzed for Year 2035 With Project traffic conditions using the same parameters as stated in Response A-4. The results are as follows:

With the aforementioned parameters, the morning peak hour delay and Level of Service is 25.9-C. The optimized morning peak hour delay and Level of Service as shown in the focused traffic analysis is 10.2-B. The evening peak hour delay and Level of Service is 43.4-D. The optimized evening peak hour delay and Level of Service as shown in the focused traffic analysis is 14.8-B (see Appendix 15.0-A, Alta Sierra Dollar General Focused Traffic Analysis (Revised), in the Draft EIR). Therefore, using Caltrans signal timing, the typical motorist will experience an average delay during the morning peak hour that is 15.7 seconds longer than the optimal signal timing. During the evening peak hour the typical motorist will experience an average delay that is 28.6 seconds longer than the optimal signal timing. The Caltrans signal timing values have been analyzed using the HCS 2010 Streets Version 6.65 software.

While previous comments noted that the signal timing for each phase is dependent on the volumes associated with each phase at a specific point in time for that cycle, the intersection analysis is based on peak hour volumes and thus spread uniformly over the peak hour. For instance, the southbound left turning movement volumes may be higher for one cycle phase and less for the subsequent phase, thus the need for more seconds of allocation needed for the first phase and less for the second. With actuation the average delay per cycle would be lower than specified.

Previous comments are correct in noting that the Levels of Service in both peak hours are significantly below the optimized Levels of Service as analyzed in the report. However, this is a result of Caltrans using a less than optimal signal timing that precludes the intersection from operating at the lowest average delay possible. Thus, green time is being allocated to movements that do not need it, while being taken away from movements that do need it. It is in essence creating a less than optimal timing based on the existing traffic count data used in the analysis.

Response A-7: The analysis of the existing turn pocket lengths using the 95th percentile turn pocket lengths was requested by the County of Nevada Transportation Department staff. This analysis was done for Year 2035 With Project traffic conditions (see Appendix 15.0-A, Alta Sierra Dollar General Focused Traffic Analysis (Revised), in the Draft EIR).
This issue will be exacerbated but that is because Caltrans is using their own predetermined fixed cycle lengths instead of optimized cycle lengths, which serve to provide the best timing possible for an intersection. Therefore, the issue is artificially worsened when it does not need to be. By using the predetermined fixed cycle lengths, unnecessary seconds will be allocated to turning movements as part of the cycle. By adding seconds to a movement that is not necessary, it increases the delay for movements that would otherwise absorb these seconds, thus increasing delay over optimization.

As an example, Caltrans is giving 20 seconds per cycle for southbound left turning movements for the two minute cycle. A two minute cycle equals 30 cycles per hour. For Year 2035 With Project morning peak hour traffic conditions, it is projected that 47 southbound left turning movements will occur. This equates to 1.6 southbound left turns per cycle. Allowing 20 seconds for 1.6 vehicles to make a southbound left turn is an obvious overestimation, and that time would be better utilized for other movements as best calculated through signal optimization. Therefore, the queue lengths that will be given are representative of Caltrans parameters and not optimal conditions.

With optimization and as analyzed in the report, the 95th percentile queue length is 85 feet for the westbound left and 185 feet for the westbound right. This queue is based on the evening peak hour. Using Caltrans signal timing, the 95th percentile queue length is 238 feet for the westbound left and 335 feet for the westbound right. This queue is based on the morning peak hour and is a queue length of 153 more feet for the westbound left and 150 more feet for the westbound right. Again, this is due to Caltrans signal timing creating additional average delay at the intersection since allocation is being given to movements that do not need it in lieu of movements that do need it and thus increasing the number of vehicles in queue per cycle (Kunzman 2017).

Response A-8:

An analysis of Year 2035 With Project including the westbound right-turn overlap was prepared to assess this request (Kunzman 2017). The morning peak hour delay and Level of Service using Caltrans parameters for Year 2035 traffic conditions with the westbound right turn overlap is 22.9-C compared to the delay and Level of Service without the overlap of 25.9-C. This is a 3 second reduction in average delay. The evening peak hour delay and Level of Service using Caltrans parameters for Year 2035 traffic conditions with the westbound right turn overlap is 42.4-D compared to the delay and Level of Service without the overlap of 43.4-D. This is a 1 second reduction in average delay. As shown, the average delay reduction is minimal.

With optimization and as analyzed in the Kunzman report, the 95th percentile queue length is 85 feet for the westbound left and 185 feet for the westbound right. This queue is based on the evening peak hour. Using Caltrans signal timing with the overlap, the 95th percentile queue length is still 238 feet for the westbound left and 240 feet for the westbound right. This queue is based on the morning peak hour and is a queue length of 153 more feet for the westbound left and 55 more feet for the
westbound right. This is due to less-than-optimal signal timing creating additional delays at the intersection. While the right turn overlap decreases the westbound right queue under these parameters, the queue would be best served under optimized signal timing instead of the signal timing described in previous comments. See also Responses A-2 and A-7.

**Response A-9:** The County will inform Caltrans of any project developments that may impact transportation and traffic.
Letter B

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
GOVERNOR’S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT

January 31, 2017

Tyler Barrington
Nevada County
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

Subject: Dollar General Store Projects
SCH#: 2016012009

Dear Tyler Barrington:

The enclosed comment(s) on your Draft EIR was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on January 27, 2017. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2016012009) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency
Letter B Continued

January 30, 2017

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

Dollar General Store Projects

Dear Tyler Barrington:

Thank you for including California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) review for Dollar General Store 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 mobility goals that support a vibrant economy, and build communities, not sprawl.

The Dollar General Stores project consists of three projects, each at a different location in western Nevada County. Each project is requesting the approvals necessary to develop and operate a 9,100 square foot Dollar General Store with associated improvements including landscaping, parking, lighting, and other improvements. The three project sites are located within unincorporated Nevada County at 10166 Alta Sierra Drive in Grass Valley, 17652 Penn Valley Drive in Penn Valley, and 12345 Rough and Ready Highway in Grass Valley. The following comments are based on the DEIR received.

VMT

In response to the provisions of Senate Bill 743, we encourage the integration transportation and land use in a way that reduces Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions by facilitating the provision of more proximate goods and services to shorten trip lengths, as well as achieve a high level of non-motorized travel and transit use. As such, we encourage the evaluation the potential of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) applications in order to better manage the

*Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability*
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR
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Mr. Tyler Barrington, County of Nevada
January 30, 2017
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transportation network, as well as transit service and bicycle or pedestrian connectivity improvements. The Department also seeks to reduce serious injuries and fatalities, as well as provide equitable mobility options for people who are economically, socially, or physically disadvantaged. Therefore, we encourage the evaluation of the project site for access problems, VMT, and service needs that may need to be addressed.

Traffic Operations

The report assumes that the signal will operate like an urban signal with roughly balanced volumes on all legs. However, this is a different situation for the following reasons:

- This intersection is rural, so it is not connected to any other traffic signals. It works alone.
- The traffic volumes on Route 49 are very high compared to the volumes on Alta Sierra Drive.
- Route 49 is on a grade, uphill to the north. The grade impacts how people drive through the intersection.

For these reasons, we operate the signal to provide maximum green time to Route 49 traffic, and only interrupt the highway when there are vehicles queued on Alta Sierra Drive. Our signal timing is well suited to this location; the assumptions about signal timing are invalid.

The following comments pertain to Appendix 15 of the DEIR.

- Figure 4 – Project Trip Distribution (Page 363 of the PDF)
  - This figure shows 5% of trips to Johnson Place. This is unrealistic, as there are few destinations along Johnson Place and the distance is short enough to be an attractive walking trip. The more logical assignment of those 5% is to the south of Alta Sierra Drive. Many people in the Lime Kiln area currently drive south to the Wolf Road/Combie Road intersection for minor shopping, as it is a shorter drive than to Grass Valley. These residents will be drawn to the Alta Sierra Dollar General due to the shorter distance.

- HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary – SR 49 at Alta Sierra Drive
  - Existing Conditions (Pages 392 and 393 of the PDF)
    - The Signal Information section shows a cycle of 35.9 seconds for the AM Peak and 60.0 seconds for the PM Peak. These numbers are not realistic. (See the attached Signal Timing Plan)
    - Our calculations show that the absolute minimum signal cycle length is 44 seconds.
      - When there are higher volumes of southbound left turns, that phase

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
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can be extended an additional 20 seconds.

- When there are higher volumes on northbound and southbound Route 49, those phases can be extended an additional 60 seconds.
- When there are higher volumes of westbound left turns, that phase can be extended an additional 25 seconds.
  o In both the AM and PM peak hours, there is a steady stream of vehicles on Route 49. Therefore, the maximum extensions for those phases are likely to be reached. Extensions for the other phases are also likely during peak hours, so the overall cycle length will typically be two minutes or longer.
  o These actual cycle lengths correspond to levels of service significantly below LOS A in the AM Peak and LOS B in the PM Peak.

- HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summary – SR 49 at Alta Sierra Drive – Existing plus Project Conditions (Pages 401 and 402 of the PDF)
  o The Signal Information section shows a cycle of 36.5 seconds for the AM Peak and 58.6 seconds for the PM Peak. These are unrealistic. As the traffic volumes have increased, the signal cycle lengths will need to increase.

- The same issues are apparent in the HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summaries for Year 2035 Without Project (pages 412 and 413 of the PDF) and the HCS 2010 Signalized Intersection Results Summaries for Year 2035 With Project (pages 421 and 422 of the PDF).

- An issue that will be exacerbated by the incorrect timing plan is the queue lengths on Alta Sierra Drive. Page 5 of the traffic study (page 352 of the PDF) shows insufficient length for right turns from westbound Alta Sierra Drive to northbound Route 49. This (unnamed) table is for the existing condition, and the queue lengths will be longer than were calculated by the inaccurate signal timing assumptions. The queue lengths will increase due the proposed project, and will increase further in future years.

We request that Nevada County require installation of a right-turn overlap at this location as a condition of approval for this development. This will ensure that as many vehicles as possible are able to make westbound-to-northbound right turns on a green arrow. Others will be able to make legal right turns on the red phase, when safe to do so. Those turns, however, are much less efficient and many drivers are unwilling to make them due to the speed of oncoming traffic and the uphill grade to the north. This will help overall signal operations, providing only the necessary green time for westbound-to-southbound turns, which leaves the remaining time for Route 49 operations.

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"
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- The construction of this right-turn overlap will mostly consist of:
  - Replacing one existing three-section signal head with a five-section signal head.
  - Installation of a new five-section signal head on a new Type 1B pole in the northeast quadrant of the intersection.
  - Tying all the connections into the signal controller box.

Caltrans Signal Operations engineers will review the plans and will assist in making the upgrade operational.

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 David Smith, Intergovernmental Review Coordinator for Nevada County, by phone (530) 634-7799 or via email to david.j.smith@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

KEVIN YOUNT, North Branch Chief
Office of Transportation Planning
Regional Planning Branch—North

Enclosures

“Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability”
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#### Configuration Phase Flags

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases (2-1-1-1)</th>
<th>Permit (2-1-1-3)</th>
<th>Phase Features (2-1-1-4)</th>
<th>Startup (2-1-1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>12...6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>First Green Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Start Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Start Overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian Overlaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Startup All-Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call To Phase (2-1-2-1)</th>
<th>Omit On Green</th>
<th>Flashing Colors (2-1-2-2)</th>
<th>Special Operation (2-1-2-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Flash Phases</td>
<td>Single Exit Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yellow Flash Overlap</td>
<td>Driveway Signal Phases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flash In Red Phases</td>
<td>Driveway Signal Overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flash In Red Overlap</td>
<td>Leading Ped Phases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian (2-1-3)</th>
<th>Overlap (2-1-4)</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Omit</th>
<th>No Start</th>
<th>Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>TIMING</th>
<th>Phase (2-2)</th>
<th>-1-</th>
<th>-2-</th>
<th>-3-</th>
<th>-4-</th>
<th>-5-</th>
<th>-6-</th>
<th>-7-</th>
<th>-8-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Don't Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Green</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dot Limit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Initial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Green 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Gap</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Gap</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Per Vehicle</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Gap By</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Every</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-Red</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red B/C (2-2)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay/Early Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Don't Walk</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Green</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike All-Red</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERLAP TIMING</th>
<th>Red Revert</th>
<th>Max 2 Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter B Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan 11...19 (7-2) TIMING DATA</th>
<th>COORDINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ Offsets ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 12: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 13: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 14: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 15: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 16: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 17: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 18: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 19: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan 11...19 (7-2) PHASE FLAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinated Phase</th>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Multi</th>
<th>Leg Gap</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 21: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 22: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 23: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 24: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 25: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 26: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 27: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 28: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 29: Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Plan 21...29 (7-3) PHASE FLAGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Letter B Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detector Attributes (5-1)</th>
<th>Slot</th>
<th>Detector Configuration (6-2)</th>
<th>Failure Times (5-3)</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Failure Override (6-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Def Type</td>
<td>Ctrl</td>
<td>Detal Delay</td>
<td>Extend</td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>Port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 49</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. COUNTER-ALL-EXTEND 29</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Failure Times (5-3)
- Maximum On Time
- Fail Reset Time

#### Failure Override (6-4)
- Detectors 1-6
- Detectors 9-18
- Detectors 19-24
- Detectors 25-32
- Detectors 33-40
- Detectors 41-44

#### System Detector Assignment (5-5)
- Sys Det 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
- Sys Det 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

#### CIC Operation (6-6)
- Enable in Plans

#### CIC Values (6-2)
- Volume
- Occupancy
- Demand
- Smoothing
- Multiplier
- Exponent

#### Detector-to-Phase Assignment (6-3)
- Sys Det 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
- Phase
- Sys Det 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
- Phase

#### Input File Port-Bit Assignments

Nevada County
Dollar General Stores
September 2017
Final Environmental Impact Report
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Letter B Continued
### HOLIDAY TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floating Holiday Table (B-2-B)</th>
<th>Fixed Holiday Table (B-2-B)</th>
<th>Solar Clock Data (B-8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Mnth</td>
<td>Week</td>
<td>DOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOD FUNCTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOD Functions (B-3)</th>
<th>Action Codes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Letter B Continued

**Railroad Preemption**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR (1-1-1)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Flags (1-1-2)</th>
<th>Pedestrian Flags (1-1-3)</th>
<th>Overlap Flags (1-1-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>Yellow Signal</td>
<td>Flash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear 2</td>
<td>Red Signal</td>
<td>Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flash DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solid DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min Gm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yel Flash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ped Gm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Flash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exit Parameters (1-1-6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR (2-1-1)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Flags (2-2-2)</th>
<th>Pedestrian Flags (2-2-3)</th>
<th>Overlap Flags (2-2-4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
<td>Yellow Signal</td>
<td>Flash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear 2</td>
<td>Red Signal</td>
<td>Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Flash DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solid DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min Gm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yel Flash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ped Gm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Red Flash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exit Parameters (2-2-6)**

**Emergency Vehicle Preemption**

**EVA (3-3-A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Green</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Phase Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NO ADVANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVC (3-3-C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Green</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Phase Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NO ADVANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVR (3-3-B)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Green</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Phase Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NO ADVANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVD (3-3-D)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Phase Green</th>
<th>Overlap Green</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Latching</th>
<th>Phase Termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>NO ADVANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Letter B Continued

---

**INPUTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enable</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max ON</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max OFF</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cabinet Status (2-1-5-3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Part</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flash Bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door Ajar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Sense</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop Time</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Function (2-1-5-4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manual Control (2-1-5-2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Port</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Battery Backup (2-1-5-6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLASHING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Y-Coordination (2-1-5-6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port C</th>
<th>Port D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**OUTPUTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loadswitch Assignments (2-1-6)</th>
<th>+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Loadswitch Codes:

- 0 Unused (no output)
- 1-8 Vehicle 1-8
- 9-14 Overlap A-F
- 21-28 Ped 1-8
- 41-47 Special Functions
- 41 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 1
- 42 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 2
- 43 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 3
- 45 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 5
- 47 Protected Permissive Flashing Phase 7

---
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#### TRANSIT PRIORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Green Factor</th>
<th>Early Green</th>
<th>Green Extend</th>
<th>Inhibit Cycles</th>
<th>Phase 1 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 2 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 3 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 4 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 5 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 6 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 7 Minimum</th>
<th>Phase 8 Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan 1</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 2</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 3</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 4</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 5</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 6</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 7</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 8</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 9</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 10</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 11</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 12</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 13</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 14</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 15</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 16</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 17</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 18</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan 19</td>
<td>Green Factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### YELLOW YIELD COORDINATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y-Coord Plans (T-C)</th>
<th>Long Grn/No Grn Offset</th>
<th>Perm</th>
<th>.5</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.8</th>
<th>.0</th>
<th>.2</th>
<th>.4</th>
<th>.6</th>
<th>.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TRUCK PRIORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truck Priority (3-F)</th>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Carry Over</th>
<th>Clearance</th>
<th>Next Priority</th>
<th>Phase Green</th>
<th>Det 1 Port</th>
<th>Det 2 Port</th>
<th>Det 3 Port</th>
<th>Det 4 Port</th>
<th>Sign</th>
<th>Slave Input</th>
<th>Slave Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter B – Scott Morgan, California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse

Response B-1: The State Clearinghouse (SCH) provided a letter from the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) dated January 31, 2017, and noted that it received the letter after the close of the comment period. The County received Caltrans’ letter separately on January 30, 2017, before the close of the comment period. Responses to the Caltrans comments are provided in Responses A-1 through A-8.
**Letter C**

From: Shannon Wood <Wood@nidwater.com>
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store Projects - NID Comments
Attachments: Pages from 2.0 Project Description-1.pdf; Pages from ES-Executive Summary.pdf

Tyler,

Staff has a couple comments. The attached pages show highlighted areas, as well as comments in the document. Here’s a summary:

- ES-2 -- I am not sure how they define offsite construction -- but I understood that the RR site will still be connecting to our system with PFS and supplementing their flow with onsite FH and pump.

- 2-2.0 -- At the RR site a 48,000 tank is in addition to the PFS. This is statement misleading in my opinion. PV improvements will improve the FF, but existing conditions provide only 300 gpm.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Shannon Wood
Business Services Technician
Nevada Irrigation District
1036 W. Main Street
Grass Valley, CA 95945
530-273-6185 ext. 240
Letter C Continued

Table ES-1: Overview of Project Attributes

<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>Proposed Parking Spaces</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alta Sierra</td>
<td>9,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>20,260 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,411 sq. ft.</td>
<td>6,622 sq. ft. (15.2%)</td>
<td>43,463 sq. ft. (1.00 acre)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Valley</td>
<td>9,100 sq. ft.</td>
<td>24,511 sq. ft.</td>
<td>7,013 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. (1.92 acre)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

While the footprints of the proposed buildings are the same for each of the stores, the exterior design elements differ slightly. The exterior design of each of the buildings is based on a western motif. Proposed parking also differs at each site depending on the lot size and configuration and building layout. As allowed by Nevada County Land Use and Development Code Section L-II 4.2.9.F.12, for those sites that provide less than the required parking of 48 spaces (Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites), the applicant has provided a parking study prepared by a registered traffic engineer that demonstrates that the proposed parking would meet demand. Lighting for the proposed projects would be designed in accordance with the Nevada County Code. Landscaping would be provided for each of the projects. Each of the proposed projects would set aside a portion of the respective project site as permanent open space in accordance with Nevada County Code.

Potable water for all three sites would be provided by the Nevada Irrigation District (NID). Off-site construction within the existing roadway is necessary to connect the Alta Sierra site to water infrastructure. No off-site construction for connection to water infrastructure is necessary for the Penn Valley and Rough and Ready Highway sites.

Wastewater treatment and disposal would be provided through separate and Rough and Ready Highway sites. The Penn Valley site would connect to the Sanitation District-Penn Valley sewer system through existing sewer lines adjacent to the site.

Storm drainage for each of the sites would include on-site detention, into off-site storm drainage ditches or washes. Each project would be project surface drainage flows at pre-project levels.

Permits and Approvals

Nevada County will use this EIR in considering approval of each of the proposed projects. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, the EIR will be used as the primary environmental document in consideration of all subsequent planning and permitting actions associated with each project, to the extent such actions require CEQA compliance. These County actions, both discretionary and ministerial, include but are not limited to the following:

- Development Permit
- Lot Line Adjustment (Penn Valley site)

I am not sure how they define offsite construction — but I understand that the RR site will still be connecting to our system with PFS and supplementing their flow with onsite FH and pump.
Letter C Continued

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

PARKING REQUIREMENTS

Section L-II 4.2.9, Parking, of the Nevada County Code identifies parking requirements for development in the county. For general retail uses, the parking requirement is 1 space per 200 square feet of gross floor area plus 1 space per 600 square feet of outdoor use area. The code allows the required number of parking stalls to be modified by the Planning Agency if a parking study, submitted by the applicant and prepared by a registered professional engineer authorized to practice as a traffic engineer, substantiates that the number of stalls required for a proposed use is significantly different from the standard. Based on square footage, each of the projects would require 46 parking spaces. Proposed parking at each site differs depending on the lot size and configuration, and building layout, with the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites seeking a reduction in the required number of spaces, as shown in Table 2.0-2. The proposed reduced parking is substantiated by traffic engineer studies showing a reduced demand. The proposed parking layout for each site is shown on the respective site plans [see Figures 2.0-8a, 2.0-9, and 2.0-10].

OPEN SPACE REQUIREMENTS

Nevada County Code Section L-II 4.2.10, Permanent Open Space/Maximum Impervious Surface, establishes minimum standards for the provision of permanent open space as part of proposed development projects. The code requires projects that are one acre or more in size and below 4,000 feet elevation to maintain a minimum of 15 percent of the site as permanent open space. As shown in Table 2.0-2, each of the proposed projects would set aside a portion of the respective project site as permanent open space in accordance with this standard.

UTILITIES

Potable water for all three sites would be provided by the Nevada Irrigation District (NID). Existing water lines are located in Alta Sierra Drive, adjacent to the Alta Sierra site, and on-site for the Penn Valley site and the Rough and Ready Highway site. Off-site construction within the existing roadway is necessary to connect the Alta Sierra site to water infrastructure. No off-site construction for connection to water infrastructure is necessary for the Penn Valley and Rough and Ready Highway sites. To provide adequate water volume and flow to meet fire suppression requirements, the Rough and Ready Highway location would require the installation of an approximately 48,000-gallon underground water tank with pump to satisfy fire flow requirements. The Rough and Ready Highway project will also include a fire pump to operate on-site fire hydrant and building sprinklers. The tank and hydrant will be located within the project site.

Wastewater treatment and disposal would be provided through septic systems at the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites. The Alta Sierra site septic system would include off-site leach fields on adjacent parcels directly to the north of the project site. The septic system for the Rough and Ready Highway site would also be set off-site by the project site. Off-site improvements would be necessary for the County Sanitation District-Penn Valley service area adjacent to the site.

Storm drainage for each of the sites would include on-site detention, which would ultimately flow into off-site storm drainage ditches or washes. Each project would be designed to maintain post-project surface drainage flows at pre-project levels. Curb openings would direct stormwater runoff into a bioretention basin where it would pass through a water quality filter. The flow would then be conveyed via pipe to adjacent underground detention pipes, the detention pipes would drain at a rate less than the pre-development flows to a roadside ditch for the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites. The Penn Valley site's runoff would flow into a wash.
Letter C – Shannon Wood, Nevada Irrigation District (NID)

Response C-1: As noted in the Draft EIR on page 14.0-25, in Section 14.0, Public Services and Utilities, the Penn Valley project site is currently connected to existing NID water supply infrastructure in the adjacent roadway and off-site connection is not required. Similarly, as stated on Draft EIR page 14.0-33, the Rough and Ready Highway site is currently connected to existing water supply infrastructure in the adjacent roadway and no off-site improvements would be required to provide water service to the project. Thus, both projects intend to connect to the NID system.

Response C-2: The Rough and Ready Highway site would connect to the NID system and provide a 48,000-gallon storage tank. As discussed on Draft EIR page 10.0-13, the project applicant intends to meet its required fire flow requirement for the Penn Valley site through the use of existing NID water and the installation of on-site water storage tanks with a fire-rated fire pump, hydrant, and post indicator valve for the fire sprinkler system. The Penn Valley Fire Protection District determined the required fire flow is 1,500 gpm and water supply needed is 180,000 gallons. Mitigation measure MM PV-10.2.4 requires 180,000 gallons of storage for the Penn Valley project.
Letter 1

From: Susan Davis <cocreationchampion@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 15, 2016 9:29 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: RE: Dollar General Plan

To: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner

RE: The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the three Dollar General projects located in unincorporated western Nevada County (in the Alta Sierra Rural Center, Penn Valley Community Region, and Grass Valley Community Region)

NO MORE Dollar Generals in Nevada County!

I am a homeowner at 12381 Sunset Ave. Grass Valley, and the proposed site for the Dollar General at the corner of Rough and Ready Highway and West Drive WILL NEGATIVELY IMPACT this neighborhood with traffic, noise, parking lot light at night, trash, retail bringing too many people into a RESIDENTIAL, FAMILY FRIENDLY NEIGHBORHOOD, and do harm to the natural environment.

This proposal is extremely short-sighted and NOT what is needed to continue quality of life for the residents of Nevada County. We DO NOT need nor want more chain-store, discount retail in our residential neighborhoods.

susanM davis • Speaker, Facilitator, Mentor

The CoPassion Project - Humans Being Positively Human

Our New Project: A Place To Call Home - www.A-Place-to-Call-Home.org
Letter 1 Continued

Banner Mountain Retreat is officially on AirBnB- Check it Out:
www.airbnb.com/rooms/6558699

www.BannerMountainRetreat.com

The Co-Creating Community
The CoPassion Project - Humans Being Positively Human

Cell: 650-823-6232
Skype: positivelymutabile
Facebook Public Profile

LIKE Us on Facebook:
Banner Mountain Retreat
GOOD AND GREEN RADIO
The CoCreating Community
The CoPassion Project - Humans Being Positively Human
Connect with me on:

Susan M. Davis
about.me/SusanMDavis_CoCreationChampion

"Be the change you wish to see in the World." Gandhi
Letter 1 – Susan M. Davis

**Response 1-1:** Areas of concern noted by the commenter were traffic, noise, parking lot lighting, trash, and attracting additional people to the neighborhood. The comment is of a general nature. The topics noted in the comment letter are addressed in the Draft EIR.

Potential traffic-related impacts resulting from the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project were addressed in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, subsection 15.3, on pages 15.0-26 through 15.0-38. The Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, traffic impacts at the Rough and Ready Highway site would be less than significant. Please see also Master Response 6.

Potential noise-related impacts resulting from the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project were addressed in Draft EIR Section 13.0, Noise, subsection 13.3, on pages 13.0-17 through 13.0-21. The Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, noise impacts at the Rough and Ready Highway site would be less than significant.

Potential lighting-related impacts resulting from the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project were addressed in Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics, subsection 4.3, on pages 4.0-34 through 4.0-37 (see Impact 4.3.2(RR)). The Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, lighting impacts at the Rough and Ready Highway site would be less than significant. Specifically, mitigation measure MM RR-4.3.2a requires the lighting plan for the development to demonstrate that all light spill will be retained on the project site.

With regard to trash, the project applicant will be required to control litter on-site in accordance with Section G-IV 8.4 of the Nevada County Code. Compliance will be monitored and enforced by the County throughout the life of the project through its Code Compliance Division. It is within the County’s authority to enforce this regulation and take necessary actions should the project applicant fail to abide by the County’s litter control regulation, as provided under County Code Section G-IV 8.12.

The potential environmental effects of project operation, which would include customers (visitors) traveling to the store, are discussed throughout the Draft EIR, including Sections 5.0, Air Quality; 9.0, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; 12.0, Land Use and Planning; 13.0, Noise; 14.0, Public Services and Utilities; and 15.0, Traffic and Transportation.
I have taken a look at the DEIR for the proposed development of a Dollar General Store on Alta Sierra Drive. I am a resident of the Alta Sierra Neighborhood and also have a Private Psychotherapy Practice in that neighborhood. I understand that the impact report finds that there is, overall, less than significant impact (with mitigation measures) for the proposed project and I am not opposed commercial development in general at that site. However, I am concerned that the specific project is not in the best interest of the community in terms of long term planning. A dollar-type store and a store of that size does not seem consistent with the needs of the community nor a right fit for the general “feel” of the location. There are already two dollar-type stores in Grass Valley in commercial areas which are well suited to that type of commercial business. The proposed area in Alta Sierra is, in my opinion, more suited to smaller scale commercial development. Additionally, there is no real need for the products offered by a dollar-type store. Instead, it is my opinion that a small grocery store offering fresh produce and more substantial grocery options than are offered by the predominately liquor store options offered by the adjacent Alta Sierra Market would be a better fit. Given the percentage of retired individuals, a small SPD type market with potential for small pharmacy would be a better long term planning option. Other options might include other, small-scale, higher quality commercial offerings rather than a dollar store.

In closing, I am fully in support of improvements and development in that vicinity as it is currently under-used and not well planned. That said, I think long-term planning that fits the needs of the community is best practice. I don’t believe a Dollar General Store is what this community needs and therefore don not support this project.

Laurie Fitzgerald, LMFT
MFC #41461
530.446.3175
530.278.8852
www.laurie-fitzgerald-lmft.com
Letter 2 – Laurie Fitzgerald

Response 2-1: The comment is related to the merits of the project in Alta Sierra and also notes that the Draft EIR concluded that the Alta Sierra project would result in less than significant impacts with the implementation of mitigation. It should be noted that Impact 4.1.1(AS) in the Draft EIR (page 4.0-6) concluded that the Alta Sierra project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to substantial changes to the visual character of the site and the surrounding area. Also to note, the County is only able to conduct an environmental review of projects that have been proposed by applicants; no other commercial projects have been proposed for development at the project sites at this time. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 3

From: K Taylor <ktaylor.ca@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 19, 2016 8:19 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: DEIR for Dollar Store -- Rough and Ready Hwy

Hi Tyler,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the environmental review of the proposed Dollar General store on Rough and Ready Highway, less than 1 mile from my house. I have the following comments.

1) The cumulative amount of traffic which will be generated by all of the previously approved projects in the area is already above desirable levels for a semi-rural area. This is a broader topic for the county that should be addressed before any new projects are added.  

2) The environmental analyses found documents indicating past UST issues but no documents indicating a full site investigation and cleanup, only an unanswered document request. The analysis concluded that there was "no" issue on the basis of lack of information. This is inappropriate. The project applicant should conduct a survey to verify that a) no USTs remain and b) that no contamination exists as a result of removed USTs.  

3) The traffic analysis did not include any assessment of the effect of either the project or mitigation on bicycle traffic. Rough and Ready Highway in this section is part of one of the premier bicycling routes in the county and is the focus of road improvement expenditures on Newtown Road. Additional traffic through the Bitney Springs/Rough and Ready and Rough and Ready/Ridge Rd intersections will significantly affect the risk to bicyclists. As vehicle traffic exceeds the capacity of a road, drivers become irate and are more likely to be unsafe. This will affect bicyclists first. Putting stoplights in at Bitney Springs and Ridge Road is not by itself an acceptable means of mitigating the risk to bicycle traffic. Bike sensors would need to be placed at some distance north of Rough and Ready Highway on the west side of Bitney Springs to allow a bicyclist to trigger the light and maintain uphill momentum. The shoulder at that location needs to be wide enough for a cyclist to fall over (which happens when you are clipped to pedals and unexpectedly have to stop), and a crossing button placed within reach of a rider. 

The intersection at Ridge Road is more problematic as both the bike route and many vehicles bear left onto Ridge Road. Bikes need to be able to safely merge across one lane of traffic and then have a safe place to stop before crossing remaining lanes with the same sensors and crossing button characteristics. A traffic circle might be a safer option.

4) The environmental impact analyses were done for a "variety store" (see trip generation reference in the traffic assessment). It is my understanding that Dollar General stores also sell alcohol. Either a new study needs to be done to augment the existing studies to ensure impacts associated with alcohol sales are adequately characterized and mitigated, or the project should only be approved with the condition that no alcohol sales permit will be issued.  

5) The sale of alcohol at this location is a health and safety issue. It is well documented that a vast majority of police hours in the Grass Valley area are associated with homeless and drug abuse issues. Homeless camps are frequently seen within 1 mile of the proposed facility and adding a new liquor sale outlet makes it more likely that there will be foot traffic through undeveloped areas to the proposed project.
6) Nevada County needs to add a light pollution ordinance. I moved here in part because of the semi-rural nature of the area and having massive lights on next door to me which could not be turned off would take away my ability to see stars from inside my house, and require the purchase of light-blocking shades to obtain dark when it should be dark outside. At the very least, the project should be required to minimize lighting during hours when the store is closed, by ensuring downward-facing lights and security lights on motion sensors. The potential street lights are also a light pollution issue. I don't think anyone making the decision about this project would want blinking colored lights reflecting in their home at night.

The proposed site is a residential neighborhood, even though the parcel is zoned as commercial. There are much more appropriate neighborhood commercial enterprises than a large neon-signed monster building that sells mainly cheap stuff imported from China and sneaks in liquor sales to make it work. I cannot imagine living next door and would certainly expect to be compensated for declines in my property value if the wrong commercial enterprise were allowed to go in next door.

These are, I presume, the Aesthetics and Land Use impacts that can not be mitigated. On that basis, I urge you to deny the permit and to establish more clearly what qualities these commercially-zoned parcels within residential neighborhoods need to comply with so we won't have this issue come up again in the future.

Thank you

Kim Taylor
10231 Mills Rd
Grass Valley CA
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 3 – Kim Taylor

Response 3-1: The Draft EIR evaluates cumulative traffic impacts in Impact 15.6.1(RR) on page 15.0-45 (see Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation). The cumulative analysis assumes existing, proposed, planned, and approved development, and the Draft EIR concluded the impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

Response 3-2: The findings of the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared for the Rough and Ready Highway project site are summarized on pages 10.0-13 and 10.0-14 of Draft EIR Section 10.0, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. The Phase II ESA report is provided in its entirety in Draft EIR Appendix 10.0-C. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the Phase II ESA did not identify any underground storage tanks (USTs) on the site but did identify a location of a probable former UST pit. Soils testing was performed, which determined that contaminant levels are below applicable screening levels, and the report determined that no further investigation is warranted. The Draft EIR identifies mitigation measure MM RR-10.3.2a, which would ensure that any hazardous materials contamination, including previously unknown USTs, discovered during site development is properly managed under the direction of a qualified professional and in consultation with County staff and other regulatory agencies, as appropriate. Please see also Master Response 4 for information on EIR adequacy.

Response 3-3: As discussed on Draft EIR page 15.0-45, all study intersections would operate within an acceptable level of service (LOS) during the peak hours for cumulative traffic conditions, with the exception of the intersection of Rough and Ready Highway and Ridge Road. Mitigation measure MM RR-15.3.1 requires the project to construct a signal at this intersection or pay fair share fees toward its construction prior to project operation, which would improve operations at this intersection to an acceptable LOS during the peak hours for cumulative traffic conditions. The Rough and Ready Highway project would also be required to pay the Western Nevada County Regional Transportation Mitigation Fee and the Local Traffic Mitigation Fee. These fees are used to offset a new project’s impacts to the county’s roadway system. Therefore, the project would not result in increases in traffic that exceeds roadway capacity. With regard to driver behavior, the EIR cannot predict the reaction of drivers to cyclists, nor is there any evidence to suggest that traffic generated by the project would be any less safe to pedestrians or cyclists. Please see Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, subsection 15.3 in the Draft EIR for a discussion on non-vehicular circulation and potential impacts.

Response 3-4: The proposed stores would sell a limited variety of beer and wine, but would not sell liquor (see page 6 in Appendix 12.0-B, Economic Study). The trip generation rate used for the project considers product sales that would occur at the proposed stores (see Appendix 15.0-C, Rough and Ready Dollar General Focused Traffic Analysis (Revised), in the Draft EIR). Please see also Master Response 4 for information on EIR adequacy.

Response 3-5: The consumption of alcohol and its effects on human behavior is a social issue, which does not require analysis in the Draft EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15131). However, issues relating to law enforcement are discussed in the Draft EIR in Section 14.0, Public Services and Utilities. Please see also Response 3-4.
Response 3-6: The addition of outdoor lighting fixtures and associated light pollution at the Rough and Ready Highway site are evaluated in Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in Impact 4.3.2(RR) on pages 4.0-36 through 4.0-38. As discussed on these pages, the project would comply with Nevada County’s Land Use and Development Code Section L-II 4.2.8(D)(2), which requires all lighting fixtures to be shielded and directed downward, requires the use of occupancy sensors or time controls to allow lights to be turned off as needed, and requires lighting to be turned off between the hours of 11 PM and sunrise. Furthermore, mitigation measure MM RR-4.3.2a (Draft EIR page 4.0-37) requires the lighting plan for the proposed Rough and Ready Highway development to demonstrate that all light spill will be retained on the project site, and mitigation measure MM RR-4.3.2b prohibits internally lit signs. Based on the existing regulations and the mitigation measures in the Draft EIR, lighting impacts resulting from the Rough and Ready Highway project were determined to be less than significant. The commenter’s suggestions for possible improvements to nighttime lighting design will be considered during the decision-making process.

Response 3-7: While the General Plan land use designation and zoning allow for the proposed use at the Rough and Ready Highway site, Draft EIR Impact 12.3.2(RR) on pages 12.0-14 through 12.0-16 (see Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning) acknowledges that the proposed development would not be compatible with the surrounding residential uses due to its proposed size and scale, and the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

Response 3-8: Please see Master Response 2.
Regarding the proposed Dollar General store in Alta Sierra

I would like to express my support for bringing the Dollar General Store to Alta Sierra. My wife and I both own businesses here in Alta Sierra and have lived in the neighborhood for over 10 years. We all struggle to make ends meet and are always looking for businesses that help us do that. We have been making the long trek down to Wal-mart every month or so to get many items that are much less expensive than the stores here in Grass Valley. We sometimes spend hundreds of dollars to stock up on certain items because we do not want to make the trip all the time. That is the first reason I support the new store here. I know we are not the only people who do the same thing. That means thousands of dollars in revenue are going to Roseville, or Target in Auburn, when a good portion of that money could remain here.

The second reason would be the jobs that this new store would create, not just the store workers but the construction contractors and other supporting businesses who would also gain a little more income.

Third would be the fees and taxes the county would receive which could be used for the good of the entire community.

The forth reason would be simply the convenience of having the items they carry close to home. Folks who cannot drive too far or perhaps do not have a car would now have a way to save money, gas and time. It is 10 miles to Raley's one way and 17 miles to Safeway one way from Alta Sierra. We could reduce the traffic on 49 a little and maybe even have a few less accidents! When it snows here in Alta Sierra the roads get treacherous, a store close by would be very appreciated during those times.

Yes, there might be a bit more traffic, but that would encourage a little more income and exposure for LOCAL businesses. Most of the traffic would be coming directly off Highway 49, not through the back streets of the neighborhood.
Letter 4 Continued

I respect those who think it will negatively effect the look of the community but I disagree. I have been to the Dollar General in Grass Valley. It is a clean, well maintained store. Their signs are within the proper guidelines, their employees are friendly and courteous. The parking lot is clean and modern, with the required handicapped access. It is a professional looking establishment and is not too big for the area.

If you want to see an eyesore look no further than the Alta Sierra Market. The outside is very trashy and their signs are in terrible condition. The parking lot is poorly set up. The prices are ridiculous and their perishable items are usually past their expiration date. However to date I have never heard of a complaint to get them to correct these conditions or any suggestion that they close.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely;

Michael Gregory
17711 Penny Court
Grass Valley, CA

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Letter 4 – Michael Gregory

Response 4-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 5

From: Stacie Jeffery <stacie.jeffery@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2016 12:14 PM
To: Tyler Barrington

I, for one, do NOT want to see any more Dollar General stores in Nevada County especially in Penn Valley. I went to the one in town and was shocked at the poor quality of the merchandize, and I do go to Dollar Store, a big difference! Please consider how far up Penn Valley has come with Whim and the Blue Cow Deli and do not allow this store in Penn Valley.

Stacie Jeffery

--

Stacie Jeffery
Letter 5 – Stacie Jeffery

**Response 5-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 6

From: Scott Campbell <longrider.scott@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2016 8:05 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No Dollar General in Alta Sierra

Personally I wouldn't shop there. I don't want to see it build in my neighborhood. Tell the company that it's a bad idea to put this store at this location. We like our little rural neighborhood just the way it is now. Don't need this big box store here. These are the comments I've heard from my neighbors. I am 100% in agreement with them. If we want to shop at Dollar General there is one up the hill from here. Just a short 10 minute drive.

Thank you for passing this on to the corporate office.

--
Scott Campbell
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

Letter 6 – Scott Campbell

Response 6-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses the rural nature of the region. Please see Master Response 4 and also Section 4.12, Land Use and Planning, subsection 4.12.1 in the Draft EIR for information on land use and zoning at the Alta Sierra site.
Letter 7

From: Melissa Hindt <mphindt@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 22, 2016 5:55 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Against Dollar General

I went in a Dollar General in Marysville, and was seriously just "creeped" out. I do not see the value of this store to our county and am totally against it. Just the one in Grass Valley dumbfounds me how it was put in so quickly without even notice. I can see that the locations for this very low level store will hurt the businesses of these small town areas that they are proposed. I will drive to town to shop at Grocery Outlet but have never entered the Dollar General in Grass Valley, that I'm sure competes with it. The store is a mish mash of low quality and random products. Let's keep this county upscale as it has been doing for so many years. If we want to fight for a quality store that would be immediately approved by residents lets try to get a Trader Joe's or a Target close by...though I will drive to Target in Yuba City or Auburn before I will step foot in Dollar General, and rarely go in Kmart. The two Dollar Stores adequately fill our need for very cheap products. We do not need more!

Melissa P. Hindt
26 year resident of Big Oak Valley, CA
Letter 7 – Melissa Hindt

Response 7-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 8

From: Janis McGregor <janismcgregor@att.net>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 9:31 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Please don't approve the store for Alta Sierra. It will not fit with the look of the area and is not a necessary store for the area.
Janis Mcgregor
15193 Sierra Star Lane
Alta Sierra

Sent from my iPhone
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 8 – Janis McGregor

Response 8-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses aesthetics of the region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 4.0, Aesthetics, subsection 4.1 in the Draft EIR for information on aesthetics at the Alta Sierra site.
Letter 9

From: Larry Flint <mnzimnn1@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 10:12 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in Penn Valley

Assuming the EIR doesn't come up with anything that can't be dealt with, I think the Dollar General store will be a great addition to the community.

Larry Flint
mnzimnn1@verizon.net
Letter 9 – Larry Flint

Response 9-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4. Please see Table ES-2 in the Draft EIR for a summary of all impacts and mitigation measures associated with the project.
Letter 10

From: Diane Spooner <dianespooner123@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 11:12 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Penn Valley Dollar General

Hi Tyler,

Please do not let the Penn Valley Dollar General be constructed. The town does not have infrastructure to support a large store such as this. Also, there are 3 “dollar” type stores in Grass Valley.

Thanks for listening.

Diane Spooner
Realtor
DRE License # 01911315

Coldwell Banker Grass Roots Realty
11364 Pleasant Valley Road
Penn Valley, California 95946
Direct Line - 530-559-6963

Oh, by the way®... I am never too busy for your referrals. If you know someone that would appreciate the kind of service I provide, please send me their name and number and I'll be happy to follow up and take great care of them.
Letter 10 – Diane Spooner

Response 10-1: Please see Draft EIR Section 14.0, Public Services and Utilities, subsection 14.2 for a discussion of the existing water, wastewater, and stormwater drainage infrastructure that serves the Penn Valley project site and the proposed improvements necessary to support the proposed development. The Draft EIR [Impacts 14.2.2(PV) through 14.2.5(PV)] determined that the proposed Penn Valley project would result in less than significant impacts on utility systems. Please see also Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements and EIR adequacy.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 11

From: Jan Crowell <jann_c@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 1:09 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Generals

Not only does Alta Sierra NOT need this monstrosity at its entrance, the one store open at Brunswick is only 10-15 minutes away and in a “busy” area, yet barely utilized from the looks of the parking lot any time I see it. In addition, I thought our community, including Penn Valley and Rough and Ready were not to be turned into box store galore areas. These stores are full of stuff readily available at other local markets, just as cheap, without further cheapening the look and aspects of our communities....

Jan Crowell

--
Sent from Hotmail Email App app for Android
Letter 11 – Jan Crowell

Response 11-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 2 and Master Response 4.
Letter 12

From: boppabegga@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 1:09 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in Penn Valley

Tyler,
I would love to see a Dollar General or some kind of store like it in Penn Valley. Hate having to run all the way up to Grass Valley for sometimes one item that you cannot buy in Penn Valley. Hope it goes through with a YES.

Sharon Sanders        .......   Resident Owner in LWW     ...  Penn Valley
Letter 12 – Sharon Sanders

Response 12-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 13

December 19, 2016

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

From: Lamra Duncan  
Planning Commission, Dist. II  
950 Maidu Ave., Suite 200  
Nevada City, CA 95959

Subject: 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 noise, 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 these 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 850 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 and the Environmental impact of this Project. It is left to you, our County Sen, 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 Alta Sierra 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 Alta Sierra Market, being a small business, with this type of competition it is substantial enough to force the Alta Sierra 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 Environmental Impact 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/express 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 a residential street (A California State Law) 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. This would create an Environmental Impact. Please see Marc Mayfield's photographs of semi-trucks on curves notice the radius difference between the front turning wheels and the rear wheels on the curve.

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 (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.

The existing leach field for newly opened Mexican restaurant would have been 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. 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. The plans show the site where the Dollar General is to be located there is not enough room for a leach field and a repair area. A pumping system will be installed pump up hill to the area where the restaurant is located. This will require the removal of trees and natural habitat area for birds, small animals and the sun screen for the residents on Little Valley road. It will also require fourteen trees to be removed from where the new leach field is to be located. Therefore that creates an Environmental Impact.

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,

Dale E. Epps
16312 Gibbonie Ln.
Grass Valley, Ca 95949
Letter 13 – Dale E. Epps

Response 13-1: The commenter describes the potential impacts of the Alta Sierra project on oak trees and oak woodland habitat. Please see Master Response 7.

Response 13-2: The proposed Alta Sierra project has been designed to ensure there would be no net increase in flows toward Little Valley Road. See Master Response 5. Please see also Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements and EIR adequacy.

Response 13-3: Aesthetic impacts at the Alta Sierra site are evaluated in Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in Impact 4.1.1(AS) on pages 4.0-6 through 4.0-10, which describes potential aesthetic impacts at the Alta Sierra site. The Draft EIR specifically acknowledges the dramatic visual change that would occur at the site as viewed from Little Valley Road and the residences to the east. Draft EIR Figure 4.0-4 (page 4.0-19) shows a visual simulation of the proposed development from Little Valley Road. To address these impacts, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measure MM AS-4.1.1a, requiring modification to the building design to break up the mass of the proposed building and retaining wall, and mitigation measure MM AS-4.1.1c, requiring further screening of the proposed parking lot. While implementation of these measures would reduce the visual effect, the Draft EIR determined that the impact related to changes to the character of the area would be significant and unavoidable.

Response 13-4: Construction dust impacts at the Alta Sierra site are evaluated in Draft EIR Section 5.0, Air Quality, in Impact 5.1.1(AS) on pages 5.0-9 through 5.0-14, which evaluates dirt and dust generated by construction truck traffic. Mitigation measure MM AS-5.1.1b requires the project to develop and implement an air district approved Dust Control Plan (DCP) to minimize the spread of soil offsite. Draft EIR Impact 13.1.2(AS) on pages 13.0-9 through 13.0-11 (see Section 13.0, Noise) evaluates temporary construction noise impacts. Mitigation measure MM AS-13.1.2 requires implementation of construction best management practices (BMPs) to reduce construction noise. Draft EIR Impact 15.1.5(AS) on pages 15.0-13 through 15.0-14 in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, presents a discussion of construction traffic and parking impacts. Mitigation measure MM AS-15.1.5 requires the project to develop a Construction Traffic Control Plan, which will ensure the safe flow of traffic through the area during construction activities.

Response 13-5: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and addresses economic considerations. See Master Response 4.

Response 13-6: Traffic impacts at the Alta Sierra site are evaluated in Impact 15.1.2(AS) on pages 15.0-11 through 15.0-12. Please see Master Response 3 related to access to the project sites with STAA trucks.

Response 13-7: Potential drainage impacts on Alta Sierra Drive are evaluated in Impact 11.1.1(AS) on page 11.0-7 in Draft EIR Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, which acknowledges existing drainage problems on Alta Sierra Drive. The local roadway flooding conditions reported by the commenter were taken into consideration in the drainage study. See Master Response 5.
Response 13-8: The proposed septic system for the Alta Sierra site is discussed in Sections 8.0, Geology and Soils, 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, and 14.0, Public Services and Utilities, in the Draft EIR. Please see also Master Response 1 and Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements and EIR adequacy.

Response 13-9: Changes in habitat and effects on sensitive species at the Alta Sierra site are addressed in Impacts 6.1.3(AS) through 6.1.6(AS) on Draft EIR pages 6.0-12 through 6.0-17 in Section 6.0, Biological Resources. The County does not have a threshold for changes in shade on adjacent properties; however, the EIR does analyze the effects of the change in character related to the removal of trees and construction of the proposed store in Impact 4.1.1(AS) on Draft EIR pages 4.0-6 through 4.0-9. See also Master Response 2 and Master Response 6.
Letter 14

From: Craig Stidham <kingbluewolf@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 2:41 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General—No!

One store is enough and even that is too much.

I vote no on another Dollar General and a resounding hel no to a Dollar General in Penn Valley.

Craig Stidham

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone
Letter 14 – Craig Stidham

**Response 14-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 15

From: A A. Khatz <helikhat@peak.org>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No Dollar General!

NO on chain stores in Nevada County!

Jean Inglis
Amaryllis Khat
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 15 – Jean Inglis and Amaryllis Khat

Response 15-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 16

From: a5Schevyguy@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 4:06 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in local areas

Sir,

I do not want another store that sells nothing but cheap nick-nacks from China. We need businesses that have local ties to their communities and don't pay minimum wages. You can go almost anywhere and find stores that sell this kind of merchandise.

No more junk from China.....please!!

Thank you
Sincerely,

A concerned, property tax paying citizen who PAYs YOUR WAGES and all the perks that go with it. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you disagree.

Mike Frasu
18497 Easy st
Penn Valley, Ca 95946
530-550-3424
Letter 16 – Mike Frasu

Response 16-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 17

From: Cyril <cyril@fastmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 4:50 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Mr. Barrington,

I have lived in Nevada 40 of my 43 years. I grew up in Rough and Ready.
Consider that the population has more than tripled in that time. I feel that Nevada County has done a pretty good job
of keeping the corporate landscape at bay. We are a county that thus has not allowed a medical marijuana dispensary
or a strip club yet we are slowly allowing this corporate cancer to creep in at the expense of the character and beauty of
Nevada County as well our independent Ma & Pa retailers. So please, three more giant boxes filled with cheap, low
quality goods that can be easily purchased at existing retailers is not going to be a net benefit to Nevada County. Note; I
am not a retailer.

Sincerely,
Cyril Gueguen
cyril@fastmail.com
Letter 17 – Cyril Gueguen

Response 17-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 18

From: Ibbickel54@att.net
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 4:06 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: dollar general in PV

As homeowners and taxpayers of Penn Valley, Nevada County – we do not want to see a Dollar General or any Dollar Store in this community.

If we need cheap plastic junk we can go to any of the 3 Dollar type stores in Grass Valley. These stores do not fit in with the theme of our small town. We also don’t need any extra traffic by the PO.

We moved to Nevada County to get away from these types of stores. We always try to support small local businesses.

Please do not allow this to happen!!

Linda and Eric Bickel
1401S River Rock RD
Penn Valley CA 95946
Letter 18 – Linda and Erik Bickel

**Response 18-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 19

From: Darlene Reuss <darlenereuss1554@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store

I like the idea of having a Dollar General in Penn Valley.

Darlene Reuss
Letter 19 – Darlene Reuss (1)

Response 19-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 20

From: Joanie Salyer <jipplyiz48@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2016 8:30 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Re: Dollar General

Should say Charming town!

Sent from my iPad

> On Dec 27, 2016, at 8:15 AM, Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@co.nevada.ca.us> wrote:
> 
> Thank you for taking the time to provide your comments below. I will make sure they are included as a part of the public record.
> 
> Sincerely,
> 
> Tyler Barrington
> Principal Planner
> 
> Planning Department
> County of Nevada
> Community Development Agency
> 950 Maidu Ave. Suite 170
> Nevada City, CA 95959 office 530.470.2723 fax 530.265.9851
> http://www.mynevadacounty.com/nc/cda/planning/Pages/Home.aspx
> 
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Joanie Salyer [mailto:jipplyiz48@live.com]
> Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2016 12:15 PM
> To: Tyler Barrington <Tyler.Barrington@co.nevada.ca.us>
> Subject: Dollar General
> 
> We do Not want a Dollar General in our, Harmimg town of Penn Valley. We have very nice businesses opening every year. We will Not support a Dollar General!
> 
> JD and Joanie Salver
> 20694 Wildwood West Dr.
> Penn Valley
> 
> Sent from my iPhone
Letter 20 – JD and Joanie Salyer

Response 20-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 21

From: Damon Hague <damonhague@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 11:33 PM
To: Tyler Barrington

It seems to me the location would be unobtrusive and the store would provide some more employment. Some people just don’t want the status quo changed, but they didn’t mind changing it when they moved here. My vote is yes to Dollar General.
Letter 21 – Damon Hague

Response 21-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 22

From: Jackie Sponsler <jakejandy4262@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 3:51 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: NO to Dollar General!

This store has cheap junk. A store is Grass valley is close enough. I will not use the Penn Valley store.

Jackie Sponsler
Letter 22 – Jackie Sponsler

Response 22-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 23

From: Ken Getz <ken.getz@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 1:44 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Hi. Don’t know if getting emails like this means much, but as a citizen of Nevada County, I’d hate to see any more stores like Dollar General. We have so many thrift stores, and dollar stores, and they seem to just uglify our beautiful area. Enough already. We don’t need THREE MORE.

The environmental draft report recently released stated that the stores will have impacts on air quality, water quality and noise.

I sure don’t see a reason to impact air quality, water quality, and noise for three more dollar general stores. — Ken

Ken Getz
530-798-4204
Response 23-1: As the commenter notes, the project would result in impacts on air quality, water quality, and noise. Air quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 5.0, Air Quality, on pages 5.0-1 through 5.0-40. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all air quality impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, on pages 11.0-1 through 11.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all water quality impacts would be less than significant. Noise impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 13.0, Noise, on pages 13.0-1 through 13.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all noise impacts would be less than significant. The comment does not provide specific comments on the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. No further analysis is required.
Letter 24

From: Sylvia Wright <sciencewrighterphotos@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 11:41 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No to Penn Valley Dollar General

I oppose yet another Dollar General store in this region. They take business from locally owned small businesses and are known as unfair employers.

I particularly oppose an out-of-area chain store with poor outside appearance in this Penn Valley location, which is rustic and full of locally owned small businesses.

Thank you.

Sylvia Wright
14460 Lodgepole Drive
Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 24 – Sylvia Wright

Response 24-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and also discusses visual character. Please see Master Response 2 and Master Response 4.
Letter 25

From: Jeanette Paganetti <jsolpag@theunion.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 8:27 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store

We do NOT NEED more Dollar General stores in our community. Please STOP with this, this is a small town community not a Big store town, it goes against everything that people have come here for, the impact on the environment and the quality of life here is appalling, PLEASE STOP NOW!!!! Jeanette Paganetti
Letter 25 – Jeanette Paganetti

Response 25-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and environmental impacts in general. The Draft EIR discloses potential environmental impacts of the projects in Sections 4.0 through 17.0. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 26

From: Ronnie Paul <rpaul@theunion.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 8:25 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: DOLLAR STORE

Please veto all of the three Dollar stores proposed for Nevada County. We already have 2 Dollar stores and 1 Dollar General store in our area, and that is more than enough.

The environmental draft report recently released stated that the stores will have impacts on air quality, water quality, and noise. Please protect our community.

Thanks for your consideration.

Ronnie Paul
Nevada City

--
I am using the free version of SPAMfighter. SPAMfighter has removed 4367 of my spam emails to date. Get the free SPAMfighter here: http://www.spamfighter.com/len

Do you have a slow PC? Try a Free scan http://www.spamfighter.com/SLOW-PCfighter?cid=sigen
Letter 26 – Ronnie Paul

Response 26-1: As the commenter notes, the project would result in impacts on air quality, water quality, and noise. Air quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 5.0, Air Quality, on pages 5.0-1 through 5.0-40. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all air quality impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, on pages 11.0-1 through 5.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all water quality impacts would be less than significant. Noise impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 13.0, Noise, on pages 13.0-1 through 13.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all noise impacts would be less than significant. The comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft EIR. No further analysis is required.
Letter 27

From: Elizabeth Kobayashi <liznroy@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2016 6:22 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: GENERAL DOLLAR STORE

Tyler Barrington,

We have a General Dollar Store in Grass Valley. No need to have another in Penn Valley. Use your money to set up in a place where it is needed.

Thank you for your time.
Elizabeth Kobayashi, Penn Valley resident
Letter 27 – Elizabeth Kobayashi (1)

Response 27-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 28

From: Sandi Heilaman <kevandi@colfaxnet.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 25, 2016 11:38 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No more Dollar stores in Nevada County

Please refrain from any more building of Dollar Stores in Nevada County. We have 3 already in this area, and I want to keep our town quaint and beautiful. Thank you for consideration on this very important matter.

Sandi Heilaman

Sent from my iPhone
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 28 – Sandi Heilaman

Response 28-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 29

From: Darlene Reuss <darlenereuss1554@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 8:18 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Please disregard my previous comment. I thought that the business of discussion was whether to have a "Dollar Store", no "Dollar General ". I would have to change my opinion to NO Do not approve.
Darlene Reuss
Response 29-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 30

From: Jordan Wambaugh <jordan@wambaugh.org>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 11:07 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general in Penn Valley

I was told to email opinions about a dollar general opening in penn valley.
If businesses want to move into our town and bring in more tax revenue then I am all for it. America should be
free, and its people should be free to operate their businesses how they see fit.
I find the fact that this is up for debate ridiculous.

--
Jordan Wambaugh
Letter 30 – Jordan Wambaugh

**Response 30-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 31

From: Gail Rudberg <budgail@sti.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2016 6:34 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general store

I would prefer that we do not have a Dollar General store in Penn Valley. We don’t need it. We have two thrift stores and that’s just fine. We can go to Grass Valley for Dollar General.

Thank you.

Sent from my iPad.
Letter 31 – Gail Rudberg

Response 31-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 32

From: Lori Wilcox <vaccine@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 9:46 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I would NOT like to see a Dollar General Store or any other dollar store operate in our little town of Penn Valley. I envision our little town to have more boutiques, maybe a few wineries with a tasting room. To develop our downtown, to be more like Pleasanton's or St. Helena's and even Grass Valleys Mill street area. It would give residents and visitors a feel of quaintness, and most people love that.

I think it would be a really big mistake to have a Dollar General Store in Penn Valley for a few reasons, such as, we are only 10 minutes away from Grass Valley. Geez some comments that were made on Nextdoor Lake Wildwood make it sound like it is so far away and such an inconvenience.

In my opinion, the dollar stores in general, have a cheapness to them. Not the kind of cheapness because their merchandise is cheap but because of the kind of people that it attracts.

I'm sure the county would love to have a little more revenue in the form of property taxes and sales taxes but this is not how we should go about it. It would be really nice if we could have a revitalization of Penn Valley that gives us and visitors a feeling that they want to return because they were made to feel welcomed and they had fun. There are a lot of people that love quaint little towns like the ones I mentioned in the first paragraph. Those towns attract visitors and so could Penn Valley. A Dollar General Store is not a good fit for Penn Valley.

So with all this being said I really hope that you will strongly consider not allowing Dollar General to operate in Penn Valley.

Sincerely,

Lori Wilcox
Letter 32 – Lori Wilcox

**Response 32-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 33

From: Jo Hathcock <artbyjove@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 9:09 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: dollar stores

REALLY, do not bring down our community more. The cheapness, the pot, the homeless, etc., etc., etc. What are you thinking?

The new hotel would be wonderful.

Flowers on the corners would be beautiful.

Sandblasting the walkways downtown will make a difference.

Consistency for signage would make things more attractive.

There are many things that would help bring more tourist and help with the economy, but not the dollar stores. Ask your community members and see the feedback you get.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 33 – Jo Hathcock

Response 33-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 34

From: Nan Spier <nan@nanspier.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 6:19 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I vote no, Tyler. NO Dollar General in Penn Valley. Tacky, cheap items. I don't even go to the one in Grass Valley because it is so bad! And the people who work there are rude. Why support a corporate business like that when we have small businesses that are quaint and better quality.

--

**

Have a great day!

Nan
Letter 34 – Nan Spier

Response 34-1:  The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
## Letter 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From:</th>
<th>Annette Smith <a href="mailto:netster00@gmail.com">netster00@gmail.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent:</td>
<td>Monday, December 26, 2016 6:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>Tyler Barrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>Dollar General</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of this community for 25 years, I feel the Dollar General store does NOT belong in Penn Valley. They are not a fit for small town. Please keep them out.

Annette Smith
Letter 35 – Annette Smith

Response 35-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 36

From: Sandra <passandra@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 3:58 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: dollar General in Penn Valley

Regarding Dollar General coming to Penn Valley
I am not against it or for it. I think it will be a big help to many who don't drive or those who can't drive all the way to Grass Valley, or Marysville. Will be good for a short trip to get something quick. For others, it will be a God-send.

Can't please all the people all the time, although that would be awesome!!!

Pastor Sandra Chipchase, Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 36 – Sandra Chipchase

Response 36-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Dear Sir - our very sweet community does not need - nor do they want - yet another Dollar General store, and certainly do not want 3 of them!!! In our small area there are already 2 dollar stores and 1 dollar general - filled with garbage made in China - is this what the community wants? I do not think so!!! Those who plan for these type of stores, surely must realize the impact they would have upon the community. People live here because we do not have so very many of shops that are found in larger communities. Please help the developers realize what a huge mistake it would be to come into our little towns. Please help the town remain small and unaffected by the intrusion of unwanted businesses.

thank you very much for your consideration - Michelle Carroll a Grass Valley resident
Letter 37 – Michelle Carroll

Response 37-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 38

From: Kate Dwyer <kate@taprootcoaching.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 12:53 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: no more dollar stores please

please resist the urge to grant another “dollar store” permission to set up in our very small town. We don't need another box store shoveling cheap plastic semi solutions that work for about a week then break then get added to our land fill.

Let's be bold, let's think big. Let's not think small and short term about growing our town. Homes cost a lot of money, rents are high, and dollar store wages solve nothing. I don't know the last time you tried to live on $10.00/hour but I bet I've done it more recently.

Dollar Stores diminish the magnetism of our unique and eclectic value to tourists and re-locators from the rest of the country. They have hidden costs that are far reaching.
Please say no to dollar stores.

thank you for reading my whole email
sincerely
Kate Dwyer
Letter 38 – Kate Dwyer

**Response 38-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 39

From: Shirley Fenile <ingrassvalley@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 11:12 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No to $$$ store

Joy & salutations,

Please vote no to another of these types of stores. I really believe in my deepest heart, they make Chinese manufacturing richer. Convenience and cheap is costing us jobs. Just say NO.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 39 – Shirley Fenile

Response 39-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 40

From: Cheryl <usacairo46@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 9:11 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Dear Mr Barrington,
I want to express my disapproval of building three more Dollar General stores in Nevada county.
We already have two Dollar stores and one Dollar General store in our area. That is enough.
The environmental draft report recently stated that the stores will have impacts on air and water quality and noise.
We do not want another Dollar General store in our beautiful county.

Cheryl Gordon
Nevada City California

Sent from my iPhone
Letter 40 – Cheryl Gordon

Response 40-1: As the commenter notes, the project would result in impacts on air quality, water quality, and noise. Air quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 5.0, Air Quality, on pages 5.0-1 through 5.0-40. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all air quality impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, on pages 11.0-1 through 11.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all water quality impacts would be less than significant. Noise impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 13.0, Noise, on pages 13.0-1 through 13.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all noise impacts would be less than significant. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 41

From: Linda <Ltn46@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 9:06 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general

Dear Mr Barrington,
I want to express my disapproval of building three more Dollar General stores in Nevada county. We already have two Dollar stores and one Dollar General store in our area. That is enough. The environmental draft report recently stated that the stores will have impacts on air and water quality and noise. We do not want another Dollar General store in our beautiful county.

Linda Newman

Linda's iPhone
530-264-6041
Ltn46@comcast.net
Letter 41 – Linda Newman

Response 41-1: As the commenter notes, the project would result in impacts on air quality, water quality, and noise. Air quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 5.0, Air Quality, on pages 5.0-1 through 5.0-40. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all air quality impacts would be less than significant. Water quality impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, on pages 11.0-1 through 11.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all water quality impacts would be less than significant. Noise impacts are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 13.0, Noise, on pages 13.0-1 through 13.0-23. As discussed on these pages, the Draft EIR determined that, with mitigation, all noise impacts would be less than significant. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 42

From: Peggy Wright <itwigwoman@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 26, 2016 8:35 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No More $$$

Please please please no more dollars stores in our area! too much imported plastic crap already in our local environment.

--

PLEASE NOTE! I have switched to gmail so please update your address book to my new email which is: itwigwoman@gmail.com

Thanks, Peggy...
Letter 42 – Peggy Wright

Response 42-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 43

From: Deb Foxen <deb@inconcertsierra.org>
Sent: Sunday, December 25, 2016 8:26 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Please no more dollar stores!

I'm writing to express my concern for more dollar stores in our county. I think we have enough for our community and don't think it offers our town a positive appearance or jobs. Can't think of a good reason to have more. Please don't let this pass in our beautiful community.

Sent from Deb Foxen's iPhone
Letter 43 – Deb Foxen

Response 43-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Dear Tyler,

I am writing to you to oppose the addition of any more Dollar General stores in our county. There appear to be enough in existence to service the community. I am concerned about the environmental impact as stated in the EIR report on our quaint and lovely community. It's a historic area.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Debra Buddie, L.Ac.
Letter 44 – Debra Buddie

**Response 44-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects and generally to environmental impacts. The Draft EIR discloses potential environmental impacts of the projects in Sections 4.0 through 17.0. Historic resources are discussed in Section 7.0, Cultural Resources, in the Draft EIR. Please see also Master Response 4.
Hello,

I would like to notify you that I am against building/opening a Dollar General store in Penn Valley.

There are plenty of “dollar” stores in Grass Valley and I don’t think that the Penn Valley community needs another one. Many of us would like to see more "upscale" stores going in, like Whim and the Blue Cow/Milk Room.

Please do not approve a Dollar General store for Penn Valley.

Nancy Rogers
19845 Echo Blue Drive
Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 45 – Nancy Rogers

Response 45-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 46

From: patriciarose1957 <patriciarose1957@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2016 3:54 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: We do not need or want a dollar General store in Penn Valley. We have one in Grass Valley and that's one to many. Don't Roseville Nevada County.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy Express 3, an AT&T 4G LTE smartphone
Letter 46 – Patricia Rose

Response 46-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 47

From: Hasbrookfetter <hasbrookfetter@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2016 10:56 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Please not another Dollar General Store.
Sent from my iPad
Letter 47 – Hasbrookfetter

Response 47-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 48

From: Don Stevens <donstevens@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 24, 2016 8:31 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Penn Valley

I support. I like small town atmosphere but zero growth advocates are too extreme.

Waxing Ct. Penn Valley

Regards,

Don Stevens
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 48 – Don Stevens

Response 48-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 49

From: BONNIE KEN WEST <bonkenwest@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 9:39 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Sent from my iPad. We do not need this store in Penn Valley. The property can be used for a better purpose. The West family
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 49 – West Family

Response 49-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Dear Sir,
Please, please don’t allow or encourage a Dollar General to be opened in Penn Valley. We have such a unique, quality oriented, friendly little town and the dollar stores are all so "cheesy". Further, we certainly don’t need the increased traffic!
Besides there are already several of them that are close by, so we certainly don’t need another!!
Thank you.

Regards,
Barbara Wright
PV Resident

Sent from my iPad
Letter 50 – Barbara Wright

Response 50-1: The comment is related to the merits of the project in Penn Valley and increased traffic. The potential impacts of project operation on traffic in Penn Valley are evaluated in Impacts 15.2.1(PV) through 15.2.5(PV) on pages 15.0-21 through 15.0-25 in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, which disclose that with mitigation, all traffic impacts at the Penn Valley site would be less than significant. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 51

From: Tracey Thompson <traceithompson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 6:10 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar store

please don't put a dollar store in penn valley. Tracey Thompson
Letter 51 – Tracey Thompson

Response 51-1: Please see Master Response 4 for information on response and comment requirements.
Letter 52

From: Cheryl Cook <2cooks@att.net>
Sent: Friday, December 23, 2016 6:08 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: 3 additional Dollar stores

We have too many Dollar stores in Nevada County already. Substandard goods made in China. Enough.
Letter 52 – Cheryl Cook

Response 52-1: Please see Master Response 4 for information on response and comment requirements.
Hello Tyler-
My 2 cents. It is not preferable. I would rather a local owned mercantile. But we don’t have one. So....
Ok on three additional conditions:
1- Employs locals only including construction.
2- Signage is tasteful. Not big yellow and black neon. Yuck. Maybe wooden signage of modest size.
3- front of store must be tasteful. It can’t be lots of plain cheap glass windows or be covered with neon or banners of advertisement.

Thank you!
Cyndi
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 53 – Cyndi

Response 53-1: The proposed storefront design for the Penn Valley site is illustrated in Figure 2.0-12 on page 2.0-31 in Section 2.0, Project Description, in the Draft EIR. Figure 4.0-9 on page 4.0-29 in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, includes a photosimulation of the signage and building façade.
Hello Tyler Barrington,

I am sending you this email, because I feel very strongly about NOT needing another CHEAP STORE in our area. We have Three (3) already. If you truly believe in supporting your local small businesses, please support the "little guy" and not the "big box" stores. 

We had this same fight over, too many pharmacies. enough is enough!

We are also back to the issues, of not becoming a ROSEVILLE . . . . . what we and our visitors enjoy, is the small town feel and the awesome local culture. . . . that means something made/created locally, not a store that came from the "flatland", that would push out the local guy.

Please consider what I have to say and how the majority of our county feels. . . . . Arline Young
Letter 54 – Arline Young

Response 54-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 55

From: Margaret Munson <devilmargaret@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 25, 2016 9:38 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store in Penn Valley

No. 3 in GV—and I like them all, is adequate. There is little enough beauty left in America and I cherish what we have here.
Letter 55 – Margaret Munson

Response 55-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Good Morning Tyler,

I would like to voice my opinion about a Dollar General in Penn Valley. I am opposed to this store locating in Penn Valley. It is a short trip to Grass Valley to shop at other Dollar stores. I would enjoy seeing more specialty shops like Whim and Blue Cow Deli/Milk Room.

Thank you for your time,
Elizabeth Kobayashi
19845 Echo Blue Drive
Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 56 – Elizabeth Kobayashi

Response 56-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 57

From: Cat Davis <catdavis99@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2016 6:14 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Any big box store in a small rural community such as Penn Valley is a bad idea—especially one like "Dollar General". Any chain store items needed can be found in Grass Valley.
Please NO!!
Letter 57 – Cat Davis

**Response 57-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 58

From: Ellen Sommers <sommersellen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2016 4:59 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Mr. Barrington,

It has come to my attention that there are proposals on the table to allow building permits for three more Dollar type stores in the Nevada County area. I would like to let you know that as a property owner and voter, I do not approve of additional Dollar store fronts.

Dollar stores serve the purpose of providing low cost and low quality merchandise and I have visited all three of the store fronts in Grass Valley. They are located in areas that are accessible and provide the limited services they are appropriate for. It does not seem necessary to create more cheap outlet variety stores. I feel that these new stores could contribute to environmental degradation and noise pollution as well as impact more locally owned stores and would not be worth the product they are bringing to the community.

I hope you will consider these issues and decide to seek out more appropriate business opportunities for the Nevada County public.

Thank you for your attention,

Ellen Sommers
11082 Copper Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945
Sommersellen@gmail.com

Sent from my iPad
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 58 – Ellen Sommers

Response 58-1: The Draft EIR discloses the potentially significant environmental impacts of the projects in Sections 4.0 through 15.0. Noise impacts are presented in Section 13.0, Noise, beginning on page 13.0-6.
Letter 59

From: Paula Evans <pevans92@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 12:41 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion AND opposition to the potential Dollar Store in Penn Valley. By putting in yet another low quality, cheap "made in China" store, it would seem to promote an environment geared toward a lower standard of living instead of building a quality business base for our small, but trying to thrive town of Penn Valley. We have multiple thrift / second-hand and consignment stores - we don't need more CHEAP retail to sell more poor quality CHEAP merchandise. If someone wants more cheap, they can go to K-Mart in Grass Valley. Supporting our local community through quality, locally made merchandise and services seems to be a much better, smarter and wiser investment in the future economy of our community, as well as Nevada County.

We strongly OPPOSE the building of more Dollar General stores, especially in Penn Valley.

Steve and Paula Evans
Penn Valley CA 95946
530-492-2427
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 59 – Steve and Paula Evans

Response 59-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 60

From: Kalli Brzezinski <kallibrealtor@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 1:44 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Fwd: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley Opinion Poll

I am writing this email as we are opposed to the store going to be put in Penn Valley. We want to remain Rural. We have one in Grass Valley, 7 Minutes away. We went in that store once and have not been back since!

Thank you,

Kalli
& Rob
Brzezinski

---

Thank you,

Kalli Brzezinski
Assistant Regional Sales Manager/Realtor
CENTURY 21 Cornerstone Realty
Letter 60 Continued

Serving Nevada, Yuba & Placer Counties
Direct: 530-470-1163 Cell: 530-277-9516
eFax: 530-485-1163
CalBRE# 01321091
Kall.Brzcinski@C21Cornerstone.com
www.C21Cornerstone.com
Letter 60 – Kalli and Rob Brzezinski

Response 60-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 61

From: Barbara Law <barbaralaw@nccd.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 1:38 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley Opinion Poll

From: Kalli Brzezinski [mailto:kallibrealtor@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 1:19 PM
To: tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us
Subject: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley Opinion Poll

I am writing this email as we are opposed to the store going to be put in Penn Valley. We want to remain Rural. We have one in Grass Valley, 7 Minutes away. We went in that store once and have not been back since!

Thank you,

Kalli
& Rob
Brzezinski
Letter 61 – Barbara Law

Response 61-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 62

From: Edith Miller <emiller@interonc.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 2:07 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Fw: Dollar General

From: Edith Miller
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 1:44 PM
To: tyler.barrington@co.nevada.us
Cc: John Miller
Subject: Dollar General

Dear Tyler,

I do not believe the dollar general store would be a benefit to our community here in Penn Valley. The Grass Valley store is just 7 minutes away.

I have only been in the store in Grass Valley once and would never go back. The store is poorly stocked and even more poorly merchandised. Lake Wildwood has one of the higher median incomes per capita in the county. I don’t believe that the Penn Valley community would consider this low class and low cost alternative a good fit.

Sincerely,

Edie Heaney-Miller
DRE # 01835167
Interon Real Estate, Nevada County
EMiller@InteronNC.com

4 Offices to serve you
Cell: 530-913-0150
Office: 530-615-0111
Fax: 530-615-0137
www.SellNevadaCounty.com

Like & Review Me on Facebook:
http://www.facebook.com/nevadacountyrealtor/

62-1
Letter 62 Continued
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 62 – Edie Heaney-Miller

**Response 62-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 63

From: Richard Nolle <ricknolle@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 2:53 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Penn Valley Dollar Store

I am writing this email as we are opposed to the store going to be put in Penn Valley. We want to remain Rural. We have one in Grass Valley, 7 Minutes away. We went in that store once and have not been back since!

Suzie and Rick Nolle
Realtors for You
Cal BRE# 01419558
BRE #01419559

Cell: 530-205-6201
Home: 530-432-5360
Letter 63 – Suzie and Rick Nolle

Response 63-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 64

From: Phil Northcutt <vetaccess@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 1:03 PM
To: Kalli Brzezinski
Cc: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Re: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley Opinion Poll

Tyler,
I also strongly oppose a Dollar Store in Penn Valley.

There is one close by and it is enough.

Penn Valley is a small but growing town, and a store like that will make it harder for local people, who are truly invested here, to maintain their businesses and will discourage new businesses.

Phil Northcutt
Land Use Consultant
GVE L.L.C.
vetaccess@gmail.com
Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 28, 2016, at 14:03, Kalli Brzezinski <kallibrealtor@gmail.com> wrote:

(tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us) correct email address

Tyler,

We are
writing this email as we are
strongly
opposed to the store
being thought of
to be put in Penn Valley. We want to remain Rural. We have one in Grass Valley, 7
Minutes away. We went in that store once and have not been back since!

Thank you,
Letter 64 Continued

Kalli
& Rob
Brzezinski
Letter 64 – Phil Northcutt

Response 64-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 65

From: Linda Rasmussen <lindarasm@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 5:32 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Opposition to a Dollar General Store in Penn Valley

I would like to register my opposition to an approval to put a Dollar General store in Penn Valley. Not only will it make more traffic in an area that can become congested with people trying to turn into a parking lot on a already busy main road, but in addition its services and products are not only in competition with already established business in our town that need our support, but also not of the quality and character that our community represents. In addition, their name is a misnomer as I tried hard to find anything that truly was a dollar in their store in town, but instead discovered a lot of overpriced (for the quality and quality) goods that were not attractive.

Thank you for allowing me to comment.

Sincerely,
Linda Rasmussen
Letter 65 – Linda Rasmussen

Response 65-1: The Draft EIR evaluates potential impacts on traffic operations and safety at the Penn Valley site in Impacts 15.2.1 and 15.2.2 on pages 15.0-21 through 15.0-24 in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. Other comments relate to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 66

From: Sam <osamperez@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 7:48 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar store

Just wanted to share my objection to this store being placed in Penn valley... please consider my families objections....

Sam Perez Sent from my iPhone
Letter 66 – Sam Perez

**Response 66-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 67

From: Millie Folda <milliecare@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 10:34 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I wish to voice my concern regarding the creation of three Dollar General stores in Nevada County. These stores do not sell quality items nor are the products made in America. These stores sell inexpensive junk that will litter our homes, highways and our dump. They also detract from our rural environment and just cause more clutter to our environment.

Dollar General does not add to the quality of our life in Nevada County, there are enough thrift stores and three dollar stores already here.

This past year when traveling the western United States I could not help but notice how many of these virus stores were in every town and many of them just a few miles apart. They littered the country side.

Since living in Nevada County since 1976 I have seen many changes here in regards to availability of shopping, mostly positive. I always thought the commission was selective to only allow quality stores into the county. I will be very disappointed if you allow this project to pass. Please vote no for Dollar General.

Respectfully,
Mildred Folda
Letter 67 – Mildred Folda

Response 67-1: The comment is related to the merits of the project and also discusses litter and the rural region. Please see Master Response 4; Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR; and Response 1-1 for a discussion on litter.
Letter 68

From: Jeanette Carr <jeanettecarr21@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 6:52 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No Dollar General

I Do Not want a Dollar General Store. We have one 10 minutes away. All that will do is kill more trees and take away farm land. And place tons of blacktop and cement. Oh and can't forget about traffic. Since we are getting a Big Brand New Community Center in the middle of town.
Letter 68 – Jeanette Carr

Response 68-1: The Draft EIR evaluates impacts related to the areas of general concern expressed by the commenter. The potential impacts of the project on loss of trees at the Alta Sierra site are addressed in Impact 6.1.3(AS) on page 6.0-13 in Section 6.0, Biological Resources, for which mitigation measures are required (MM AS-6.1.3a through MM AS-6.1.3e). The Penn Valley and Rough and Ready Highway sites have few trees. None of the sites are classified as farmland, and there would be no impact related to farmland loss. Potential impacts related to the conversion of undeveloped sites to commercial uses are evaluated in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning. Traffic impacts are evaluated in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, beginning on page 15.0-8.
Letter 69

From: Sabrina Dodaj-Zeitler <siddodaj@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 5:47 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store

Please do not allow a Dollar General Store in Penn Valley. As a resident of Lake Wildwood, the attraction for living here is the charm of the area. A Dollar General Store will cheapen it. As a single mom, I am always watching my budget, but those stores are just flat out tacky and unhealthy. Also, for anyone who wants to shop at a store like that, there are two dollar stores already in Grass Valley. We do not need one here.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Sabrina Zeitler
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

Letter 69 – Sabrina Zeitler

Response 69-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 70

From: Sadina <sadinarenfrow@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 7:36 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Please note our opinion that we do not need a Dollar General store in Penn Valley!! No thank you!

- The Renfrow Family

Sent from my iPhone
Letter 70 – Renfrow Family

Response 70-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 71

From: lyndershem@gmail.com
Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2016 8:47 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general

No Dollar General in Penn Valley. We only want stores that offer quality.

Sent from my iPhone
Letter 71 – Lyn Dershem

Response 71-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 72

From: Laurel Foster <laurelkfoster@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 1:05 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Please do not allow any more Dollar General stores in Nevada County

Thanks
Letter 72 – Laurel Foster

Response 72-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 73

From: Gwen <g-cipolla@att.net>
Sent: Friday, December 30, 2016 11:23 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No to Dollar General

Hello!

I am writing to voice my opinion on the above subject. A few months ago I stopped at the Grass Valley Dollar General to get my impression of it, which was not good.

Just for starters I find the exterior ugly and old fashioned. Inside was dreary – nothing compelling about it. The products were of no interest and very limited. One can buy those basics in any grocery store. I walked out empty handed.

Traveling to the coast this year across Hiway 20, we came upon numerous Dollar General stores in the small towns we passed through. In my opinion they were a blight to the community.

I don’t want one in my community of Penn Valley, and I don’t think they belong in Rough and Ready or Alta Sierra. Especially not at the busy corner in Alta Sierra.

Thanks for your consideration.

Gwenneth Cipolla
17753 Foxtail Drive
Penn Valley, CA
Letter 73 – Gwenneth Cipolla

**Response 73-1:** Traffic and transportation at the Alta Sierra site are discussed in Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, in subsection 15.1 in the Draft EIR.
Letter 74

From: Carolyne Moss <carolynemccormos@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 6:57 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Yes!

Carolyne Hatfield McCoy (Moss) Sent from my iPad
530-432-8351
Letter 74 – Carolyne Moss

Response 74-1: Please see Master Response 4 for information on response and comment requirements.
Letter 75

From: Paula Wittler <wittlerpl@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, January 02, 2017 8:57 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General?

Tyler,
I received information about the possibility of a Dollar General store coming to Penn Valley. Is this true?
I recall contacting you a couple years ago after a meeting in Penn Valley about a low income apartment complex slated for Penn Valley. The Penn Valley community was not happy about the plans for the low income housing and this is EXACTLY why! We do not need another Dollar General in Nevada County. There are already at least three of them....if I need to shop at a Dollar General I will drive into Grass Valley.
The businesses that are thriving in Penn Valley are the businesses that do NOT cater to the lowest common denominator; Blue Cow, 1022 Restaurant, Caleb's.
Please stop the madness of shoving the "crap" to Penn Valley. We are trying to build our community not tear it down.
Thank you

I will not be able to attend the community meeting January 27th but I wanted to make my opinion known...and hope it will matter

Paula

(Sent from my iPhone....please excuse typos)
Letter 75 – Paula Wittler

Response 25-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 76

From: Debbie Mazorra <debbie.mazorra@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 9:49 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General objection for Penn Valley Ca.

We just moved here from the Bay Area. We bought in Penn Valley because of the lack of cheap chain stores and natural setting which is beautiful. My experience in the Bay Area is that stores like Dollar General don't do well in small quaint towns like ours. The simple fact that folks are opposing almost certainly sets this business up for failure and it would be in their best interest to go somewhere else. Since moving here in November we have enjoyed shopping at True Value, Holiday Market and Kmart in Grass Valley which is only 10 minutes away. I have been to a Dollar General in Grass Valley and didn't find anything other then some cheap holiday decorations that I used to dress up my Christmas packages.

I strongly oppose a Dollar General being built in Penn Valley.

Sincerely,
Debbie Mazorra

Sent from my iPhone
Letter 76 – Debbie Mazorra

**Response 76-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
If I need something of Poor Quality and inexpensive I will drive over to the Grass Valley Dollar General. We could use a few more commercial businesses but they should be of better quality and in character with our town.

Peace,
Elenita Duelo
Sent from my iPad

REMEMBER ***If you forward this,

PLEASE REMOVE all email addresses
including mine
before you send it on, and use the Bcc area when forwarding to several friends at once. "Be kind
to our email
friends".
Letter 77 – Elenita Duelo

**Response 77-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 78

From: Marlene Bracken <mwbracken@fsaccess.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 1:21 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in Penn Valley

Dear Sir:

Penn Valley needs many things, such as a reasonably priced market, more public transportation etcetera. It does NOT need a store full of cheaply-made commodities.

Marlene Bracken
12945 Lake Wildwood Dr.
Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 78 – Marlene Bracken

Response 78-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 79

From: Barbara Law <barbaralaw@nccn.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 3:44 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store

I just don't think it is a good fit to this lovely rural area of Nevada County. Next thing we will have Costco. No Way...
Barbara
Letter 79 – Barbara Law

Response 79-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 80

From: john_thompsonieww@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 3:58 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Development permits

Re: SCH No. 2016012009

Mr. Barrington,

My wife and I support the Dollar General Development permits as proposed. We currently buy many items in surrounding counties, and, as such, our tax dollars are being given to these other counties rather than staying in Nevada County. The Dollar General proposal will allow more variety in shopping as well as retain the needed tax dollars in this community.

Sincerely,

John Thompson
12851 Lake Wildwood Drive
Penn Valley, CA 95946
3.0 Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft EIR

Letter 80 – John Thompson

Response 80-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 81

From: Fagan Cathy <cathysagan@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 3:58 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I am NOT IN FAVOR of a Dollar General Store in Penn Valley.

Cathy Fagan
Letter 81 – Cathy Fagan

Response 81-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 82

From: Michele Lefkowitz <13200@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 4:15 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store

I would rather not see a Dollar Store in Penn Valley. We have a delightful community with essentially local traffic. I am concerned that a Dollar Store would bring additional traffic to the area, as well as to open the door to retail chains. Part of the charm of country living is that we have a self-contained community with local merchants. I would rather not see Penn Valley go the way of Grass Valley, which has, over the 25 years that I have been here, lost much of its charm as it has sprawled and expanded into a more urban community.
Letter 82 – Michele Lefkowitz

Response 82-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and also discusses additional traffic. The potential impacts of project operation on traffic in Penn Valley are evaluated in Impacts 15.2.1(PV) through 15.2.5(PV) on pages 15.0-21 through 15.0-25 in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. As discussed on these pages, with mitigation, all traffic impacts related to development of the project at the Penn Valley site would be reduced to less than significant. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 83

From: patrickcb72@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 4:13 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I try to buy everything local from locally owned stores...Dollar General isn't.

Patrick Martin, Resident Lake Wildwood.
Letter 83 – Patrick Martin

Response 83-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
We think they are UGLY!!! No Thanks! Terrie Collins

Terrie Collins,
Broker Associate
Bre #0553096
Wildwood West Real Estate
Home Office: 530-432-1218
Cell: 530-913-3401
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 84 – Terrie Collins

Response 84-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 85

From: Vicki Maddox <vicki@vidaconsultants.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 4:34 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley

I would like to see the Planning Commission recommend that a percentage of the construction work be done by local (Nevada County) contractors. I like that the tax base will increase and provide a few more jobs than PV currently has, albeit lower wage jobs.

The worse that could happen is that a building is constructed in Penn Valley by a business enterprise that decides to later shut it down. The building asset will remain in the community and could be repurposed for a different economic opportunity. Overall, in my opinion, bringing a national business into the Penn Valley community is a positive.

Vicki Maddox
18673 Lake Forest Drive
Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 85 – Vicki Maddox

Response 85-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 86

From: Gem Platte <gemfira99@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 8:40 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Opposition to Dollar General in PV

Greetings Mr. Barrington,

For what it's worth, I'm expressing my opposition to the dollar general which I hear is being considered for Penn Valley area.

The charm of our small town is threatened by needless chain stores. Small 'mom & pop' shops are the heart of our community and the reason that we enjoy increased revenue from tourism. Please don't encourage our outlying communities to 'Roseville' our area with urban sprawl.

People may argue that we need businesses in order to thrive. This is true. We do need goods and services, but when large chains come in to our area it has negative effects. We see the revenue from the business leave our area. Unfair practices treat employees poorly and underpay their wages/hours which in turn hurts the community. Also, trash and plastic bags make their way into the wild areas and streams (as evidenced by other chains such as Taco Bell).

Please consider supporting business in other ways. Our community does not possess a need for a Dollar General. We already have one less than 15 minutes away.

--

Gem Platte

"The vision that you glorify in your mind, the ideal that you enthrone in your heart, this you will build your life by, and this you will become."
Letter 86 – Gem Platte

**Response 86-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and discusses litter. Please see Master Response 4 and Response 1-1.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 87

From: Bob & Pinky Martin <n142ph@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 8:37 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in Penn Valley

Dear Sir:

I am absolutely against a store like this in Penn Valley. Most of us who live out here do so because we wish to be "in the country". Our very good hardware store and Holiday Market have a good supply of our "necessities". When we need the kind of merchandise one would find in a Dollar General we are quite willing to take the short trip "in town" where there are three (count them - 3) similar stores. Putting one of these stores in Penn Valley would trash our environment to say nothing about the negative financial effect upon our established stores. Please, do not allow them to come here or to Rough and Ready.

Thank you,

Bob & Pinky Martin
Lake Wildwood
Letter 87 – Bob and Pinky Martin

Response 87-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 88

Tyler Barrington

From: Katherine Heuer <kateheuer@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 6:40 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I would like to know how we can have a say in dollar general coming to Penn Valley. We have a struggling grocery on the corner of Penn Valley and Penn Valley drives already. I really don’t see the need for another store.

Is there a ballot or anyway to have my opinion heard?

Thank you.
Kate Heuer

Sent from my iPhone
Letter 88 – Kate Heuer

**Response 88-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 89

From: Short Jo <jogey1934@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 3:53 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store in Penn Valley
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 89 – Jo Short

Response 89-1: Please see Master Response 4 for information on response and comment requirements.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 90

From: Ann Wright <abwright2010@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 3:22 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Stores

Dear Sir,

It has come to my attention that there are some plans in place for the construction of a Dollar General store on Penn Valley Drive in Penn Valley, CA. I would like to take this opportunity to raise my objections - both to the Dollar General plans all over Nevada county as well as this one closer to home. My objections are this: traffic, traffic and more traffic. Right now, Penn Valley Drive is already a very busy rural road. The addition of this commercial traffic is a hazard as well as unnecessary. We already have a wonderful hardware store, nursery and other amenities. I see no need for additional shopping - especially a "Dollar" Store.

Thank you for your consideration of my objection.

Ann Wright
15401 Indian Ct.
Penn Valley, CA 95946
Letter 90 – Ann Wright

Response 90-1: The Draft EIR (Impacts 15.2.1 and 15.2.2 on pages 15.0-21 through 15.0-24 in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation) evaluates potential impacts on traffic operations and safety at the Penn Valley site. Other comments are related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
I oppose the idea of a Dollar General in Penn Valley. There is a comfortable "small town" feel there that would not be well-served by such a facility. Those of us who live in the area are trying to promote a more "upscale" feel there. A new restaurant, a Starbucks, or a Coffee Bean would be far more desirable. I don't believe that a Dollar General will appeal to the demographics in this area, particularly Lake Wildwood.

Keeth Lawrence
Letter 91 – Keeth Lawrence

**Response 91-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 92

From: smc@wildblue.net
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 7:54 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Dear Sir(s) or Madam(s):

I would like to add my voice to those commenting on the Dollar General store proposed for Penn Valley.

I do not believe that bringing this company to Penn Valley is in the best interests of the town of Penn Valley, or its residents. This company has proved to have a very predatory attitude toward forcing itself on communities who who do not want it. Why on earth would a company be so determined to come places where the local citizenry are opposed to it? Penn Valley is not the only local community where this is happening. Browns Valley has a similar controversy at the moment. And why, when such a business is so controversial would local government officials be so willing to go against citizen’s wishes to invite it in? It is not worthwhile to permanently alter the character of a community, to accommodate a business we don’t need, and don’t want. The tax revenue it would generate would not be worth the trade off.

Respectfully,

Sarah McCarthy, DVM
Letter 92 – Sarah McCarthy

**Response 92-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 93

From: Cheri <charingm@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 8:22 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar store

I vote bring it in. Of course keep to building codes. I think lower income people that cannot afford or have the abilities to get into Grass valley, desperately need a store that sells these inexpensive good. I have relatives in this position, and they need to have services and stores they can afford right here in Penn Valley.

Sent from my iPad
Cheri Merrifield
(512) 897-8022
charingm@comcast.net
Letter 93 – Cheri Merrifield

Response 93-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4 and Figure 2.0-9 in the Draft EIR for information on building code requirements that are applicable to the site.
Letter 94

From: Johnathan Sare <johnathandjsare@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 7:04 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No dollar general

I don't think we need a low quality chain store taking business from locally owned businesses. I vote no.

Sincerely, John Sare
Letter 94 – John Sare

**Response 94-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 95

From: pennmartiniii <pennmartiniii@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 5:39 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general

We Do Not want a dollar general store in Penn Valley.

Penn Martin

Pennmartiniii@gmail.com

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Letter 95 – Penn Martin

Response 95-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 96

From: Ken Buchanan <kenmcblu@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 5:35 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store in Penn Valley?

We have plenty of stores in Penn Valley that sell products of modest quality like the Dollar stores. Let's let local proprietors keep this business and encourage new businesses that have higher quality merchandise and services to serve the area.
Quite sincerely,
Ken Buchanan
LWW

Sent from Ken's iPad
Letter 96 – Ken Buchanan

Response 96-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 97

From: Robert Bumgarner <r2bumgarner@idouc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 5:27 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I am a consumer, living in Lake Wildwood. For gatherings, I travel to GV at the Dollar Store near Raileys. I am in favor of a similar store in PV. I think there is a need and those who oppose it will end up shopping there. I try to shop local, but there is very little local in PV that offers what Dollar General offers.

I grew up in Kailua, Oahu and saw similar protests for Target. Small town opposing growth. No protests for Whole Foods that knocked down buildings. But now, the locals all go to Target and the tourists go to the boutiques. There is room for everyone.

Janis Bumgarner

Sent from my iPad
Letter 97 – Janis Bumgarner

Response 97-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 98

From: E. Alvarado Mary <elizalvarado@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 5:26 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in Penn Valley

Dear Tyler:

I SURE HOPE NOT! First of all my opinion of Dollar General is NOT GOOD. I shopped there once and will never go back. Their prices are higher than most places in town, we have enough Dollar Stores to keep us all happy and with the exception of what I purchase at Holiday Mkt. in Lake Wildwood, I do most of my shopping in Grass Valley, at Grocery Outlet, Savemart, and the Dollar Store near Penney’s. We don’t need to be taking business away from our vendors in Grass Valley.

Thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion. I will be very upset to see this sub par store be part of Penn Valley.

Mary Alvarado
18853 Lake Forest Drive
Penn Valley, Ca. 95946

98-1
Letter 98 – Mary Alvarado

Response 98-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 99

From: Maureen Baker <mobaker58@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2017 5:26 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Don't need one

Sent from my iPad
Response 99-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 100

From: Christopher Ward <caward32@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 9:41 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general

Hello and Good Day,
A local perspective,
Thank you this opportunity to address the issue of a Dollar General construction. I would like to start by stating clearly and without the possibility of interpretation. I and many others are strongly opposed to the Dollar General in Penn Valley!
My family have been residents of Penn Valley for over fifty years now and we've seen a tremendous amount of growth and change in the community, the Majority of which has been positive for the community and a benefit to our residents.
However, there are exceptions.
Going back decades now, Penn Valley and our past urban development choices unfortunately enjoy a long history of ill informed decisions with regards to acknowledging environmental and cultural heritage sites. This glaringly concerns me and I believe we can make wiser choices.
Western Gateway Park for all its beauty and benefit has impacted numerous historic and prehistoric sites.
The creation of Lake Wildwood destroyed without recordation our regions oldest historic and culturally significant sites.
The building of the Taco Bell and gas station on the corner of Highway 20 significantly impacted known historic and prehistoric cultural sites, including the burial plots of locals.
The creation of the water treatment facility on Spenceville Road, there again, numerous sites of unique cultural heritage impacted.
Time and time again the historic landscape of our community has been negatively impacted with little or no Reporting, Recording or acknowledgement.
Even more recently, only a couple of months ago road development along Indian Springs Road completely destroyed a section of 1873 stack stone wall, an admittedly minor cultural Site of significance but it stands as Testament to the lack of foresight in the development of the region.
Did you know that NO precision is made by our county to address such issues?
Additionally, Structures and businesses such as the Dollar General and other chain retail facilities of non-local origin have proved to contribute Huge amounts of waste and significant light pollution to our community. (another huge lifestyle concern).
Never before have the creeks And waterways of our beautiful community be so clouded with the detritus of Fast food And small Disposable items, like a Dollar General would only exasperate. Please do not allow a Dollar General Construction in the Penn Valley!
There are numerous other alternatives to bring responsible retail success and improved economic growth to our community.
To be sure, local endeavors by local citizens have dramatically improved our community over the last decade And more. This is the kind of growth that Is beneficial to our community.

The construction of such sites as the Dollar General WILL come at the cost Of our cultural and environmental heritage, please don't let that happen.

We love this place, deeply. We can make well informed, thoughtful choices. NO S-GENERAL.

Thank you
Letter 100 Continued

Ward family
Chris Ward
530 575 7750
caward32@yahoo.com
Letter 100 – Christopher Ward

Response 100-1: The sites noted by the commenter are not at or near any of the proposed project locations; the cause of purported impacts of projects unrelated to the current proposal do not require evaluation in the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR has fully complied with CEQA requirements for determining the significance of historic and cultural resources at each of the proposed sites and identifying mitigation to protect resources. The results of the evaluation for each site are presented in Section 7.0, Cultural Resources, in the Draft EIR. There are no known significant historic or archaeological resources (as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5) that would be adversely affected at any site. The Draft EIR acknowledges, however, that there is the possibility of discovering previously unknown resources, including tribal cultural resources, whenever ground disturbance occurs. The Draft EIR includes mitigation measures for each project site (MM AS-7.1.2, MM PV-7.2.2, and MM RR-7.3.2), which are presented on pages 7.0-11, 7.0-14, and 7.0-17, respectively, that describe procedures that must be following in the event resources are found. The County is responsible for enforcing and monitoring compliance with the mitigation measures through the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Response 100-2: The project applicant will be required to control litter on-site in accordance with Section G-IV 8.4 of the Nevada County Code. See Response 1-1 for a discussion on litter.

The Draft EIR evaluates impacts associated with nighttime lighting and potential for light pollution in Section 4.0, Aesthetics. The analysis for the Penn Valley site specifically is presented in Impact 4.2.2(PV) on page 4.0-32, and mitigation measures are identified in mitigation measure MM PV-4.2.2a and MM PV-4.2.2b to minimize the potential for light pollution.
Letter 101

From: FAKER <faker@att.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 1:17 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: dollar general

I do not a Dollar General here in Penn Valley!
Jody Faker
Letter 101 – Jody Faker

Response 101-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4
Letter 102

From: Yvonne ANAST-ERB <erbslakehouse@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 11:42 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Opposed to having a General Store/Dollar store

Good afternoon Tyler,

I am opposed to the store being opened in Penn Valley. We have one in Grass Valley, 7 Minutes away and there is nothing of quality to be purchased, its junk from abroad. I would support and do wish to have quality shops, restaurants and businesses.

If we plan to grow and promote Penn Valley let's do it with thought and with quality.

Kind regards.

Sent from iPhone Yvonne ANAST-ERB AP YCHS
Letter 102 – Yvonne Anast-Erb

Response 102-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 103

From: Carla Ford <carla4rd@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 1:41 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store for Penn Valley

No thank you.

Carla Ford
carla@netspert.net
408/710-6031
Letter 103 – Carla Ford

**Response 103-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 104

From: John & Jerri Morello <jjmorello@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 3:23 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

I have been to a Dollar General one time in Marysville on my way home from work. They had what I needed and the prices were good. I think the conception is that “Dollar General” is a dollar store. It is more of a convenience store with lower prices than most convenience stores. I think that people would be surprised at the inventory and would use the store. The only other store is Holiday Market and it is further away for some people who might not have transportation. I vote yes.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 104 – John and Jerri Morello

**Response 104-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4
Letter 105

From: Gerry Cosby <thecosbys1@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2017 11:43 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store

Absolutely NO. Gerry and Stan Cosby
Letter 105 – Gerry and Stan Cosby

Response 105-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 106

From: Meredith Martin <mOntana@netzero.net>  
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 1:01 AM  
To: Tyler Barrington  
Subject: Dollar store in Penn Valley

This is a dumb idea as we already have 2 to many in Grass Valley. They only carry cheap junk that is not needed in Penn Valley.

Sent from my iPhone

How to End Your Diabetes In 2017 (Watch This Video) Medical Health Advisor  
http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TG1L3231/586e06b6892bcf6b70913551vuc
Response 106-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 107

From: dottiefazio@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, January 08, 2017 4:21 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store

I am definitely against a Dollar Store and so much low income housing. The housing should be spread throughout the county. Please take into consideration that our roads are not equipped to handle the additional traffic. Why is the county trying to dump all this housing on a small community like Penn Valley.
A Dollar store is in Grass Valley, we do not need one here. It is a horrible and dirty store.

Dottie Fazio
dfaz@comcast.net

Sent from XFINITY Connect Mobile App
Letter 107 – Dottie Fazio

Response 107-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4. The proposed project is a commercial development and does not include housing. Traffic is discussed in Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 108

From: Cathy Rado <car530@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 08, 2017 3:27 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: I am definitely opposed to a Dollar General Store in Penn Valley.
Letter 108 – Cathy Rado

**Response 108-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 109

From: Diane L. Myers <dmyerscpa@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 05, 2017 5:29 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

As a resident of Lake Wildwood since 1979 I oppose the Dollar General store in Penn Valley. We are a rural community not needing such a store.
Diane Myers
18204 Wildflower Dr
Penn Valley

Get Outlook for iOS
Response 109-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Penn Valley project and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 110

From: Nora Nausbaum <noraroberta@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 2:16 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No more Dollar General stores

Mr. Barrington,

Please vote against the Dollar Store encroachment in our county. These stores degrade our quality of life. Building them will negatively impact roads and environment since there will be large truck deliveries, increased traffic, destruction of many trees and wildlife habitat. These stores are useless anyway. They sell crap. There are already too many Dollar General stores here. Why do we need more.

Nora

Nora Nausbaum
15631 Lower Colfax Rd
Grass Valley, CA 95945
http://www.ATsierra.com
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 110 – Nora Nausbaum (1)

Response 110-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also includes general issues of concern. Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, on pages 15.0-1 through 15.0-49, addresses potential impacts of the proposed project on traffic operations [see Impacts 15.1.1(AS), 15.2.1(PV), and 15.3.1(RR)]; traffic hazards [see Impacts 15.1.2(AS), 15.2.2(PV), and 15.3.2(RR)]; and road maintenance [see Impacts 15.1.3(AS), 15.2.3(PV), and 15.3.3(RR)]. Draft EIR Impacts 6.1.3(AS) and 6.1.5(AS) discuss the Alta Sierra project's potential impacts on landmark oaks and landmark oak groves in Section 6.0, Biological Resources. In addition, Draft EIR Appendix 6.0-AS contains the Oak Management Plan developed for the Alta Sierra project. Draft EIR Impacts 6.2.6(PV) and 6.3.5(RR) conclude that neither the Penn Valley project nor the Rough and Ready Highway project will result in the removal of any protected trees. Draft EIR Section 6.0, Biological Resources, on pages 6.0-1 through 6.0-30 [see Impacts 6.1.2(AS), 6.2.2(PV), 6.2.3(PV), 6.3.2(RR), and 6.3.3(RR)] addresses the proposed projects’ potential impacts on wildlife habitat and other biological resources. Quality of life is not a topic that requires evaluation under CEQA. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 111

From: Bradley Dixon <dixon.bradley@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 10, 2017 11:41 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alta Sierra Dollar General

Mr. Barrington:
My principal concern with the proposed Dollar General store in Alta Sierra is one of delivery truck traffic. As I believe you know, Dollar General transports its store-brand merchandise on a weekly basis from a Southern California using a 73-foot tractor trailer. A Dollar General representative has stated that they cannot break down the load to smaller trucks for economic reasons. Using 73 foot tractor trailers are illegal in Alta Sierra sites without a one-time permit from the CHP for each trip. Many residents believe that traffic traveling into Alta Sierra from Hwy 49 through the reverse S-curve, encountering a truck which would block both lane either entering or exiting the proposed driveway, and a limited line of sight would not allow enough distance to prevent rear-end collisions.
The same traffic restrictions apply to the store in Grass Valley. However, based on history Dollar General has chosen to ignore the law. They received a citation from the CHP a couple of months ago. According to the manager of that store, Dollar General changed their delivery schedule from a mid-week mid-day delivery to an after 5:00 pm Friday as they would be less likely to encounter the CHP.

Need I say more?
Bradley Dixon
17274 Geneva Court
Grass Valley, CA 95949
dixon.bradley@gmail.com
Letter 111 – Bradley Dixon

Response 111-1: Impact 15.1.2(AS) on pages 15.0-11 and 15.0-12 in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, addresses the potential for traffic hazards at the Alta Sierra site, including a discussion of line of sight and delivery truck access. Please see also Master Response 3.
Letter 112

To: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Maidu Ave, Su 179
Nevada City, CA 95959

From: Nora Nausbaum
15631 Lower Colfax Road
Grass Valley, CA 95945

January 10, 2017

Planning Commission:

Please vote against the Dollar Store encroachment in our county. These stores degrade our quality of life. Building them will negatively impact roads and environment since there will be large truck deliveries, increased traffic, destruction of many trees and wildlife habitat. These stores are useless anyway. They sell crap. There are already too many Dollar General stores here. Why do we need more.

Nora Nausbaum
Bill Douglass
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 112 – Nora Nausbaum (2)

**Response 112-1:** This letter, addressed to the Planning Commission, duplicates the comments presented in the commenter’s Letter 110 that was separately submitted to the project planner. See Response 110-1.
Letter 113

DRAFT EIR COMMENT FORM for the DOLLAR GENERAL STORE PROJECTS at Alta
Sierra, Rough & Ready, and Penn Valley.

To: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us
750 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Name: Ray Wadding
Address: 10195 Alta Sierra Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Date: 01/16/2017

Comments:
SEE Attached Documents
The Article on Letter from Personal
& Leet Me

Signed: Ray Wadding
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 113 Continued

DOLLAR GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

PRIOR CONCERNS AND STATEMENTS NOT ADDRESSED:
1) The DEIR lists pages of comments and issues that were presented by concerned citizens and legal representation as inadequate for addressing the impacts, or recognizing them correctly, but this report does not address them either.
a. The DEIR is inadequate in responding to the concerns of both the residents and Nevada County’s guidelines.

TRANSPORTATION AND DELIVERY:
1) The Developer depicts deliveries to all project sites with a Box-style STAA truck of 73’ total length, but it is illegal for them to enter any of the site locations. The EIR requires a change of each route to require a re-designation by Cal Trans as a STAA route.
a. The Dollar General Store delivery truck system has already demonstrated disregard for the STAA laws at the Brunswick store, and has not made any provision for any other course of delivery, but continues to deliver during nighttime hours. The STAA designation should already be in place before this plan is even considered.
b. The CHP is unable to enforce the STAA laws without “catching” them in the roadway as they violate the laws.
2) Those of us who travel Alta Sierra Drive fear the certain rear-end accidents that will be precipitated by access at this point of the S-Curve. The traffic flow does not allow for a traveler to stop at that vicinity without endangering themselves or those behind them.
a) The driveway proximity to the intersections of SR49 and Little Valley Road make this very dangerous, and will impact the current flow.
b) The traffic presentation does not consider the condition of the roadway with rain, ice, and snow during the winter months.
c) This poor line of sight will rely upon continual maintenance of bushes and trees on other properties and roadides.
3) The reduction of parking made available is based upon a study from a San Diego strip-mail. Strip-mail parking allows for the overflow of parking from one store to use other adjacent parking within the mall. This site does not join with any other parking site, so it will have to supply all of the parking that it could potentially need.

THE SIZE OF THE PROJECT:
1) Calls for the destruction of over 100 trees, further impacting 1.4 acres of landmark oak woodlands and 4 landmark oak trees, and reduces the flora fauna area for small birds and animals (squirrels, deer, etc.)
2) The loss of tree cover and other vegetation will decrease the amount of water shed and create more water onto Little Valley Road (which currently has drainage flow problems which cause flooding.)
a. Maintenance of the ditches along Little Valley Road are not maintained adequately to prevent the blocking and flooding of drainage culverts leading to the creek.
3) The property cannot support its own septic waste management, and requires off-site transfer and disposal of septic waste.
a. The site that the waste is being pumped to will become designated as a 1.75 acre parcel septic system and repair area, with no obvious responsible owner to deal with septic failures, located directly above the drainage ditches and culverts that flow into Rattlesnake
Letter 113 Continued

Creek.

b. The California Plumbing Code does not allow for private sewage disposal systems to go beyond the property borders unless the parcel directly abuts the site, and there is a transfer of ownership. The disposal system travels beyond the abutting parcel, and sewage sites will not be owned by the Developer.

d. The site and plan of construction calls for the cutting in of a steep slope (and replacement) along Little Valley Road for temporary access for construction personnel and 450 trucks of earth removal along this residential district, and all the noise, dirt, and traffic that will come with it.

e. Allowing the removal and replacement of a natural steep slope will cause instability solely for the purpose of making the construction process easier. Doing so does not outweigh the impact on Little Valley Road to allow even temporary access during construction.

f. The existing scenic quality of the project area in Alta Sierra and Rough & Ready "are largely defined by small-scale rural residential development" and in both cases the projects are "out of scale with the existing neighborhood". "This impact would be significant and unavoidable." (DEIR, pg 4.0-36)

LAND USE:

1) The project allows the developer to reduce the Nevada County standard parking need by 26%. This would restrict the buildings further use to meet the needs of any other successful retailer after the Dollar General has finished its 15 year lease.

AESTHETICS:

1) "The project would be visually inconsistent with the scale and style of the existing structures and the nearby residential uses as viewed from Little Valley Road." (DEIR, pg 4.0-7). AND "Given the visual degradation and change of public views of a visually sensitive site, this would be a significant impact." (DEIR, pg 4.0-8)

2) The landscape plan as suggested does not address the increased exposure to the residential side of the existing commercial buildings upon the residents living on Little Valley Road. The engineers point out that "additional landscaping would likely not reduce the perceived scale of the building for Little Valley Road."

3) Visual representation of the finished project design includes tree and bush cover that completely block the walls, but will not be present for 15 – 20 years. The project should be shown how it will appear upon completion, and through that growth period.

4) The visual representation of the finished project tries to diminish the appearance of what will appear as it truly is... a 27 foot tall block building with block screening.

5) The loss of foliage during the winter months for this landscape currently allows the view of a skyline. This project means that you will now only see the walls and structure for 1/3 of the year.

NOISE AND LIGHT:

1) The proposal removes the existing limited tree barrier to commercial lights and noises.

2) The store hours proposed are 12 hours per day (7am-7m), 7 days per week. Even without the traffic and noise during those hours, the lighting will never be turned off.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

1) The DEIR does not address the economic impact of having more than one Dollar General Stores in our County (1 store at Brunswick, 3 proposed with this project, and an additional target location at the Higgins Marketplace). It is left to our County Seat to review. We already provide
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR
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one store in the Brunswick Basin that does not show a need for growth.
2) The DEIR does not address the economic impact of direct competition with locally-owned, long-term businesses that currently meet the neighborhood's needs. Direct competition with "bargain-stores" will force most out of business, creating more empty structures that do not meet the needs of the community.

EMERGENCY RESPONSE:
1) Previously submitted truck turn templates were inadequate to allow emergency response trucks to enter the property. They would be required to access the site on foot.
2) Emergency Response vehicles would park along the roadway.
   a. We are in a high-fire danger area that requires quick response. If emergency equipment is going to access the site on foot, our whole area becomes more dangerous to fire protection.

WATER RUNOFF ENVIROMENTAL IMPACT
The existing ditches along the 5 curves of Alta Sierra Drive and Little Valley Road are inadequate to contain the water from flowing freely across the roads during any rainfall. These conditions create black-ice conditions on the roadway. In addition to the flow of water crossing the roads, the ditches barely keep pace with the fast flowing drainages leading to the creek, and have caused recurring floods to the properties in the vicinity. These ditches require intermittent and annual maintenance and repairs to maintain that condition, but it continues to go without any maintenance for the past couple years, even after repeated requests to the Road Department. The revised drainage study fails to take the existing condition into consideration, and the catastrophic result it will have on the delicate balance that currently exists. I have left on file with the planning dept. approximately 40 photographs showing these conditions. With all due respect to the dept. of road & maintenance why would we want to create more water flow when the situation has hasn't been addressed in years?

FUTURE WATER NEEDS:
1) The buildings water supply needs will be deficient by 2035 if there is one single Dry Year.
   A) All provisions currently rely upon the passage of the proposed Centennial Reservoir which has been nothing but opposition from the citizens of Nevada County.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 113 – Ray Yedding (1)

Response 113-1: Subsection 1.8, Comments Received on the Notice of Preparation, in Draft EIR Section 1.0, Introduction, on pages 1.0-6 through 1.0-13, summarizes all written and verbal comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation for the projects. The commenter does not cite specific inadequacies; therefore, a detailed response is not possible.

Response 113-2: Please see Master Response 3.

Response 113-3: Impact 15.1.2(AS) on pages 15.0-11 and 15.0-12 of Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, addresses the potential for traffic hazards at the Alta Sierra site. Please see also Master Response 3.

County Code Section L-XVII 3.4, Design Geometrics, requires a minimum offset between intersections of 150 feet. The proposed Alta Sierra access driveway would be more than 150 feet from both the Little Valley Road and State Route (SR) 49 intersections.

The Draft EIR concludes that with implementation of mitigation measure MM AS-15.1.2a, the proposed site plan would provide more than the minimum required sight distance of 150 feet in both directions (233 feet looking south and 171 feet looking north). Routine landscape maintenance, including maximum shrub height along streets, is required per County Code Section L-II 4.2.7, Landscaping, and will be monitored and enforced by the County throughout the life of the project through its Code Compliance Division.

Response 113-4: Draft EIR Appendices 12.0-C and 12.0-D contain the parking studies prepared for the Alta Sierra site and the Rough and Ready Highway site, respectively. As discussed on Appendix 12.0-C pages 2-3 and Appendix 12.0-D pages 2-3, both parking studies were based on parking surveys performed at three similar Dollar General stores in Northern California, all of which are freestanding stores lacking connections to adjacent retail parking. The proposed reduced parking at the Alta Sierra and Rough and Ready Highway sites is substantiated by traffic engineer studies consistent with County requirements.

Response 113-5: Page 6.0-10 in Draft EIR Section 6.0, Biological Resources, states that a tree survey was conducted for the Alta Sierra project site which identified for removal 85 oak trees, including four landmark oak trees. Please see also Master Response 7. Draft EIR Impacts 6.2.6(PV) and 6.3.5(RR) conclude that neither the Penn Valley project nor the Rough and Ready Highway project will result in the removal of any protected trees.

Draft EIR Section 6.0 pages 6.0-1 through 6.0-30 [see Impacts 6.1.2(AS), 6.2.2(PV), 6.2.3(PV), 6.3.2(RR), and 6.3.3(RR)], addresses the proposed project’s potential impacts on wildlife habitat and other biological resources. As discussed on these pages, with mitigation, these impacts would be less than significant.

Response 113-6: Please see Master Response 5.

Response 113-7: Please see Master Response 1.
Response 113-8: Proposed earth moving and construction truck trips at the Alta Sierra project site are part of the proposed Alta Sierra project and are considered throughout the Draft EIR. Draft EIR Section 13.0, Noise, subsection 13.1 beginning on page 13.0-6 addresses construction-related noise impacts. Draft EIR Section 5.0, Air Quality, subsection 5.1 beginning on page 5.0-9 addresses construction-related dust. Draft EIR Section 8.0, Geology and Soils, subsection 8.1 beginning on page 8.0-5 addresses construction-related earthmoving, including proposed cuts and fills. Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, subsection 15.1 beginning on page 15.0-4 addresses construction-related truck access and traffic.

Response 113-9: Draft EIR Section 8.0, Impact 8.1.2(AS) on pages 8.0-7 and 8.0-8 addresses the potential for slope instability. Mitigation measure MM AS-8.1.1a requires the developer to submit a final Geotechnical Engineering Report to the County for review and approval. Mitigation measure MM AS-8.1.1b requires the developer to incorporate all grading and structural improvement design criteria recommendations into the final project design. These measures will ensure that the proposed earthmoving activities are implemented properly and slope stability is maintained. Furthermore, CEQA does not weigh the merits of a project against its potential impacts. The comment is noted for the decision-makers. Please see also Master Response 4.

Response 113-10: The commenter restates the conclusion of Impact 4.3.1(RR) on pages 4.0-35 and 4.0-36 of Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics. The comment is noted.

Response 113-11: Please see Master Response 4.

Response 113-12: Please see Master Response 2.

Response 113-13: Impact 4.1.1(AS) on pages 4.0-6 through 4.0-10 of Section 4.0 addresses the potential visual effects on residents and drivers along Little Valley Road to the east of the site. The Draft EIR acknowledges that implementation of the project would result in a substantial change in views of the site from the east and that due to the limited area available for landscaping, that additional landscaping would not lessen this change.

Response 113-14: Impact 4.1.2(AS) on pages 4.10-10 and 4.0-11 in Section 4.0 addresses the effect of project lighting on surrounding properties. Project lighting would comply with County standards as well as mitigation measure MM AS-4.1.2a, which will ensure that project lighting is designed in a manner that will prevent light spill onto surrounding properties.

Response 113-15: CEQA does not require consideration of economic effects of a project. The commenter is correct that the decision to approve or deny the project is at the discretion of the Planning Commission in the case of these projects. Please see also Master Response 4.

Response 113-16: As discussed on Draft EIR page 15.0-11, emergency response vehicles would access the site via the proposed driveway. Only in the event that this driveway is blocked would emergency responders need to park on the roadway and access the building by foot. Given that the building is less than 1,000 feet from the roadway, this would not impede emergency response.
Mitigation measures MM AS-15.1.2b and MM AS-15.1.2c would prohibit STAA delivery trucks from entering the site, thereby limiting the potential for the driveway to be blocked during an emergency situation.

**Response 113-17:** Please see Master Response 5.

**Response 113-18:** As discussed on pages 14.0-21 and 14.0-22 of Draft EIR Section 14.0, Public Services and Utilities, Nevada Irrigation District (NID) projections show adequate water supply to serve the projects through 2035 and beyond under normal water year conditions. After 2035, NID projects a shortage during the fourth year of a multiyear drought. Such a shortage could be addressed through implementation of NID’s shortage contingency plan.
Letter 114

Hi Tyler,
I know the meeting is coming up but it’s during my store hours so I won’t be able to attend. We recently talked via the phone. You said you thought it would probably be approved and building would start in the spring. I saw an article in the Union after that saying building my begin in early summer. Please do everything you can to make it happen as soon as possible. Please.

My store means the world to me. So many people here in Alta Sierra have lost their homes and moved out of the area. We lost our home here in Alta Sierra as well. New retail business is what is needed to bring people back to this entrance. I’m the only retail store left from my location up to the gas station. I’m seriously floundering. I need a store like the Dollar General to go in QUICKLY in hopes of saving my own business. It’s been beyond slow because there aren’t other retail places to check out while here.

Without the addition of a new retail business here, I fear I’ll lose my store. It’s all the savings I have left. If I have to close, I’ll lose everything. I hate having my future hang on the balance of another store coming in but that’s the way it is.

It is my sincere hope that Dollar General is given the ok to start building. We need an affordable place we can go to shop so we don’t waste time and gas going all the way into town and a place that may bring more business back to me as well!

Sincerely,
De Linda Brady - Owner
The Healing Garden
10128 Alta Sierra Drive
Letter 114 – De Linda Brady

**Response 114-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 115

From: bcdbass@gmail.com on behalf of Bill Douglass <Bill@sierrajazzsociety.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2017 8:35 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No Dollar General

Please do not allow the Dollar Store to open in this county! We really don't need it!

--
Bill Douglass
Sierra Jazz Society
(530)273-5489 h
Letter 115 – Bill Douglass

Response 115-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 116

From: Richard J. Jacob <rjacob@mac.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 2:01 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: OPPOSITION TO DOLLAR GENERAL - ALTA SIERRA

Tyler Barrington
Principal Planner

Mr. Barrington

Leslie and I ABSOLUTELY OPPOSE the projected Alta Sierra- Dollar General project (herein after referred to as DG), and respectfully request that you NOT APPROVE it.

Listed below are some of the many reasons we object to the project, and one objection is that we live directly across the street from the proposed project, which means we are directly negatively impacted by all the items that concern us.

We also CONCUR with and SUPPORT all of our neighbors who also OPPOSE this project for all the reasons they have already submitted.

Some of the reasons we OPPOSE this project are:

1. INCREASE IN TRAFFIC - Little Valley Rd. is a narrow and curvy two lane road, which is already dangerous since drivers use it as a speed way and do not honor the speed limit. Additional traffic will increase the danger. Many of us walk along this road for exercise and to go to the market. The intersection of Little Valley Rd. and Alta Sierra Drive is already a hazard since a lot of drivers do not make full stops. I have almost been hit a fews already.

2. DELIVERY TRUCKS - DG will be using 73 FOOT TRUCKS for its deliveries. These trucks are TOO BIG for this roadway according to State Law, and the CHP is not always able to police this road to catch them in the act. Therefore, the Planning Commission must recognize this is a serious problem (as the DEIR says) and not approve this project now or in the future.

3. The DG store will have 26% less parking than required. This is a restriction that will be impossible to enforce when the business is sold.

4. The DG store will DESTROY almost 100 TREES several of which are HERITAGE OAKS. This will have a very negative impact on the environment from the loss of wildlife habitat and shade, and the erosion from the increased run-off and flooding to Rattlesnake Creek.

5. The DG store will LOWER PROPERTY VALUES and degrade the rural appearance of our community forever by placing a 27 foot tall building, shielded by a 6 foot wall, with lights 24/7 (which will reflect on our home 24/7). We choose to live in a rural community to avoid living in an urban setting, which should be in city locations.

6. The DG store is a big box "bargain-store" that will compete and destroy mom & pop businesses (like the Alta Sierra market) that have successfully served our neighborhood for years.

7. The DG's 9100 sq. ft. building is way TOO LARGE for our rural residential neighborhood and the properties selected. Other issues such as sewer and storm-water run-off prove that the property cannot support this project.
Letter 116 Continued

8. Nevada County, Grass Valley, Nevada City and other surrounding communities are known for their quaint rural and historical settings, which is what brings visitors to our beautiful communities. We do not need to infest this setting with more BIG BOX stores such as DG. DG already has a store in Grass Valley and Cofax and there are at least TWO additional “dollar” bargain stores in our area that are than 10 to 15 minutes away.

In closing, Leslie and I would like to thank you for taking the time to read, understand and appreciate our concerns and those of our neighbors. We would also like to encourage you and the commission to REJECT AND NOT APPROVE the Dollar General Alta Sierra permit. We of the Alta Sierra community do not want Dollar General in our community, will not support Dollar General and we do not want the project to destroy the AESTHETICS of our BEAUTIFUL community.

Sincerely

Leslie and Richard Jacob

15691 Little Valley Road

Richard J. Jacob
rickjacob@mac.com
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 116 – Leslie and Richard Jacob

Response 116-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses several environmental impact topics of concern, which are addressed in Responses 116-2 through 116-8, below. Please see also Master Response 4.

Response 116-2: Impacts 15.1.1(AS) and 15.1.2(AS) in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, evaluate potential traffic hazard impacts for the Alta Sierra project.

Response 116-3: Please see Master Response 3.

Response 116-4: The proposed reduced parking at the Alta Sierra site is substantiated by a technical study (see Draft EIR Appendix 12.0-C), consistent with County requirements. Please see Master Response 4, which addresses issues related to parking if the business no longer operates at that location.

Response 116-5: Please see Master Response 7, which clarifies information presented in the impact analysis (Impact 6.1.3[AS] in Section 6.0, Biological Resources) and mitigation requirements.

Response 116-6: The removal of vegetation at the Alta Sierra site would temporarily increase the potential for soil erosion and would increase runoff compared to existing conditions. Potential impacts related to erosion are addressed in Draft EIR Section 8.0, Geology and Soils, in Impact 8.1.2(AS), which explains that, upon completion, the site would be covered with impervious surfaces, much like the adjacent commercial development. This substantially reduces the potential for erosion. As explained in Impact 11.1.1(AS) in Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, the project drainage system has been designed so that even after the site is developed with impervious surfaces, because the project would provide for no net increase in off-site flows, the increase in flows from the site that would be directed toward Rattlesnake Creek would not cause adverse hydrologic effects such as flooding. Please see also Master Response 5.

Response 116-7: Impact 4.1.1(AS) on pages 4.0-6 through 4.0-10 of Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics, addresses the aesthetic impacts of the Alta Sierra project and acknowledges that it would result in the significant and unavoidable degradation of the visual character and quality of the site. All outdoor lighting at the site will comply with County standards and mitigation measures MM AS-4.1.2a and MM AS-4.1.2b to prevent light spillage onto adjacent properties.

The commenters also assert that the project will lower property values and degrade the rural appearance of the local community. Other than speculation, the commenters do not provide any data or analysis demonstrating how the project would cause property values to decrease. Such an analysis is not required under CEQA. The Draft EIR also evaluates the project’s impacts on the rural character of the neighborhood in Impact 4.3.1(AS) in Section 4.0 and concludes that impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Please see Master Response 2 as well as Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements and EIR adequacy. The commenters
speculate that the project would compete with and destroy “mom and pop” businesses. An economic study was prepared for the project, which is included in Appendix 12.0-A in the Draft EIR. The results of the study are summarized on pages 12.0-5 and 12.0-6 in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, under the Urban Decay subheading. Based on the study, the project is not anticipated to cause negative economic impacts. The commenters do not provide any data or analysis contradicting the conclusions in the economic study.

Response 116-8: Please see Master Response 2 regarding the size and scale of the building. The Draft EIR evaluates sewer (septic system) impacts in Impact 8.1.4(AS) in Section 8.0, Geology and Soils, and in Impact 14.1.3(AS) in Section 14.0, Public Services and Utilities. The Draft EIR concludes that impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Stormwater runoff is evaluated in Impact 11.1.1(AS) in Section 11.0, which concludes impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Please see also Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements and EIR adequacy. The commenter did not provide any data or analysis contradicting the conclusions in the Draft EIR for either topic.
Letter 117

Tyler Barrington

From: Jane Markham <janeandco@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 1:25 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Dear Mr. Barrington,

I have written several letters in protest of the Dollar General stores in our small rural areas. The impact will be felt for years. Too many trees taken down, lowering property values, & bringing big box mentality of greed to our neighborhoods. We have stores within 6 miles that we support. Most of the goods in the Dollar General are imports from China & I support goods made in the USA.

A good example is Wal-Mart as they shut down mom & pop business across the country. We want to keep our local businesses alive & thriving.

Please help keep our neighborhood unique.

Sincerely,

Jane Markham
Alta Sierra resident
Letter 117 – Jane Markham

Response 117-1: Please see Master Response 7 regarding removal of trees at the Alta Sierra site. EIR Impacts 6.2.6(PV) and 6.3.5(RR) in Section 6.0, Biological Resources, conclude that neither the Penn Valley project nor the Rough and Ready Highway project will result in the removal of any protected trees.
Letter 118

16330 Gibboney Lane
Grass Valley, CA 95949
January 13, 2017

Mr. Brian Foss, Nevada County Zoning Administrator
Mr. Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
Mr. Ed Scofield, Area 2 Supervisor
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959

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

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

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 approximately 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 would definitely be a safety hazard to people driving on Alta Sierra Drive. This large retail store, a mini Kmart, would be built with a parking lot off a dangerous blind reverse S-curve on Alta Sierra Drive. 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 from Route 49. Even with a third turning lane on Alta Sierra Drive, the store’s large delivery trucks would take more than those two lanes to turn in or out of the parking lot.

2. 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.

3. There is already an existing business, the Alta Sierra Market, 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 a large, empty parking lot.

4. If the Planning Department allows this Dollar General Store to be built on the proposed site between Casa Las Katarinas Restaurant and the Alta Sierra Market the Planning Department is setting a precedent for other large box warehouse-type stores to be built in that same area.

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

Sincerely,

Larry and Carol Purcell
Letter 118 – Larry and Carol Pireiel

**Response 118-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses the rural region and various environmental issues, which are addressed in Responses 118-2 through 118-4, below. Please see also Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.

**Response 118-2:** Impact 15.1.2(AS) in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, addresses potential traffic safety hazards. Please see also Master Response 3 and Response A-2.

**Response 118-3:** The Draft EIR evaluates impacts related to the loss of trees at the Alta Sierra site in Impact 6.1.3(AS) in Section 6.0, Biological Resources. Please see also Master Response 7.

**Response 118-4:** The Draft EIR evaluates operational noise in Impact 13.1.1(AS) in Section 13.0, Noise. Lighting impacts are evaluated in Impact 4.1.2(AS) in Section 4.0, Aesthetics. The Draft EIR concludes that impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. Please see also Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements and EIR adequacy.

**Response 118-5:** Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 119

From: dsolelano <dsolelano@att.net>
Sent: Saturday, January 14, 2017 1:02 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar Store DEIR Public Input

To: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Main Ave., Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

From: Donna Soldano (resident on Jitney Lane, GV 95945)
POB 98
Rough & Ready, CA 95975
Jan, 14, 2017


As it pertains to the Rough and Ready Highway site, I am voicing a concern Not For The First Time. Since the 1970's, I have written, called, attended Board meetings. I am not one of those citizens who is opposed to development and change. I only ask that the elephant come out of the closet. Any and all types of development, especially around and west of downtown Grass Valley and into Rough and Ready, has over the years created major traffic trying to funnel its way through business, school, and residential areas. While some traffic issues have been addressed elsewhere, Richardson Street – a major side artery, and two access side streets have been consistently and visibly neglected while more and more people have to use that route on a daily basis.

Richardson Street is a mess. Why is it neglected? I have lived here since 1974 and witnessed development, changes, and mitigations such as roundabouts, stoplights, volunteer maintenance, brick crossways, repaired sidewalks, new on-off ramps, and resurfacing for Rough and Ready Highway, Main Street, Ridge Road, Alta Hill and Hughes Road. Little happens for Richardson Street, even when new business or housing sites are created, not to mention that utility repair holes are only roughly patched.

Richardson Street is heavily used. At times it becomes critical to use this route to bypass traffic jams caused by school areas, special events, accidents, work hour impacts, church hour impacts, and ironically, even road maintenance on all the surrounding transportation flows. Every new project adds more traffic trying to get through Grass Valley. Richardson Street is critical.

Consistently, through traffic from either direction take some combination of routes that include Alta and Richardson Street. The newly approved school site on Rough and Ready Highway will add major traffic jams at certain times, as did the Twin Cities Church development. Now city and county want to approve another business site on Rough and Ready Highway that will add again to the traffic that will most certainly also use Richardson Street. All development should be accountable for bringing Richardson Street up to the standards obviously being set for all the other main routes.

I assumed that the renovation of the corner for Marla's Restaurant in Grass Valley would address Richardson Street. What was done was merely a block worth, just enough for a good visual impression (for someone's benefit) before the street remained an accident waiting to happen. I have even asked owners on Richardson Street this question: "Who on this street do the authorities dislike?" Several years ago I wrote my concerns to the city council; the first letter got no response, the response to the second letter was not believable in any context. I do not accept that this
Letter 119 Continued 119-1

problem is some other entities responsibility. This is a transportation route that is used by people from all over Nevada County as well as tourists.

Consequently I can not support projects that do not address such an obvious EIR mitigation need. Maybe somewhere in the draft EIR, there is planning language that addresses this street, but I doubt it. I request that all be accountable for REPAIRING RICHARDSON STREET.

Sincerely,
Donna Soldano
POB 98
Rough and Ready, CA 95975 dsoldano@att.net
Response 119-1: Richardson Street is located in Grass Valley, which is outside of the traffic
study area for all three proposed projects because they would have no
appreciable effect on traffic or maintenance of Richardson Street. The
commenter asserts the proposed projects should mitigate impacts on
Richardson Street, but no data or technical analysis was provided in the
comment indicating how the project would result in a significant impact on
Richardson Street that would require the need for mitigation.
From: Dave Chaney <bodegaDave6@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 17, 2017 11:52 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General in Nevada County

Hey Nevada County,
Please don't let these tacky-tack stores devalue our quality of life here. Don't allow the proliferation of this deal - the citizens of this county reserve better.

It is clear that Dollar Store is trying to manipulate every passive county in America. Please stand tall for the people. Thank you,
David Holderman
Grass Valley
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 120 – David Holderman

Response 120-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 121

From: Will Larson <carsonhatch@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 18, 2017 10:50 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Draft EIR for Dollar General

Dear Mr. Barrington,

I just bought a home on Sunset Avenue about six months ago after a pretty intense search of the neighborhoods in Grass Valley and Nevada City. I'm very happy to have found this rural, quiet area which is nonetheless within a five or ten minute drive of the excellent shopping choices of Grass Valley. The open views of hills, gorgeous shade trees, and beautiful night skies are delightful, as is the peace and quiet. I'm in love with the wonderful neighbors as well, both the old-timers and the new arrivals.

Last month I received a notice about the draft EIR for the Dollar General project, and the more I learn about it the less I approve of the whole idea. It seems to me that the project is totally unnecessary from the point of view of the local community. There's already a Dollar General less than four miles from here, not to mention the A to Z Supply, and the Oak Market on Squirrel Creek, both just about a mile away. This so-called convenience store would be more at home on a freeway frontage road than in an unspoiled rural setting.

Among the adverse effects on the neighborhood are increased traffic, light pollution, and litter. I understand that delivery trucks may use Sunset Avenue, endangering the local children and other pedestrians who now are pretty safe with the local traffic. I wonder if the semi trucks I've heard of will cause the pavement to deteriorate. Day and night air conditioning is bound to cause audible humming even after construction is complete. Light pollution from the parking lot will make the stars fade out. My experience living near convenience stores makes me foresee an increase in litter, probably even on the hiking trails across the highway. Dollar General's business model, from what I gather from a visit to their local store on the Nevada City Highway, seems to be based on sugar drinks, potato chips and other junk food, tobacco products and beer. As a public health nurse, I'm appalled at the idea of this ugly sprawl in the service of a business that profits through the promotion of diabetes, obesity, heart disease and addiction. If people want these products they're easy enough to get on a regular visit to town, or the other mom and pop stores within a mile or two. To make it easy for those with poor impulse control to buy them, such as children or the homeless in the woods, is likely to lead to an increase in the health problems I mentioned.

It isn't only my own impression that DG's business model is built on addiction. The following links from The Motley Fool

http://www.fool.com/investing/general/2014/03/18/cigarette-sales-are-soaring-at-dollar-general-show.aspx

and Forbes

http://www.forbes.com/sites/maggiemccrath/2015/06/02/high-on-vice-tobacco-candy-and-snacks-drive-dollar-general-sales/#eb75566e4a9

corroborate that this company's plan is to grow and profit by outsourcing the health consequences of their products to the national medical system. They may claim that they're only selling these items to people who are going to buy them anyway, but it's hard to dispute that easier access makes for more consumption.

Thanks for providing this opportunity to give my thoughts on this project. Many of my neighbors dread this proposed degradation of our community. I hope that this will have some effect on the decision to move forward or not.

Yours sincerely,

Will Larson, RN
12251 Sunset Ave
Grass Valley, CA 95945
Letter 121 – Will Larson

Response 121-1: The comment is related to the merits of the project and also discusses traffic and delivery trucks, light pollution, and noise from mechanical equipment, as well as the rural region. Potential traffic and truck impacts of the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project are evaluated in Impacts 15.3.1(RR) through 15.3.5(RR) in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. Nighttime lighting impacts are evaluated in Impact 4.3.2(RR) in Section 4.0, Aesthetics. Impact 13.3.1(RR) in Section 13.0, Noise, evaluates noise impacts. The project applicant will be required to control litter on-site in accordance with Section G-IV 8.4 of the Nevada County Code. Compliance will be monitored and enforced by the County throughout the life of the project through its Code Compliance Division. It is within the County’s authority to enforce this regulation and take necessary actions should the project applicant fail to abide by the County’s litter control regulation, as provided under County Code Section G-IV 8.12. Please see also Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 122

From: Holly Rice <hollyrice2@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 1:54 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Proposed Dollar Store for Alta Sierra

Dear Nevada County Planner Tyler Barrington,

I have recently moved to Alta Sierra and learned of the proposal to rezone and allow Dollar Store to move into the Alta Sierra shopping center.
After reviewing the information regarding the environmental impacts, the traffic resulting, as well as the size of the store, parking problems, large double trailer trucks- I am diametrically OPPOSED to this proposal.
There is already a Dollar Store in Grass Valley. Our Alta Sierra area attracts people like myself and my husband who were able to become longtime residents here after buying our home here because we love the rural nature of this Alta Sierra neighborhood.
There are plenty of stores offering amenities close.
Cutting down 100s of trees is counter to sound environmental planning , impacting the area with more traffic also a very bad idea.
We do not want the Dollar Store here.

Sincerely,

Holly Rice
15735 Thiel Way Grass Valley CA 95949
530.446-3334

Sent from my iPad
Letter 122 – Holly Rice (1)

Response 122-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses impacts evaluated in the Draft EIR, including traffic, parking, large double-trailer trucks, and loss of trees. Please see Master Response 3 regarding truck traffic, Master Response 7 regarding the removal of trees, and Master Response 4.
Letter 123

From: Tim Feller <timfeller1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 2:11 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General - Rough and Ready Site
Attachments: EPSON002.PDF

Dear Mr. Barrington,

Please accept this comment letter from many of the residents in the Sunset community.

We are hopeful these concerns will be included into the commission information packet prior to the public meeting next week.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email or I can drop off a hard copy with the original signatures.

Regards,
Tim Feller
Letter 123 Continued

January 20, 2017

TO:  Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
      950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170 Nevada City, CA 95959

RE:  Dollar General Store, Rough and Ready Highway Site

FROM:  Affected Residents Listed Below

As residents of the neighborhood to the west and downstream of the proposed Dollar General Store project at 12345 Rough and Ready Highway (R&RH) in Nevada County near Grass Valley, we are strongly opposed to this type of commercial development at this site. We have several concerns about the proposed project as listed below. The surrounding area is rural residential, which will be impacted by the common Dollar General aesthetics of the project and offsite impacts that will be brought to the Sunset residential community.

This commercial site has had a small restaurant and later an archery store that were limited in hours of operation and did not impact the nearby residents. The only other commercial establishments in the Sunset area in the past 40 years were a small neighborhood market (Sunset Market out of business for many years), Bittney Springs Corner (a small hamburger restaurant previously located where the mini-storage is on the corner of Rough & Ready Hwy and Bittney Springs Road), and the building opposite the mini-storage that was once a garden nursery, followed by the efforts of several different owners to establish a restaurant. All of these business attempts have failed.

For those of us who own and reside on property directly fronting Rough and Ready Highway and others in the area surrounding the proposed store, the character of the neighborhood remains exclusively rural and residential. We have the following concerns about the proposed project.

1. **Increased Traffic and Noise.** R&RH is often busy during commute times, especially during the school year because of its use as a direct access to 3 different high-enrollment schools and access to the towns of Grass Valley and Nevada City. However, outside of rush hour and especially in the evenings, the neighborhood reverts to its quiet residential feel and benefits from the lack of any large nearby retail facility that would generate noise or additional traffic. In particular, the proposed 10PM closing would extend the traffic hours and associated noise, causing a significant and unwelcome intrusion into the evening. Quiet rural residential nighttime noise level is 20 (dBA) as indicated in Table 1 of the Environmental Noise Assessment. Although Dollar General indicates compliance with the zoning noise level for commercial operations, it does not meet the surrounding residential area nighttime standard. There were no noise level studies completed during the 7-10 PM time frame. The noise report on page 7 of 9 indicates hours of operations compliance between 7AM and 7PM. This is the problem with a grandfathered, one-acre site surrounded by rural residential. **Does less than 5% of commercial area take precedence over the remaining rural residential standards?**
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2. **Water run-off during the rainy season.** Runoff from the proposed project (one acre of asphalt parking lot and the building roof) will increase the possibility of flooding along the south side of R&R to the west. [See attached photos 1, 2, and 3 of run-off area]. During the most recent storm event, an acre-foot of water fell on the property. The drainage report indicates that a single, filtered detention facility with a capacity of 1,131 cubic feet will eventually drain to the northwest corner of the project site and will mitigate offsite impacts to the existing historic ditch to the west on the south side of the R&R/RR. One acre-foot of water is 43,560 cubic feet. **The drainage proposal does not address this potential storage deficiency and impact to the downstream ditch (which already has eroded travel-way shoulders) or flash run-off flow impacts to the ditch [See attached photos 4 and 5 showing road erosion from current conditions].** Currently, a cross drain culvert under R&R at the top North East corner of the project site diverts water to minimize impact to the 1600’ long ditch system on the south side of the R&R/RR. **Mitigation should require the project applicant to install another cross drain under R&R.**

3. **Light and Litter Pollution.** The lighting required for a facility that is open late into the evening is also a major concern. Further, **security lights will cause light trespass during normal operations and night hours when the store is not open.** Litter problems associated with commercial businesses will impact the nearby road and drainage ditch and neighborhood aesthetics.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns and hope that the Nevada County Planning Commission will vote against the development at this location.

Sincerely,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>print name</th>
<th>signature</th>
<th>address</th>
<th>date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barry A. S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12252 Sunset Ave</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William F. Larson</td>
<td></td>
<td>12251 Sunset Ave</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanette Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td>12251 Sunset Ave</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo S. Zeller</td>
<td></td>
<td>12231 Santa Cruz</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Anthony</td>
<td></td>
<td>12115 Sunset Ave</td>
<td>1-19-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Johnson</td>
<td></td>
<td>10070 East Dr. Grass Valley</td>
<td>1-19-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Hume</td>
<td></td>
<td>10200 East Dr. Grass Valley</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td>10070 East Dr. Grass Valley</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Springer</td>
<td></td>
<td>10071 A West Dr. CV</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR
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2. **Water run-off during the rainy season.** Runoff from the proposed project (one acre of asphalt parking lot and the building roof) will increase the possibility of flooding along the south side of R&R to the west. [See attached photos 1, 2, and 3 of run-off area]. During the most recent storm event, an acre-foot of water fell on the property. The drainage report indicates that a single, filtered detention facility with a capacity of 1,131 cubic feet will eventually drain to the northwest corner of the project site and will mitigate offsite impacts to the existing historic ditch to the west on the south side of the RR&H. One acre-foot of water is 43,560 cubic feet. **The drainage proposal does not address this potential storage deficiency and impact to the downstream ditch (which already has eroded travel-way shoulders) or flash runoff flow impacts to the ditch.** [See attached photos 4 and 5 showing road erosion from current conditions]. Currently, a cross drain culvert under R&R at the top North East corner of the project site diverts water to minimize impact to the 1600' long ditch system on the south side of the R&R. **Mitigation should require the project applicant to install another cross drain under R&R.**

3. **Light and Litter Pollution.** The lighting required for a facility that is open late into the evening is also a major concern. Further, **security lights will cause light trespass during normal operations and night hours when the store is not open.** Litter problems associated with commercial businesses will impact the nearby road and drainage ditch and neighborhood aesthetics.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns and hope that the Nevada County Planning Commission will vote against the development at this location.

Sincerely,


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Feller</td>
<td></td>
<td>12493 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Dunn</td>
<td></td>
<td>12855 R&amp;R</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack O’Rourke</td>
<td></td>
<td>12889 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luisa McLean</td>
<td></td>
<td>12489 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12333 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12383 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Brown</td>
<td></td>
<td>12385 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Dejardin</td>
<td></td>
<td>12365 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1/19/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Cochrane</td>
<td></td>
<td>10068 West</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay A. Feller</td>
<td></td>
<td>12493 R&amp;R Hwy</td>
<td>1-19-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Photo Attachments 1 through 5

Runoff crossing Rough & Ready Hwy.

Photo 1: Flooding along the south side of R&RH to the west

Runoff diverted onto HWY at NW corner of property.

Photo 2: Flooding along the south side of R&RH to the west
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Photo 3: Flooding along the south side of R&RH to the west

Runoff diverted onto HWY at NW corner of property.

Photo 4: Road Erosion

R&R HWY erosion west of property.

Photo 5: Ditch issue

Ditch failure west of property corner.
Letter 123 – Tim Feller

Response 123-1: The comment letter referenced in the email contains a letter with signatures of several residents in the Sunset neighborhood (Rough and Ready Highway project site). The comments in the letter address project impacts of concern, for which responses are provided in Responses 123-2 through 123-5, below, and also discuss the rural region. See also Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR. The commenter expressed a desire that their letter would be included in the January 26 Planning Commission meeting packet. However, comments received on the Draft EIR were not included as part of the Planning Commission materials, as that meeting’s purpose was solely to take public and planning commissioner comments on the Draft EIR. The commenter’s letter is included in this Final EIR and, therefore, will be included as a part of future public hearing materials.

Response 123-2: As discussed in Impact 13.3.1(RR) on Draft EIR Section 13.0, Noise, pages 13.0-18 through 13.0-20, truck delivery noise was determined to be a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation, but mechanical equipment and parking lot noise would not exceed noise standards for all daytime and nighttime hours. To reduce the truck delivery noise impact, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measure MM RR-13.3.1a, which requires construction of a 6-foot-high wall constructed of CMU or similar material on the western and southern site boundaries, and mitigation measure MM RR13.3.1b, which limits all truck deliveries to the Rough and Ready Highway project site to between the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. These measures would reduce project noise levels to within the standards shown in Table 13.0-2 on Draft EIR page 13.0-5. Truck traffic for the Rough and Ready Highway site is discussed in Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, subsection 15.3 in the Draft EIR.

Response 123-3: The methods for determining stormwater runoff from the site are identified in the drainage study and meet the County’s standards for determining runoff. No hydrologic or hydraulic analysis prepared by a professional engineer was submitted to document why the larger value referenced in the comment is appropriate for determining the need for an additional cross drain. Roadway flooding and overtopping is a common condition during the rainy season. The project is not required to mitigate an existing condition, but it is required, under CEQA, to mitigate any potential significant impact the project would cause compared to existing conditions. The project’s drainage system has been designed to ensure no net increase in flows that would have the potential to cause off-site flooding, as explained in Impact 11.3.1(RR) in Draft EIR Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, and mitigation measures are required to reduce impacts to less than significant. Please see also Master Response 4 and Master Response 5.

Response 123-4: Impact 4.3.2(RR) in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, evaluates potential impacts related to nighttime lighting and identifies mitigation measures MM RR-4.3.2a and MM RR-4.3.2b. The results of the analysis and mitigation are based on a photometric lighting study, which is shown in Figure 4.0-15 in the Draft EIR. The commenter does not provide any evidence or illustration that contradicts the Draft EIR.

Response 123-5: Please see Response 1-1 for a discussion on litter.
Response 123-6: The comment consists only of signatures. All comments preceding the signatures are addressed in Responses 123-3 through 123-5, above.
Hello Mr. Barrington,

We do not NEED or want additional Dollar Generals in the area!

People do not go down the hill because of a Dollar General. People do not come up the hill because of a Dollar General.

Dollar General stores Do Not Enhance a community. Dollar Generals have not shown a great commitment to the communities in which they exist.

We have several thrift stores, hospice stores, and second hand stores serving our communities with good causes. The money stays in the area.

We need quality stores that will serve the needs of our communities. Not ones that hands out flyers once a week with a few specials highlighted. If you're going to bring in stores please Upgrade your standards.

Please disapprove all three Dollar Generals!!! Especially for Penn Valley!!!!

If you are trying to appeal to new-comers and the present community, the Dollar Generals are not the answer.

Take care,

Joe Fernandez
Penn Valley
Response 124-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 125

From: Juanita Hoffman <juanitazwith@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 12:30 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store APN 52-122-03

Dear Sirs,

Please reconsider the project plans to build a Dollar General Store on the Rough and Ready Hwy. (12345 Rough and Ready Highway) for all the reasons that have already reached your desk. Those concerns for the Sunset Ave. East and West Streets traffic, cultural change of the neighborhood, litter, road maintenance and more.

I'm saddened that I share these feelings of hopelessness I hear. It's all about money$. The Planning Commission won't veto this for any of our concerns$.

This unhappiness reaches beyond our neighborhood. There are tourist that take the Rough and Ready Hwy. that are here for the rural beauty of our slopes.

I moved here to find just this quiet little place where kids and older folks are out riding bicycles, walking their dogs or visiting at the mailbox.

But to hear that this little residential neighborhood is in for the same look and environment built everywhere else and that so many people feel they don't matter and can't change what is proposed for the neighborhood they live in is sad.

This is a happy little gem of a place. WE hope you and those with influence can help protect our neighborhood and the health of our community.

Sincerely,

J Maron Hoffman
Response 125-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses traffic, cultural change of the neighborhood, litter, and road maintenance. The Draft EIR evaluates traffic conditions, traffic safety, and road maintenance in Impacts 15.3.1(RR) through 15.3.5(RR) in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. The project applicant will be required to control litter on-site in accordance with Section G-IV 8.4 of the Nevada County Code. CEQA does not require an analysis of cultural changes, which are a socioeconomic consideration. However, the Draft EIR does evaluate how the land use environment would change compared to existing conditions in terms of land use compatibility (Impact 12.3.2(RR) in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning) and visual quality (Impact 4.3.1(RR) in Section 4.0, Aesthetics). Cultural resources are discussed in Section 7.0 in the Draft EIR. Please see also Master Response 2 and Master Response 4.
Letter 126

From: callhounclan@yahoo.com
Sent: Thursday, January 19, 2017 8:22 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Comment - please reply that this has been received, reviewed, and recorded

Hello Tyler - I have taken a few car trips across the US and noted many places where on the edge of town are the Walmart and the Dollar General, and the downtown is now dead.
It is a shame to see Nevada County going down the same road. Everyone I know loves where we live for our rural quality of life, and high quality of our downtown businesses. Why is the Nevada County Planning Department ready and willing to sell out our local independent businesses and quality jobs for chain stores selling poor quality products, uninspired work by low paid workers, supporting the economies of corporations from out of the area and from out of the country.
I support an ordinance to prevent these ugly chain stores from populating our lovely county. To add insult to injury, this proposal is for three ugly chain stores with the same corporate ownership and name. A travesty. Do not ruin our economy and our landscape. Joy Waite Grass Valley
Letter 126 – Joy Waite

Response 126-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses the rural region and aesthetics. Please see Master Response 4 and Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics, and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning.
Letter 127

From: Pat Gruwell <gruwellpat@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 22, 2017 4:05 PM
Subject: Dollar General Stores

Charisse and Tyler

I have attended all the other meeting on this subject of stopping Dollar General.
"Big Corporation" I can't make January's 26th meeting (Total knee replacement), but I do want my voice into the Minutes of Jan 26th meeting.

NO MORE "DOLLAR GENERAL" STORES IN NEVADA COUNTY
Nevada County does not need 3 more Dollar General stores Period!! We want to preserve our "Mom and Pop" businesses, our quaint shops and our boutiques. They work hard to stay in business. Tourists that visit our Nevada County don't want to shop in a Dollar General Store.
The proposed DG in Alta Sierra, will cause property damage to homes and businesses in the area. It's an UGLY building for our Rural Home Town. Alta Sierra is already a busy road. With the proposed DG, more traffic, heavy trucks, noise, dirt and a danger to all walkers, runners, children and everyday motorists.
Nevada County is already losing a lot of our Trees to the Drought & Beetles. Clearing 100 Heritage Oaks and Pines that are good healthy trees is not safe for the Environment. Many years to replace the trees plus the run off of good red dirt.
No more asphalt and cement to our beautiful Rural area.
I strongly oppose the building of 3 more Dollar General stores.
Thank you for letting me a Nevada Co. tax payer & private homeowner in the area--voice my concerns.
Patricia A Gruwell 14723 Penn Rd, G V CA 95949 530-274-7814 or gruwellpat@yahoo.com
Response 127-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses aesthetics, traffic and traffic safety, truck deliveries, noise, dirt, and loss of trees at the Alta Sierra site. The Draft EIR addresses these topics as follows: Aesthetics impacts are evaluated in Impact 4.1.1(AS) in Section 4.0, Aesthetics. Traffic and traffic safety, including truck deliveries, are evaluated in Impacts 15.1.1(AS) through 15.1.5(AS) in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. Please see also Master Response 3. Noise is evaluated in Impacts 13.1.1 (AS) through 13.1.3(AS) in Section 13.0, Noise. Potential dust emissions are evaluated in Impact 5.1.1(AS) in Section 5.0, Air Quality. Dirt from erosion is addressed in Impact 8.1.2(AS) in Section 8.0, Geology and Soils. Impact 6.1.3(AS) in Section 6.0, Biological Resources, evaluates impacts on trees. Please see also Master Response 7 and Master Response 4. The commenter asserts the project will cause property damage to homes and businesses, but does not identify how such damage would occur, and there is no recommendation as to what the Draft EIR should have evaluated regarding that topic.
Letter 128

DRAFT EIR COMMENT FORM for the DOLLAR GENERAL STORE PROJECTS at Alta Sierra, Rough & Ready, and Penn Valley.

To: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
tyler.barrington@co.nevada.ca.us
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Name: MG Metropoulos
Address: 11339 Callega Canyon
Graeagle, CA

Data: 1/10/2017

Comments:
I am not in favor of a Dollar General store at Alta Sierra which is closest to where we live. I cannot comment on the other two locations.

Signed: MG Metropoulos
Letter 128 – MG Metropulos

Response 128-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 129

Bill Haire
10200 East Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945

January 17, 2017

Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Dear Mr. Barrington:

Re: Dollar General, Rough and Ready Highway

I am writing you regarding the DEIR and associated plans and reports associated with the DEIR for the Dollar General Stores. My comments are directed at the Rough and Ready proposal, but may have application to the other store proposals.

I wrote in May 2015 (enclosed) as well as in February 2016 (enclosed) regarding the proposal and find that some of my concerns were addressed in the DEIR. Impact 4.3.1(RR) is correctly identified as an impact that cannot be mitigated. As I stated in my February letter, the proposed store is contrary to the General Plan Philosophy, specifically that there is no evidence that there is a sufficient population that would be served by a store of this size. The size of the proposed store is grossly out of scale with the existing, surrounding residential uses and will result in degradation of not only the adjoining properties but entire neighborhoods. These facts cannot be ignored and for these reasons alone, the project should be halted. The only reasonable alternative would be to downsize the project to approximately 25% of the size proposed, and even that would result in negative impacts to the neighborhood.

In my February letter I also expressed my dismay over the lack of local knowledge shown in the Economic Report prepared by the developer. The points I made (6 in total) have never been addressed and it would appear that the developer is proceeding with this project based on flawed economic reasoning. This leads me to believe that if this store is permitted and constructed, it is only a matter of time before it will be closed and fall into disrepair as an economically inviable retail establishment. We are constantly being informed by the news media of the closure of dozens or hundreds of stores by large, national retail businesses. I don't want the Rough and Ready store to be constructed on the basis of a faulty economic report and I certainly don't want to see the store built and then close in a few years, when the corporate headquarters realizes what a loser this store is.

I must also comment on the Conceptual Landscape Plan that I was provided in June 2016. The plan proposes to use almost entirely non-native vegetation. Several of the plants proposed are likely, a threat to become invasive, spreading out from the store site into the wildlands and home sites in the area. There is even a species of "broom" (Genista lydia) that is proposed for planting as well as a holly (Ilex crenate), and Rose of Sharon (Hibiscus synaucus) described as a plant with "fruits (that) produce many unwanted seedlings" in the Sunset Western Garden Book.
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Why would anyone want to plant these non-native plants when there are so many native California plants that are better suited to the site? The native species are drought tolerant and do not include the risk of escape and development of another environmental disaster like the escape of the Scotch broom and other brooms, the holly, and the Himalayan blackberry have? I believe that the DEIR should address the suitability of each species that is proposed for planting and the potential adverse effects of planting each and every plant species proposed and not just examine the plants that are growing on the site. In this respect, the DEIR is incomplete.

On Page 12.0-15 the document states: Given that the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project site is located above 4,000 feet elevation and is over 1 acre in size, the minimum amount of open space to be provided is 15 percent of the overall site acreage. The Rough and Ready Highway project proposes to set aside 7,405 square feet or 16.7 percent of the 1.02-acre project site, which would comply with the County’s open space requirements. However, the proposed reduction in parking standards allows a larger building design, and the proposed structure would be substantially larger than any other building in the immediate vicinity. Development of the Rough and Ready Highway site as proposed would result in a building that is out of scale with the development in the area and would substantially change views. Given the rural residential nature of the area, such a change would be considered to degrade the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings.

This statement is obviously in error as the site elevation is about 2,400 feet and not over 4,000 feet. What are the requirements at this elevation?

If the requirements for development at 2,400 feet elevation are accurate, as stated above, then the only way this project can comply with open space requirements is by reducing the parking accommodation and pushing the site development right up to the 15% requirement so that it can fit within the 1.02 acres available. If the parking standards are not relaxed, there is no way the project can comply with open space requirements. Reducing the size of the building to about 25% of the proposed size (2,500 sq. ft, or less) would allow the site to be developed in a manner that is both consistent with the development standards and would be of a scale that would be more compatible with the existing surrounding land use. Because the proposed project requires that standards be compromised so that the developer can slip it by as being in compliance, this project should not be allowed to go forward as proposed.

If, as I maintain, this is not a viable location for such a large store, the store will close in a few years and the building owner will seek to turn the property over to another business. What assurance do we have that the new business can operate with the reduced number of parking spaces that would be available if the number of parking spaces built is reduced from the standard? The new business would then further impact the neighborhood with customers, clients, and/or employees parking on the narrow residential streets and perhaps even along Rough and Ready Highway. The proposed reduction in parking standards should not be allowed and the store should either be reduced dramatically in size or the building should not be permitted.

In conclusion, I request that the standards not be changed to accommodate this proposal and that a permit for development of the Rough and Ready site not be granted. There are too many reasons why this is an unacceptable project. The fact that the DEIR identifies significant, unavoidable impacts that cannot be mitigated is reason enough to deny approval of the project. Furthermore, the residents of area are overwhelmingly opposed to the project and state that they will not trade at the Dollar General
Letter 129 Continued

store if it is built. These are the very same people that Dollar General maintains they are going to serve by building the store.

Sincerely,

Bill Haire

Enclosures (2)

cc: Dan Miller
Planning Commission
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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.
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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 nearby (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 reliability 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 buildings 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.
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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 ventilating 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
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BILL HAIRE
10200 East Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945

May 7, 2015

Ms. Kesler-Wolfson
Nevada County Planning Department
950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959-8617

Dear Ms. Kesler-Wolfson:

I am a member of the Friends of Squirrel Creek and received a notice of the Second Early Consultation /Project Description for the proposed Dollar General store on Rough and Ready Highway at West Drive. I am responding to this request for review and comment.

My first observation is that the proposal would result in the covering of about 70% of the parcel with a hard surface (roof, curb, gutter, walkways, and paved road and parking lot). There is no indication as to how runoff from these surfaces is to be handled; the area lacks any type of storm drain system, catchment basin, or other means of capturing and holding the runoff from this area. Properties to the south of the parcel already are subject to periodic flooding during heavy rain. There is no space within the subject parcel to develop a catchment basin and/or detention ponds. As a result, all of the water shed by the hard surface created by this proposal will be discharged on to other properties with unforeseen effects. For this reason alone, the parcel is not suitable for the proposed development, and the project should not be approved. However, if the project is allowed to go forward, it must address the runoff, and mitigation measures must be developed, to capture and hold the water that will be shed from these impermeable surfaces.

My second observation is the property is zoned C-1, and as such, should only be occupied by a commercial business that serves the local neighborhood. The proposed 9,100 square foot retail market is at least 4 times larger than necessary to serve the local neighborhood. As such, this business is not appropriate and should not be located on this property or in this neighborhood.
My third observation is that the added traffic to be created by such a large retail project will create an unsafe situation. The scale of the project, at least 29 parking spaces (46 parking spaces is the standard), indicates there is a high volume of traffic planned for this business. Access to and from the site is at the top of a grade on a curve with heavy traffic in an otherwise quiet residential neighborhood. The former business on the site was a small restaurant that accommodated only about 20 guests, maximum, at one time. Traffic into and out of the site was limited to perhaps one vehicle entering or leaving every 10 to 15 minutes. The site easily accommodated that level of traffic, however, it certainly is not suitable for the level of traffic a Dollar General store requires to be a viable business. As I stated above, I recognize that the property is zoned Commercial, however it is not suitable for a business of this magnitude.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal and please keep me informed as the planning process continues.

Sincerely,

Bill Haire

BILL HAIRE

CC: Dan Miller, District Supervisor
Anita Daniels, Friends of Squirrel Creek
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 129 – Bill Haire

Response 129-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses aesthetics and land use. Aesthetics Impact 4.3.1[RR] identified in the Draft EIR is a significant and unavoidable impact (Section 4.0, Aesthetics). Please see also Master Response 2 and Master Response 4. The Draft EIR also evaluates a Reduced Project Alternative (page 16.0-21 in Section 16.0, Project Alternatives) and concludes that a smaller project would also result in aesthetics and land use compatibility impacts that cannot be mitigated, as noted by the commenter. For information on land use and planning, see Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.

Response 129-2: Please see Master Response 4.

Response 129-3: The County had required that the applicant revise the original landscaping plan to include more native plant species and an updated plan has not yet been submitted. The project will be conditioned to include the use of native species in project-related plantings and eliminate the proposal for potentially invasive non-natives.

Response 129-4: As stated in the second line at the top of page 12.0-4 in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, “[f]or the proposed projects, all of which have a site elevation of less than 4,000 feet, the standard is 15 percent for projects over 1 acre and 10 percent for projects 1 acre or less in size.” The statement referenced by the commenter on page 12.0-15 in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, contains a typographical error. The Rough and Ready Highway site is not higher than 4,000 feet. The last paragraph under the Open Space Requirements subheading on page 12.0-15 in the Draft EIR has been revised as follows:

Open Space Requirements

Nevada County Code Section L-II 4.2.10 provides minimum requirements for the provisions of permanent open space in all commercial, industrial, multiple-family, public, and recreational zoning districts. Given that the proposed Rough and Ready Highway project site is not located above 4,000 feet elevation and is over 1 acre in size, the minimum amount of open space to be provided is 15 percent of the overall site acreage.

The Rough and Ready Highway project’s proposed design meets the County’s open space requirements.

Response 129-5: Please see Master Response 4, which addresses the issues raised by the commenter concerning parking in the event of store failure and blight.

Response 129-6: Please see Response 129-1.

Response 129-7: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and discusses land use and economic considerations. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, subsection 12.3 in the Draft EIR.
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Response 129-8: The Draft EIR evaluates aesthetics and changes in visual character impacts at the Rough and Ready Highway site in Impact 4.3.1(RR) on page 4.0-35 in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in the Draft EIR. Please also Master Response 2 regarding aesthetics and Master Response 4.

Response 129-9: Potential environmental impacts of the project are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Sections 4.0 through 15.0. Regarding specific topics identified by the commenter, noise from building mechanical systems is evaluated in the Draft EIR in Impact 13.3.1(RR) on page 13.0-19 in Section 13.0, Noise, under the “Mechanical Equipment Noise” subheading. Traffic operations and traffic safety impacts of the Rough and Ready Highway site are evaluated in Impacts 15.3.1(RR) through 15.3.4(RR) on pages 15.0-26 through 15.0-38 in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation (please see also Master Response 6). The Draft EIR evaluates aesthetics and changes in visual character impacts at the Rough and Ready Highway site in Impact 4.3.1(RR) on page 4.0-35 in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in the Draft EIR. Impacts on water services are evaluated in Impact 14.3.2(RR) on page 14.0-32 in Section 14, Public Services and Utilities, in the Draft EIR. Please see also Master Response 4 for comment requirements.

Response 129-10: Storm drainage and water quality impacts at the Rough and Ready Highway site are evaluated in Impact 11.3.1(RR) on pages 11.0-17 through 11.0-20 in Section 11.0, Hydrology and Water Quality, in the Draft EIR. Please see also Master Response 5.

Response 129-11: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and discusses land use. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, subsection 12.3 in the Draft EIR.

Response 129-12: Please see Response 129-7.
Letter 130

RECEIVED
JAN 2 3 2017
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Tyler,

The statement below was in printed The Union March 14, 2015 pageA9. It was about another situation, I hope it holds true in this situation.

According to Barrett-Green, the county’s land use policies exist for the benefits of the community as a whole and those policies are enforced through reasonable conditions of approval. The county is defending this case as to protect the scope of its land use authority to protect the rural quality of life for the benefit of all not just a chosen few, she said. (I believe this statement to be valid in this situation).

[Signature]

Ray Yooling
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Letter 130 – Ray Yedding (2)

**Response 130-1:** The comment references the County’s land use policies. Please see Master Response 4. Please see also Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
Dear Sir,

This is in regard to the Dollar General Store Project on Rough and Ready Highway, APN 52-122-03, Grass Valley, Ca. 95945.

For my own curiosity I visited the Dollar General Store on the Nevada City Hwy, a few miles from my home. I frequently shop in this busy area of town but never the Dollar General Store.

It was a busy day around that area however there were only two cars in the parking lot of the Dollar General store. The owner of the one car was working under the hood of his car, the other car did not belong to a customer of the store.

Inside the store was a feeling of dead space filled full of product but completely empty of customers. There was no activity inside the store and it was uncomfortable to be there. I left knowing I'm not a customer of products sold in a Dollar General Store and personally not in support of this kind of business. What purpose does it serve?

The project for the proposed site on the Rough and Ready Hwy of a Dollar General Store would be a sad sight and a mismatch in view of our lovely tree lined peaceful neighborhood.

The land of the proposed site is green now birds are in numbers, unseen activity of life beyond my knowledge but plenty for investigation for science and biology at work in the soil, on the surface and the unblocked air all feeding the ecology.

To build a Dollar General Store here on this site would take away from this open space before we can appreciate its better land use, its potential to welcome sightseers and locals to the beauty on this rural road to Grass Valley.

I look forward to your support and with my vote in coming elections to reward those who work for me and my family's behalf on this crucial issue.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely,

Juanita Hoffman

Juanita Hoffman
12251 Sunset Avenue
Grass Valley, Ca. 95945
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Letter 131 – Juanita Hoffman (2)

Response 131-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and discusses various other environmental issues. Please see Master Response 4 and Sections 2.0, Project Description, 6.0, Biological Resources, and 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.
January 4, 2017

Tyler Barrington
County of Nevada
950 Maidu Ave
Nevada City, CA 95959

Subject: Notice of Review Period for the Draft EIR for the Dollar General Store Project

Dear Tyler Barrington,

Thank you for requesting information regarding the above referenced project. The United Auburn Indian Community (UAIC) of the Auburn Rancheria is comprised of Miwok and Southern Maidu (Nisenan) people whose tribal lands are within Placer County and whose service area includes El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, and Yuba counties. The UAIC is concerned about development within its aboriginal territory that has potential to impact the lifeways, cultural sites, and landscapes that may be of sacred or ceremonial significance. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this and other projects in your jurisdiction. The UAIC would like to consult on this project.

We would like to receive copies of any archaeological reports that are completed for the project in order to ascertain whether or not the project could affect cultural resources that may be of importance to the UAIC. We also request copies of future environmental documents for the proposed project so that we have the opportunity to comment on potential impacts and proposed mitigation measures related to cultural resources. The information gathered will provide us with a better understanding of the project and cultural resources on site and is invaluable for consultation purposes. Finally, please contact us if you know of any Native American cultural resources within your project area or if you discover any.

Thank you again for taking these matters into consideration, and for involving the UAIC early in the planning process. We look forward to reviewing the documents requested above and consulting on your project. Please contact Marcos Guerrero, Cultural Resources Manager, at (530) 883-2364 or email at mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gene Whitehouse,
Chairman

CC: Marcos Guerrero, CRM
Letter 132 Continued

Tyler Barrington

From: Tyler Barrington
Sent: Monday, January 23, 2017 4:16 PM
To: mguerrero@auburnrancheria.com
Subject: Draft EIR for the Dollar General Store Project

Good Afternoon Mr. Guerrero,

Per your January 4, 2017 letter here is the link to the cultural resources chapter of the Draft EIR for the Dollar General Store Project:
http://www.mynevadacounty.com/nc/cda/planning/docs/DOLLAR%20GENERAL/Dollar%20General%20EIR/7.0%20Cultural%20Resources.pdf

and the link to the cultural resources technical appendix (Cultural Resources Reports):
http://www.mynevadacounty.com/nc/cda/planning/docs/DOLLAR%20GENERAL/Dollar%20General%20EIR/techApps/Appx%20%20Cultural%20Resources%20Reports.pdf

Tyler Barrington
Principal Planner
Planning Department
County of Nevada
Community Development Agency

950 Main Ave Suite 170
Nevada City, CA 95959
office 530-470-2723 fax 530-265-5831
http://www.mynevadacounty.com/nc/cda/planning/Pages/Home.aspx
Letter 132 – Gene Whitehouse, United Auburn Indian Community of Auburn Rancheria

Response 132-1: The commenter requests copies of archaeological reports and environmental documents for the projects. The County responded to the request on January 23, 2017, and provided website links for the documents. Section 7.0 in the Draft EIR discusses cultural resources.
NO, no, no, no, no, no, no, no!!! It is not necessary to our area. If someone must go to a Dollar Store, we have three such stores in GV alone. We average one trip to town a day. That would be sufficient to pick up the cheap stuff at Dollar General, which we will never do. Ugly store and not needed. 

Lark and Wes Zachary 15764 Annie Dr. GV

Sent from Windows Mail
Letter 133 – Lark and Wes Zachary

Response 133-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and discusses aesthetics. Please see Master Response 4, Master Response 2, and Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in the Draft EIR.
Hello Tyler,

Please find my Comment Letter to the DEIR for the Dollar General Store projects attached. I would like you to provide a copy to Engineer firm, Michael Baker International, who prepared the DEIR, along with a copy to each member of the Planning Commission (their email is not public), and the remaining members of the Board of Supervisors (I have copied Ed Scofilde here). Each of these members of our County Seat are important to this issue.

I’ll see you tomorrow.

Charisse Lolli
15729 Little Valley Rd.
Grass Valley, CA 95949
(530) 273-3945
Letter 134 Continued

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

January 16, 2017

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

Michael Baker International  
Laura Duncan  
Planning Commission, Dist II

RE: Public Comment regarding the adequacy of the DEIR for the 3 proposed Dollar General Stores in Nevada County

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

I have been a resident of Nevada County for most of my life, and have lived on Little Valley Road for the past 5 years. My home is located directly across the road from the proposed development sites at Alta Sierra, and if allowed to be constructed as it is designed, will allow the lighted face of the store to look right into my home! There is no mitigation measure that can make that less than significant! But it is certainly avoidable, and as CEQA instructs, the development should strive to avoid negative impacts whenever possible. Therefore, any developments within the commercial center should be required to face the commercial road that serves it, rather than any residences, and I am astonished that our Planning Department would even consider anything else.

I live and work in my home, so I’m there most of the time, and I travel the surrounding roads one to five times per day. I am intimately familiar with the various issues that are specific to our area. I’ve had to personally unclog the county drainage ditches which annually threaten to flood our homes due to lack of regular maintenance. My husband regularly cleans up the trash that litters our yards and roadway from the existing commercial center customers. Our neighborhood is often used to reroute vehicles as a result of the many accidents along Alta Sierra Drive and Hwy 49, so we are regularly burdened with overflow traffic from other areas. And the ‘S’ Curve at the commercial center is a poorly designed roadway with
limited line of sight, clearly not designed to handle the safe ingress and egress from multiple business driveways traveling along Alta Sierra Drive.

It must be obvious to you that the issues and scope of this project have much of the public’s negative attention. We have been presenting our comments regarding the problems with each of these developments for almost 2 years, but so many of these issues still go without proper response or resolve, that it would be impossible to consider this DEIR as being adequate.

The authors of the DEIR and the reports it relies upon continue to declare the negative impacts as little without a proper qualitative benchmark of what constitutes little impact. Failure to address some very direct concerns makes it necessary for me to address each of those concerns again.

But let me start where the DEIR admits that it cannot respond, and looks to the Planning Commission to decide… the Individual and Cumulative Economic impact of allowing more than one Dollar General Store in Nevada County. We already have one Dollar General Store in the hub of our Brunswick commercial district, and it fails to show a need to expand. Even though the existing store is much closer for Nevada County residents than the real bargain-stores (like Sam’s and Costco), it fails to capture the sales that leave Nevada County for those stores. 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. Instead, they take business from the small mom and pop stores that supply our neighborhoods.

What about competition between the various locations of the Dollar General stores? There are no successful retail businesses within the County that successfully support as many locations because they would be competing with each other. It would be a gross mistake not to consider the economic effects of this Project. If we allow development that cannot be supported by the business, we will continue to fill our county with vacant shopping centers, like the ones that already exist.

Successful landlords with interest in shopping centers do not fill them with retailers who directly compete with each other because of its obvious negative economic impact upon each other, and the center as a whole. In fact, those centers have specific language within their contracts for tenants to ensure that direct competition does not take place. In this case, it is left to our County Planning Commission to review the economic impact of the existing stores at that location. The Alta Sierra center in whole has a very low occupancy rate. However, there is a variety of businesses that cater to the local residents. The Alta Sierra Market 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 availability 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.

The Project parcels in question are zoned for Neighborhood Commercial, and have legal access 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 any commercial development proposed. The Project proposes to needlessly cut an access route from the residential district (on a steep slope several...
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feet high), to provide access for 450 dump trucks used for soil transportation during the 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. In response to our concerns of excessive traffic, noise, vibrations, mud and dust, 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. And it does not address the safety issue of the large number of pedestrians and school children that walk that road daily. The DEIR fails to explain why any part of this commercial construction project should even consider negatively impacting the residential neighborhood. Instead, it should restrict all of the construction equipment, personnel, and commercial activities to the existing commercial access of Alta Sierra Drive. It is the goal of any development to eliminate negative impacts when possible, and this one can be eliminated entirely by prohibiting any access from Little Valley Road. It is already very highly traveled by hundreds of residents each day.

The size of trucks traveling along Alta Sierra Drive and Little Valley Road is limited by STAA truck route standards. However, the Dollar General makes deliveries to each of its stores once or twice per week using a 72-foot truck to do so, one that is illegal to use on the road accessing each of the proposed sites. The Developer acknowledges that it WILL make deliveries with those trucks, and although the DEIR acknowledges that for the Dollar General to legally access either property with their trucks, Nevada County must apply for and be accepted by Cal Trans for each of those routes to be STAA truck routes, there is no restriction by the County to fulfill that caveat before any permits or development are issued. The Dollar General has not offered or demonstrated any attempt to comply with the STAA laws at the existing location at Brunswick, even though they have been cited for violation. Enforcing compliance is very hard for the CHP because the offender has to be “caught in the act.” It should be assumed that if you allow any part of development to take place prior to Cal Trans re-designating the roadway, you are permitting Dollar General to violate the laws of our roads.

But if you have ever driven the narrow and windy curves of Alta Sierra Drive, or Hwy 20 at Rough and Ready, you would know that a truck that size cannot safely make that route without crossing over lanes of on-coming traffic. The obvious conclusion is to prohibit ANY activity if and until either of these locations can be properly improved and re-designated as STAA routes. The designation of these routes is not an instant process, and should not be thought of as an “easy” request. It requires various improvements, including the need for any route to provide a turn-around area for these trucks available 24/7 at each end of the STAA route. It does not appear that any of these sites would meet that requirement without major improvements, and there is nothing within any document submitted discussing who would pay for such improvements.

The plan suggests that reductions in the required number of parking stalls should be permitted because the current tenant does not need as much parking. They propose a 26% reduction in the required number of parking stalls at the Alta Sierra store, and a 37% reduction at the Rough & Ready site. The Developer has based that reduction on a study they performed at a strip mall in San Diego. There are two issues not addressed in the final conclusion. 1) It is certain that there will be a change in tenants at some point in time. (Dollar General only has a 15 year lease, if it does not sell or go out of business before then). When that happens, the County will not be able to enforce whether the buyer and/or tenant will meet that.
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restriction, thereby causing increased traffic and parking needs where none can be tolerated. 2) The study was based upon a location within a strip mall. Strip malls share and overlap large parking areas. In that way, if one store needs more parking, they can conveniently use parking right next door. There is no 'near' or 'off-site' parking at the Alta Sierra location. Any overflow of customers would have to walk along Alta Sierra Drive to get to other business parking lots. Alta Sierra Drive is not pedestrian friendly, and does not offer safe sidewalks and walkways to travel up and down between businesses. Further, the DEIR makes no comment about the disproportionately increased traffic to residential Little Valley Road from travelers wanting to escape the road blocks surely to happen at their entrance on Alta Sierra Drive.

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. The traffic traveling into Alta Sierra is often non-stop, being fed by both northbound and southbound traffic from Highway 49. It then flows through an S-curve which is already lined by three other driveways which require entrance by crossing into oncoming traffic. The need to stop for entrance into either of these existing driveways shortens the line-of-sight even more for those coming from behind, and does not allow enough distance to prevent rear-end collisions, further causing backups to Hwy 49. A forth driveway onto Alta Sierra Drive would be a burden the traffic flow could not tolerate by creating a back-up of vehicles waiting to turn into either of these driveways. Those of us who travel Alta Sierra Drive fear the certain rear-end accidents that will be precipitated by access at this point of the S-Curve. Further, the maintenance of other property brushes and trees is required to maintain these diminished lines-of-sight, with no enforcement provision. Conditions of the roadway further complicate safety. When there is rainfall, the existing ditches that run along Alta Sierra Drive do not contain the flow of water. Instead, the water runs across the roadway at each angle of the S-curve, turning to ice in winter months, adding even more danger to driving conditions. The only way to safely allow for traffic to enter the store from that direction would be to supply proper road improvements. (i.e., perhaps a middle turn-lane for those cars to pull into while stopped to enter the driveway so that they would not stop through traffic). The line-of-site is even shorter if you are approaching from the other direction, so slowing to enter that site should also allow for a pull-out to make that turn safely without impeding through traffic.

Although deficiencies in traffic queue on Highway 49 and Little Valley Road have been identified in the Kuzmian Traffic Reports, there is no comment on this in any County report that has been provided. The belief that development money paid into the County coffers for future "traffic concerns" will address this situation is negligent. Any money 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. It doesn't even appear that good road maintenance is going to happen for the next 5 years, save filling some potholes. Is it likely that we could hope for some relief after lives are damaged and lost because our roadway is unsafe, and unfixable?

The DEIR correctly describes the Aesthetics of the Alta Sierra site as "significant and unavoidable". It is a "visually sensitive" region, "largely defined by small-scale rural residential development". Both the Alta Sierra and Rough & Ready project are described as "out of scale with the existing neighborhood". The plan would have a 27' tall brick building, shielded by a 6' block wall, sitting upon another 6' extension of that block wall at the south corner (A total of 33 feet!). A 6' block wall is not sufficient to hide the 27'
mass behind it as it sits at the same elevation as Little Valley Road. All other surrounding businesses are not as tall, and are set back so that they are not readily visible from the street. Noticeably, the visual representation from the Engineer hides the building’s bulk with trees in front of it that do not exist as they are pictured. Other angles hide it completely with bushes and tree cover that do not exist, being photographed from a distance that does not demonstrate it as depicted from the parcel border, or the Developer’s own rendering. (See pictures below comparing the Google picture, the Engineer’s altered photo, and the 3D Rendering provided by the Developer).

Current view of property from Little Valley Road across the driveway from the Alta Sierra Market.

33' Tall at most exposed corner, with 12' brick wall shielding 6' of the building height. Notice these trees in the picture are not present now, nor do they ‘hide’ the bulk of this building at this mature age.
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Approach from Little Valley Road at property line... Now take away the trees and build the DG Store

Engineer’s rendering after construction of the 9100 sf building atop a 1 acre parking lot and 6’ – 12’ screen walls.

Where is the store and walls? It seems invisible! But just a few feet in from that property line you’ll see

Developer’s rendering from Little Valley Road
The business will be open to the public 12 hours per day, every single day. The continual noises emanating from the store, delivery trucks, and customers from a commercial enterprise are a terrible imposition upon the residential area that it faces. The lights from the store, its signs, and parking lot will never be turned off. This is not an insignificant impact on the residential neighborhood! The store will have several deliveries (by step vans with back-up horns) every day, in addition to their illegal semi-truck once or twice per week, further adding to the traffic, noise, and general chaos that comes with putting a store that is too large in the wrong place.

The building size of 9,100 square feet is too large for the building sites. Besides the Alta Sierra site being unable to provide enough parking for the building size, it cannot support its own septic system. It has designed an elaborate system to pump the sewage across the abutting property, to another parcel that the developer does not own, before leaching into the ground, thereby impacting 2 other non-abutting parcels... an act that is not permitted within the 2007 California Plumbing Code. (OWTS Policy Implementation Reference, Appendix K).

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 of Little Valley Road, and the Engineers further comment that increased landscaping would not likely reduce the buildings perceived scale. The proposal removes what is already a limited tree barrier to commercial lights and noises. Finally, with all of the destruction taking place in our county with floods, sinkholes, old growth trees collapsing, roads washing away, and the destruction to our pines by the drought and the pine beetles, why would you want to cause the needless destruction of so many healthy trees for a store that does not fit the environment?

Areas of Nevada County attract thousands of tourists for its historic and rural charms. We need to be careful not to clutter our neighborhoods with big box stores. Developments like that should be restricted to the larger commercial strip malls that already exist. We rely upon our County Seat to protect our way of life, just as the City Seats within our county strive to maintain certain standards within their borders.

Reports and truck templates provided by the Developer to provide the ingress/egress of delivery trucks provide confusion 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. Reliance upon the incorrect data provided results in incorrect conclusions. These issues were clearly defined to the Engineers, but were not even addressed in their DEIR.

The DEIR states that “the distances from Alta Sierra Drive to the entrance of the building and property boundary are less than 1,000 feet, indicating that adequate emergency access is provided because emergency personnel can park along Alta Sierra Drive and provide emergency services in the event that the project access is blocked or otherwise inaccessible.” Alta Sierra is considered such a high fire risk that insurance policies are often cancelled on that basis, leaving homeowners without insurance. It is not wise to further impede access to properties that require emergency services.

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. The loss of vegetation at the sites will decrease the amount of water shed absorption, causing more water to flow into the already inadequate ditches. 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). Maintenance of the ditches and culverts are not done adequately, it has been several years since the last one, even after problems were reported, and requests were submitted.

As part of the solution to the increased watershed, the project suggests an underground holding tank for its runoff, that will be metered out at a controlled pace. But when the holding tank is full, there will be no control for the overflow, even though the build-up of water will continue. We have seen flooding conditions coming down our roads and ditches with recent storms, and nearby residents know first-hand that one tank under this store is NOT going to supply any protection as the natural watershed absorption on those properties are destroyed.

I would also like the Lead Engineer with this project at MBI (Patrick Hinchmarsh) to receive a copy of this letter, in addition to a copy to each of the Planning Commission Members, including Linda Duncan (her email address is not made public).

Thank you for your consideration,

Charisse Lolli

cc: D.B. Mooney, Attorney at Law
cc: Honorable Steven S. Honigman
Letter 134 – Charisse Lolli (1)

**Response 134-1:** The Draft EIR discusses the generation of light on the project site in Impact 4.1.2(AS) on pages 4.0-10 and 4.0-11 in Draft EIR Section 4.0, Aesthetics. As discussed in the Draft EIR, the project would be required to comply with the County's Land Use and Development Code Section L-II 4.2.8(D)(2), which states that “all outdoor lighting fixtures shall be fully shielded to prevent the light source or lens from being visible from adjacent properties and roadways..” In addition, mitigation measure MM AS-4.1.2a requires the use of reduced-wattage light fixtures on the southwest and southeast corners of the building and reducing the wattage of the lighting fixtures or moving poles farther into the interior of the site for the parking lot on the north of the site to reduce lighting impacts. Regarding signage on the front (north) of the building, because Alta Sierra is not within a community region, internally lit signs would not be allowed per County Code. Downward-facing lighting (gooseneck lighting) is allowed, but would be required to comply with the code, such as including shielding, to prevent light and glare off-site.

**Response 134-2:** Please see Master Response 5 regarding project-related drainage at the Alta Sierra site. With respect to litter, the project applicant will be required to control litter on-site in accordance with Section G-IV 8.4 of the Nevada County Code. Compliance will be monitored and enforced by the County throughout the life of the project through its Code Compliance Division. Please see also Response 1-1 for a discussion on litter. Impact 15.1.2(AS) in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, evaluates traffic safety, including line of sight, along Alta Sierra Drive. The Draft EIR identifies the need for mitigation to ensure appropriate line of sight based on the current roadway alignment relative to the proposed driveway (mitigation measure MM AS-15.1.2a) and for curb modification at the proposed driveway (mitigation measure MM AS-15.1.c). As stated in the Draft EIR (page 15.0-11), these mitigation measures would reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

**Response 134-3:** The standards by which impacts are evaluated are stated for each of the 12 environmental topic sections in the Draft EIR under the subheading Standards of Significance in each Impact Methodology subsection. The Draft EIR fully discloses the environmental impacts and provides substantial evidence to support the conclusions. The Draft EIR adequately addresses the potential impacts of the projects. Please see Master Response 4 for information on EIR adequacy.

**Response 134-4:** Please see Master Response 4 for project-related economic considerations.

**Response 134-5:** Comment noted. The effects of construction traffic on Little Valley Road have been evaluated in the Draft EIR. Haul truck traffic associated with grading and soil export and its potential to impact existing land uses along Little Valley Road is specifically addressed in Impact 12.1.2(AS) and mitigation measure MM AS-12.1.2 on page 12.0-9 in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning. The Draft EIR also includes mitigation measures MM AS-15.1.5 (construction traffic control plan) in Section 15.0, MM AS-13.1.2 (construction noise) in Section 13.0, Noise, and MM AS-5.1.1a through MM AS-5.1.1c (construction vehicle emissions, construction dust, and volatile organic compounds) in Section 5.0, Air Quality.
Response 134-6: Please see Master Response 3.

Response 134-7: Please see Master Response 4.

Response 134-8: Draft EIR Appendix 12.0-C contains the parking study prepared for the Alta Sierra site. As discussed on Appendix 12.0-C pages 2-3, the study was based on parking surveys performed at three similar Dollar General stores in Northern California, all of which are freestanding stores lacking connections to adjacent retail parking. The proposed reduced parking at the Alta Sierra site is substantiated by traffic engineer studies consistent with County requirements.

Response 134-9: Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation, in the Draft EIR discusses transportation and traffic. Please see also Master Response 4 for information on response and comment requirements.

Response 134-10: Please see Response 134-2.

Response 134-11: As discussed in Response A-2, one off-site roadway improvement will be required for the proposed Alta Sierra project. This improvement will be required as a condition of approval for the project and will be completed prior to project operation.

Response 134-12: The Draft EIR's four photosimulations for the Alta Sierra site are in Figures 4.0-2 through 4.0-5 on pages 4.0-15 through 4.0-21 in Section 4.0. The commenter's letter includes five photographs. The first two photographs correspond to Figure 4.0-4. The third photograph is not an image in the Draft EIR. The fourth photograph corresponds to Figure 4.0-5 (Proposed).

The fifth photograph appears to be an early rendering, which no longer reflects the proposed project design.

As noted by the commenter, the conclusion in the Draft EIR is that the bulk of the building would change the character of area and this would be significant and unavoidable. There was no attempt to hide the size and scale of the building in the simulations shown in Figures 4.0-2 through 4.0-5 in the Draft EIR. The visual simulations in the Draft EIR are intended to show general size and scale and exterior treatments on the site and to generally disclose the change at the site from a particular viewpoint. The simulations provide adequate information to the public and decision-makers regarding the potential changes in the visual character of the site.

Response 134-13: As discussed in Impact 13.1.1(AS) on Draft EIR pages 13.0-7 and 13.0-8 in Section 13.0, truck delivery noise was determined to be a potentially significant impact requiring mitigation. To reduce the truck delivery noise impact, the Draft EIR includes mitigation measure MM AS-13.1.1, which limits all truck deliveries to the project site to between the daytime hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. With implementation of this measure and construction of a 6-foot-tall concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall along the east property line, the impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Response 134-14: Please see Master Response 2 related to building size and Master Response 1 regarding the septic system.
Response 134-15: Please see Master Response 2 and Master Response 7.

Response 134-16: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses aesthetics. Please see Master Response 2 and Master Response 4.

Response 134-17: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses the rural region. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR.

Response 134-18: As discussed in Draft EIR Section 15.0 in Impact 15.1.2 on page 15.0-11 and in Master Response 3, STAA trucks are prohibited by law from entering the Alta Sierra site. In addition, mitigation measure MM AS-15.1.2b prohibits the use of STAA trucks for delivery to the site. Therefore, the truck turning templates to which the commenter refers are not applicable to the project.

Response 134-19: The commenter expresses the opinion that it is not wise to impede access to properties that require emergency access, referring to the text in the Draft EIR that states “the distances from Alta Sierra Drive to the entrance of the building and property boundary are less than 1,000 feet, indicating that adequate emergency access is provided because emergency personnel can park along Alta Sierra Drive and provide emergency services in the event that the project access is blocked or otherwise inaccessible” (Draft EIR page 10.0-9 in Section 10.0, Hazards and Hazardous Materials). It should be noted that the 1,000-foot distance referenced is intended to show that in the unlikely event that there is a fire and access at the driveway is blocked, emergency personnel would still be able to access the site.

Response 134-20: Please see Master Response 5.
Hi Tyler,

I will not be able to make tomorrow's meeting due to having to work, but wanted to add my comments to this.

I am adamantly opposed to having a Dollar General in Alta Sierra. I live about a quarter mile from that location (on Beeman Lane), and would be extremely unhappy with all the added traffic and blight that would be sure to happen if it was built there. The whole reason for living in Alta Sierra is for the rural beauty without a bunch of ugly chain stores. Why can't people drive 8 miles into GV to go to the store?

Know that if it goes through and is built there, I'm sure I am not the only one who will boycott it and never shop there.

Thank you for listening!

Janet Goodban
Beeman Lane, Grass Valley
Letter 135 – Janet Goodban

Response 135-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Alta Sierra project and also discusses traffic, blight, and aesthetics. Traffic impacts are evaluated in Impact 15.1.1(AS) in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. Aesthetics are discussed in Impact 4.1.1(AS) on page 4.0-35 in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, in the Draft EIR and Master Response 2. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 136

From: Robert Sproul <robertsproul@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 3:23 PM
To: Dollar General, Rough & Ready Highway

Sir,

I have observed the permitting process for this proposed development for over two years.

As the local people who are going to be negatively impacted by these mall developments have done the best that they could, writing letters, having meetings, and putting up Facebook pages, the Arizona-based development company, working in the interest of a 20 billion dollar national company, has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars relentlessly pushing their agenda forward. They have hired a local land use attorney and an international engineering firm, they have courted local all-growth-is-good-growth political contacts and networked extensively with the county building authorities.

This corporate interest in our Nevada County market is unsolicited, and seems to be entirely unsupported by the citizenry. Our primary defense against inappropriate, unwanted, development is our elected, appointed, and paid, county representatives.

Dollar General’s development model is specifically designed to circumvent local zoning laws meant to limit the size of neighborhood markets. Their 72” delivery trucks flout local road use ordinances.

If the developer were allowed to proceed with all these projects, despite a complete lack of community support for this kind of growth, local businesses would see roughly $8 million dollars a year drained out of the local economy and sent to a corporation in Tennessee.

To reiterate: Out of town interests want to build 3 more wildly inappropriate retail facilities which will siphon off, first the construction profits, and then the operating profits, for as long as these ill-conceived projects manage to survive.

Nevada County “gains” a corporate employer consistently rated amongst the worst in the nation and a handful of jobs that don’t pay a living wage. When inevitably, (and perhaps surprisingly soon) Dollar General’s business model fails, we will be left with 4 big, empty, cheaply constructed, boxes dotted around the county.

I am opposed to this development.

Regards,
Robert Sproul
Letter 136 – Robert Sproul

Response 136-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses truck size and safety, which is addressed in Master Response 3. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 137

January 24, 2017

RE: proposed Dollar General Store on Rough and Ready Highway

To whom it may concern,

I am writing in opposition to the Dollar General Store proposed for the Rough and Ready Highway.

We live 0.5 miles away from the proposed building site. We often hike near the proposed building site.......enjoying the quiet, the scenery and the easy access. We do not want a commercial building of any size or type as this is a quiet residential community.

I actually believe this is a zoning issue. The proposed store is to be approximately 9,100 square feet. This is totally inappropriate for the small residential neighborhood in which the property sits. The zoning needs to be changed to prohibit commercial buildings in the area.

The location is in a small rural neighborhood. All the homes are small, single family and mostly single story. It is a quiet neighborhood with a rural atmosphere. A large commercial building would be visually offensive and bring noise, bright lights and commotion to a quiet community.

The building alone is totally incompatible with this neighborhood. The whole vicinity in all directions is rural residential with little or no commercial buildings for several miles.

Until several years ago there was a general store in the town of Rough and Ready. This was located a couple of miles west of the proposed Dollar General. It closed several years ago and nothing has replaced it. This closure suggests that the Rough and Ready residents drive outside of their local neighborhood to shop.

Also, I fear that this store will fail and the neighborhood will be left with a huge empty ugly building. We know that such buildings depress the local morale and property values.

There is a lot of community opposition to this proposal. Please, listen to the residents and decline this application.

Sincerely,

Diane Walker
William Lawrence
10201 Ridgeview Drive
Grass Valley, CA 95945
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 137 – Diane Walker and William Lawrence

**Response 137-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses zoning, land use compatibility, and aesthetics. The project is consistent with current zoning, but it would result in significant land use incompatibility and aesthetics impacts that are unavoidable, as explained in the Draft EIR; see Impact 12.3.2(RR) in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, and Impact 4.3.2(RR) in Section 4.0, Aesthetics. Please see Master Response 2. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 138

From: Charmian <19fordknocks77@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 8:47 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Proposed Dollar General Stores in Nevada County, CA

Dear Mr Barrington,

1. Charmian Railsback, of Grass Valley CA, am totally against MORE (two is enough) Dollar General Stores for this county. The EIR out recently is woefully inadequate.

2. Traffic powering up Rough & Ready Highway from Bitney Springs Road rarely keeps to the posted 35 mph speed limit making very dangerous driving conditions in that small neighborhood further impacted by the Charter School being built.

2. Dollar General’s proceeds go to their home state of Tennessee. They are absolutely NOT the type of growth appropriate for Nevada County.

3. Dollar General has really unrealistic expectations of minimum customers needed for viable business operation. They also offer only a few minimum wage jobs.

4. Truly this county does not need more foreign made inferior merchandise when our county is full of entrepreneurs offering a wide variety of products.

Please be most circumspect in your Dollar General deliberations.

Thank you
Charmian Railsback
Letter 138 – Charmian Railsback (1)

Response 138-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses traffic hazards. Traffic safety is evaluated in the Draft EIR in Impact 15.3.2(RR) on page 15.0-35 in Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation and Master Response 6. Please see also Master Response 4 pertaining to EIR adequacy.
Letter 139

From: Padeeblack <padeeblack@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:51 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: DOLLAR GENERAL, R&R Hwy

Dear Mr. Barrington,

I am writing in opposition to the Dollar General store proposed for Rough and Ready Highway.

I think these stores are wildly out of sync with most Nevada County folks idea of appropriate, desirable, growth. There has been virtually no local support for them, they are being imposed on us. Out of state developers are working to subvert the intent of our zoning laws, so that out of town contractors can build these stores. They buy none of their merchandise locally, and send all their profits to Tennessee. Nevada county’s only upside, is some sales tax revenue and a few jobs. These jobs are not living wage, and Dollar General has been ranked among the worst employers in the nation.

Per Nevada County zoning regulation:
"C1 is intended to provide for the retail and service needs of nearby neighborhoods"
"C2 is intended to serve the varied needs of a large geographic area"

If this exact store was appropriate to build in Brunswick Basin (C2 zoning) how is it appropriate for a C1 lot on the rural periphery of Grass Valley?

The developer is trying to pass these stores off as “neighborhood convenience” stores which is ridiculous. At 9100 square feet they are three times the size of the standard industry definition of a convenience store.

The average size of a Rite Aid is 12,750 Sq. Ft. only 25% larger than this so called “neighborhood convenience” store.

It would be very weak governance and a terrible political legacy to allow these projects to be built. Please do not approve this project located at 12345 Rough and Ready Hwy, my next door neighbor.

Thank you,
Padee Black
Letter 139 – Padee Black (1)

Response 139-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses zoning. The project’s consistency with zoning is addressed in Impact 12.3.2(RR) in Section 12.0, Land Use and Planning, in the Draft EIR. Please see also Master Response 4.
Letter 140

From: jofiksdal@att.net
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2017 4:26 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Alta Sierra Dollar General

Dear Mr. Barrington,

We are very much opposed to the development of a Dollar General store in Alta Sierra. We don't need it here, we don't want it here and if it is built, we won't shop there. As it is, we've hardly seen any cars parked at the one now in Brunswick basin so who needs them? We have Kmart, that's enough of a "big box discount" store.

We are concerned about traffic issues and overuse of our existing roads by large trucks will cause damage and potholes.

We are concerned about the removal of many trees, including heritage trees that will significantly impact the rural appearance of the gateway to our Alta Sierra neighborhood.

We are concerned that the building will be an eyesore.

We are concerned the lighting will negatively impact any residents living nearby.

We are concerned about the impact on existing local business that have been a convenient choice for Alta Sierra residents.

Dollar General does not belong in Alta Sierra, period. Please do not approve the development of this chain store here. We don't want it.

Thank you for your time and attention to our comments.

James and Barbara Fiksdal
Alta Sierra residents since 2004
Letter 141 – Evan L. Peard

**Response 141-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses history. Please see Master Response 4 and Section 7.0, Cultural Resources, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 142

From: Vivian Malka <vmalka@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 7:05 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar general

Hi,

I would just like to inform you that as a resident of Nevada County, I object to the building of these three additional Dollar General stores. For the sake of our roads, our property values, our trees, our mom-and-pop shops, and the aesthetic of our community, please do not approve of these unnecessary projects.

Regards,

Vivian Malka
Letter 142 – Vivian Malka

Response 142-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses trees, aesthetics, and roads. Impacts 6.1.3(AS) and 6.1.5(AS) in Draft EIR Section 6.0, Biological Resources, discuss the Alta Sierra project’s potential impacts on landmark oaks and landmark oak groves. In addition, Draft EIR Appendix 6.0-AS contains the Oak Management Plan developed for the Alta Sierra project. Draft EIR Impacts 6.2.6(PV) and 6.3.5(RR) conclude that neither the Penn Valley project nor the Rough and Ready Highway project will result in the removal of any protected trees. Aesthetics are addressed in Draft EIR Section 4.0, as well as in Master Response 2. Please see also Master Response 4 and Section 15.0, Transportation and Traffic, in the Draft EIR.
Letter 143

Tyler Barrington

From: Melinda Filer <melinda@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 1:21 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: No Dollar Store

I live in Alta Sierra, moved here almost 2 years ago. PLEASE, NO DOLLAR STORE IN ALTA SIERRA, OR ANYWHERE IN NEVADA COUNTY. This store is too Huge, unnecessary because we can go to the one in Grass Valley, which hardly has many shoppers anyway. This will ruin the landscape and I read about all the environmental impacts that would negatively affect our community.

Thank you,
Melinda Filer
Buck Mountain Rd,
Grass Valley

Sent from my iPad
Letter 143 – Melinda Filer

Response 143-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses the landscape. Please see Master Response 4 and Sections 4.0, Aesthetics, 6.0, Biological Resources, and 8.0, Geology and Soils. Please see Master Response 4 for information on comment requirements.
Letter 144

From: Michele Langhorst <michele.langhorst@oragroup.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 8:23 AM
To: Tylar Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Good Morning,

Although I am not able to be at the meeting today because I work I do support the store being there and I think it would help the other businesses that are currently there. It seems like all people want to do is complain about it being there without even giving it a chance. These are the same people that probably do not support the shops and things already there... People also need to stop referring it to a dollar store. I do support it and hope that it gets approved. My good friend owns the healing garden and I think it would be a great benefit to her business...

Thank you for your time and have a good day

Michele Langhorst
Buyer/Purchasing

Landsberg Orora
1981 Terra Court
Redlands, CA 92373
T: 909-454-3133
F: 909-454-3149
E: michele.langhorst@oragroup.com
www.landsberg.com

CAUTION - This message may contain privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the addresses named above. If you are not the intended recipient of this message you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this message is prohibited. If you have received this message in error please notify Orora immediately. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender and may not necessarily reflect the views of Orora.
Letter 144 – Michele Langhorst

**Response 144-1:** The comment is related to the merits of the projects. Please see Master Response 4.
Letter 145

From: Steve Schulte <sschulte@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, January 26, 2017 7:58 AM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General Store Proposal

Hi Tyler,

My name is Steve Schulte. I own the Penn Valley Mini Mart in Penn Valley just on the other side of the post office from where the Dollar General store is being proposed. Out of all of the people in Penn Valley that will be impacted financially, I will be impacted the most. I rely on the income from my Penn Valley business for my income and since I am 67 years old it is no small concern for me.

My store manager and I have been trying to gauge the impact to us of what a Dollar General Store opening so close to us and that sells every item that we in store sell will have. At best we have determined that we will sell less product since they will likely undercut us on pricing some, do to the fact that being a large corporation they have incredible purchasing power from their whole sellers. Since Penn Valley doesn't have a projected population increase of any magnitude in the future, whatever hit we take will more than likely be permanent. We will have to reduce our work force to survive. At worst they may put me out of business.

However, I am pretty sure that my personal financial situation is not a reason for you to deny Dollar General approval. But, let me share some thoughts with you about what could happen if I am forced to go out of business.

Make no mistake, someone will more than likely run a business at my location if I can't. It would be a marginal business, but it will operate. It could be a single owner person who would most likely have to work sixteen hours a day with his wife and maybe a relative working for him for cash. That way he could avoid workman's compensation insurance, social security unemployment, minimum wage, etc. Much of the business would more than likely be done off the books in order to avoid sales tax, income tax etc. The repairs or maintenance on the inside and outside of the building will more than likely be minimal to nonexistent to avoid expenses. The business would likely get that run down look over time. I'm sure you have seen these businesses before. All of these things should be considered in your impact analysis because it will have an impact on Penn Valley in my opinion and not a positive one.

Penn Valley Mini Mart has prided itself in being the home town friendly store. We have people that come in every day and over time we have become like family. I think that is a good thing for a small town to have that kind of atmosphere.

Please add this to your list of considerations when you make your decision.

Thanks

Steve Schulte
Owner Penn Valley Mini Mart
Letter 145 – Steve Schulte, Owner, Penn Valley Mini Mart

Response 145-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also describes the potential for disrepair (blight) at his business. Please see Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 146

From: andrea <honested@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:16 PM
To: Tyler Barrington
Subject: Dollar General

Dear Mr. Barrington,

My name is Andrea Aanestad Bradley and I am a resident of Grass Valley. I am contacting you to express my concerns about the proposed development of three Dollar Generals in our area. I believe the one that already exists is more than enough to meet our needs. There is a quaintness about the towns in our county that would suffer with the addition of these businesses. Not only are they aesthetically displeasing, big discount stores would take away from the the variety of small business...owned and operated by local members of our community.

I’ve watched the development along hwy 49 in Auburn over the last few years...thankful that I live in Grass Valley. Please don't allow that to happen here. The historic charm of this area, part of the reason we decided to settle here and raise our family, charm which brings in tourism, would be muddled with the addition of businesses like Dollar General.

I am curious about the proposed benefit to our community. What does the planning board see that would allow them to entertain something like this? As far as I can tell, the negative impact would far outweigh the positive.

In short, I am whole-heartedly opposed to any further Dollar Generals coming to nevada county. I look forward to hearing what you and the community have to say at tomorrow’s meeting.

Thank you for your time,
Andrea Bradley

Sent from my iPad
Letter 146 – Andrea Bradley

Response 146-1: The comment is related to the merits of the projects and also discusses aesthetics and historic charm. Aesthetics are evaluated in the Draft EIR in Section 4.0, Aesthetics, and cultural resources are evaluated in Section 7.0, Cultural Resources. The majority of impacts were either found to be less than significant or could be mitigated to that level (see Table ES-2 in The Executive Summary in the Draft EIR). Please see also Master Response 4.
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 147

January 20, 2017

TO: Tyler Barrington, Principal Planner
    950 Maidu Avenue, Suite 170 Nevada City, CA 95959

RE: Dollar General Store, Rough and Ready Highway Site

FROM: Affected Residents Listed Below

As residents of the neighborhood to the west and downstream of the proposed Dollar General Store project at 12345 Rough and Ready Highway (R&RH) in Nevada County near Grass Valley, we are strongly opposed to this type of commercial development at this site. We have several concerns about the proposed project as listed below. The surrounding area is rural residential, which will be impacted by the common Dollar General aesthetics of the project and offsite impacts that will be brought to the Sunset residential community.

This commercial site has had a small restaurant and later an archery store that were limited in hours of operation and did not impact the nearby residents. The only other commercial establishments in the Sunset area in the past 40 years were a small neighborhood market (Sunset Market out of business for many years), Bitney Springs Corner (a small hamburger restaurant previously located where the mini-storage is on the corner of Rough & Ready Hwy and Bitney Springs Road), and the building opposite the mini-storage that was once a garden nursery, followed by the efforts of several different owners to establish a restaurant. All of these business attempts have failed.

For those of us who own and reside on property directly fronting Rough and Ready Highway and others in the area surrounding the proposed store, the character of the neighborhood remains exclusively rural and residential. We have the following concerns about the proposed project.

1. Increased Traffic and Noise. R&RH is often busy during commute times, especially during the school year because of its use as a direct access to 3 different high-enrollment schools and access to the towns of Grass Valley and Nevada City. However, outside of rush hour and especially in the evenings, the neighborhood reverts to its quiet residential feel and benefits from the lack of any large nearby retail facility that would generate noise or additional traffic. In particular, the proposed 10PM closing would extend the traffic hours and associated noise, causing a significant and unwelcome intrusion into the evening. Quiet rural residential nighttime noise level is 20 (dBA) as indicated in Table 1 of the Environmental Noise Assessment. Although Dollar General indicates compliance with the zoning noise level for commercial operations, it does not meet the surrounding residential area nighttime standard. There were no noise level studies completed during the 7-10 PM time frame. The noise report on page 7 of 9 indicates hours of operations compliance between 7AM and 7PM. This is the problem with a grandfathered, one-acre site surrounded by rural residential. Does less than 5% of commercial area take precedence over the remaining rural residential standards?
WATER RUN-OFF DURING THE RAINY SEASON. Runoff from the proposed project (one acre of asphalt parking lot and the building roof) will increase the possibility of flooding along the south side of R&R to the west. [See attached photos 1, 2, and 3 of run-off area]. During the most recent storm event, an acre-foot of water fell on the property. The drainage report indicates that a single, filtered detention facility with a capacity of 1,131 cubic feet will eventually drain to the northwest corner of the project site and will mitigate offsite impacts to the existing historic ditch to the west on the south side of the RR&H. One acre-foot of water is 43,560 cubic feet. The drainage proposal does not address this potential storage deficiency and impact to the downstream ditch (which already has eroded travelway shoulders) or flash runoff flow impacts to the ditch. [See attached photos 4 and 5 showing road erosion from current conditions]. Currently, a cross drain culvert under R&R at the top North East corner of the project site diverts water to minimize impact to the 1600’ long ditch system on the south side of the R&R. Mitigation should require the project applicant to install another cross drain under R&R.

3. Light and Litter Pollution. The lighting required for a facility that is open late into the evening is also a major concern. Further, security lights will cause light trespass during normal operations and night hours when the store is not open. Litter problems associated with commercial businesses will impact the nearby road and drainage ditch and neighborhood aesthetics.

We appreciate your consideration of our concerns and hope that the Nevada County Planning Commission will vote against the development at this location.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]

[Date]

[Print name]

[Signature]

[Address]

[Date]
3.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIR

Letter 147 – Marion Host (1)

**Response 147-1:** This is a form letter signed by the commenter and is the same letter that was separately signed and submitted by others regarding the Rough and Ready Highway project. Please see the responses to Letter 123, which address the topics of concern in this letter (aesthetics, traffic, noise, drainage, lighting, and litter).
Letter 148

Marion Host
12224 Sunset Avenue
Grass Valley, CA 95945
(707) 779-2740

January 20, 2017

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

Dear Mr. Barrington:

My husband and I purchased our Sunset Avenue home last summer because of the peaceful rural environment, and the beauty the neighborhood afforded. Its proximity to downtown, while located outside the city limits, also drew us to this neighborhood. We were appalled to learn that Dollar General may become one of our neighbors.

There is no consumer demand for a Dollar General in the Sunset area. A Dollar General already exists in one of Grass Valley’s commercial areas, and is a 15-minute drive from the proposed site. Moreover, a Dollar General will provide no benefit to our community with its junk food and beer offerings. It will, however, invite additional traffic, litter, and noise to our residential community. It will also attract loiterers, a situation which is likely to pose safety issues for our Sunset area residents.

I urge the Nevada County Planning Commission to vote against the Dollar General development at this location.

Sincerely,

Marion Host
Letter 148 – Marion Host (2)

Response 148-1: The comment is related to the merits of the Rough and Ready Highway project and also discusses traffic, litter, noise, and loiterers. Traffic impacts are evaluated in Impact 15.3.1(RR) in Draft EIR Section 15.0, Traffic and Transportation. Impact 13.3.1(RR) in Section 13.0, Noise, evaluates noise. The project applicant will be required to control litter on-site in accordance with Section G-IV 8.4 of the Nevada County Code (see Response 1-1). The potential for the project to attract loiterers is a social impact that does not require evaluation under CEQA. Please see Master Response 4.