

**From:** Julia Carroll [jcarroll43@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 19, 2009 1:51 PM  
**To:** Tom Last  
**Cc:** Mike Shea  
**Subject:** Idaho Maryland Mine - draft EIR deficiencies  
Hello, Tom,

My husband, Mike Shea, and I have attended a couple of meetings concerning the proposed Idaho Maryland Mine, and Mike has written to you and he spoke at the last planning meeting about some of his major concerns regarding the draft EIR - specifically, regarding air quality and traffic. I have been glad to see that many others, including the Nevada County Traffic Commission, also have weighed in on those concerns.

I want to share my concerns regarding the inadequacy of the EIR with regard to two issues:

First, the EIR does not address the **devaluation of real estate** - homes - located near the proposed project areas. To make my point, my husband and I are actively looking to buy a new home in the Grass Valley/Nevada City area. We currently live in Grass Valley, just off 174, a few miles below the Y.) We found a home on Cedar Ridge Dr. that we really like, but because of the home's proximity to the proposed Brunswick facility, we will not consider putting an offer on that house unless and until the mine project is rejected. We cannot be the only potential buyers taking this view of real estate in the vicinity of the mine. It appears the trade-off may be new jobs for some folks at the cost of lost property values for others. The EIR doesn't say how the mine owners might mitigate this serious problem.

My second concern has to do with the inadequacy of the EIR with regard to **aesthetics**. To illustrate my point, the other day I sat in a room in the outpatient wing of SNMH, where I was attending a support group. One of the other members of my group looked out the window and commented on what a beautiful view there is from the hospital, across 49, and to the woods and hills beyond. I said to her, "Well for now there is, but if the mine is approved the beautiful view will be gone." She replied, "Surely, *they* [the mine owners?] will do something to make it okay." Wishful (naive) thinking.

What qualifies the folks who wrote the draft EIR to determine the extent and seriousness of the *potential substantial adverse effects on scenic vistas*? From what I see in the draft EIR, the most that has been suggested the mine owners may do is plant some trees near the facilities - but not nearly as many as the more than 1000 trees *they* will remove.

The EIR also reports that [emphasis and comment added]:

"...a number of state routes are eligible to be designated as scenic routes including the entire lengths of State Routes 49, 89, and 174 and Interstate 80 throughout the County as well as the remainder of SR 20. The project sites are located to the east and south of SR 20/49, **which is eligible for a scenic route designation. The Idaho-Maryland site is the only project site that would be**

**visible from this route.** [That is, the mine will present a large chunk of the view through the Golden Center of our communities.]

What possible mitigation is there for the loss of the possible *scenic route* designation - a positive designation that may draw more visitors, along with new businesses and residents to our area - if we forgo our current *scenic route* to the mine? The EIR doesn't say.

Thank you for passing my comments on to the Planning Commission in time for the meeting on Tues. 1/20.

Sincerely, Julia Carroll, Grass Valley, CA 95945