

From: William [william.now@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2009 8:11 PM
To: Tom Last
Subject: IMMC DEIR

Attachments: Picture (Metafile)

Public Comment Card
Idaho-Maryland Mine Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)
SCH No. 2007092017
Comment Period: 10/30/08 to 12/15/08

Name: William Now
Residence: 301 WoodPecker Lane, Nevada City, 95959 (530-478-0464)
Profession: Technical Writer (25 years)
Profession: GV Business Owner (Massage Therapist)
Business Address: Main Street Offices
406 E. Main, Street, Suite K
Grass Valley, CA 95945
(Idaho Maryland Road/SR 49 NB ramps (Intersection #2))

General Position on This Project: I strongly oppose ANY proposal that would re-open this mine in the most congested and strategic transportation nexus in our entire community.

Comment (1) Traffic & Noise Impacts on my business

As a business owner with an office located within 100 feet of Intersection #2 as cited in the DEIR, my business will be severely and negatively impacted by the projected increase in traffic and noise through this intersection. The noise of a diesel truck engine is a particular bane to a massage studio that requires a certain level of solitude and repose.

Comment (2) Traffic & Accident Impacts on Hospital and Emergency Services

Intersection #2 as cited in the DEIR is the primary transportation nexus for hospital services. The project's large trucks will present slow moving obstacles to emergency vehicles and persons racing to hospital services. Should an accident occur with one of these trucks, cyanide may be involved. Such a horror!

Comment (3) Water Quality and Water Treatment

Environmental and human safety risks from mine water are among the chief issues facing this project. If questions regarding them are not rectified UP FRONT instead of waiting until the

project is half completed, then all the time and money spend on this project will have been wasted.

Mitigation and monitoring plan 4.7-2 in Table 8-1 of the DEIR addresses mitigation and monitoring of water from mine dewatering and from the actual gold milling process. The plan calls for a monitoring of the mitigation plan itself and compliance to that plan but I see NO monitoring of the actual safety levels of the water, with the exception of dissolved oxygen levels. I see no mention of regular or even initial testing for heavy metals or other toxics. So we are planning to monitor the plan (a promise) without actually monitoring the safety of the effluent.

I also do not see an initial study that examines and proves what toxics exist in the existing mine water. Once the toxics are identified, expensive studies for EACH toxin will need to be conducted to determine what levels are possibly considered safe AND how we would monitor and or remediate them. Clearly, this is an exhaustive but essential process.

I do NOT see any of this addressed and conclude the DEIR is drastically lacks the safeguards to protect humans and environment.

Comment (4) Risk of Mining Accidents Related to Cyanide

In Nevada and Arizona, over a four-year time span through the end of 2000, cyanide spilled twice and caused a major mine waste spill in 1997 that cost more than \$30 million to clean up. A single such mining accident related to cyanide or other toxic spills would likely wipe out ANY economic gains realized by the county (not to mention the human calamities).

In addition, there are deleterious consequences with regard to the cyanide industry in general. While the production of cyanide does not directly impact Nevada county, I believe we should NOT be supporting industries that pose a threat to ANY community or the environment.

Comment (5) Contamination Risk to Hospitals, Nursing Centers, and Homes

Contaminated dust on project truck tires will track through the busiest intersection in the region. This means hospital vehicles will track it into the hospital parking lots where foot traffic could carry it INTO THE HOSPITAL. Personal vehicles could carry this dust onto our personal properties where our children play.