
CITY OF YREKA
ADDENDUM TO THE
FRUIT GROWERS SUPPLY COMPANY
SAWMILL PROJECT
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Prepared for:

CITY OF YREKA
701 FOURTH STREET
YREKA, CA 96097

Prepared by:

Michael Baker
INTERNATIONAL

140 INDEPENDENCE CIRCLE, SUITE C
CHICO, CA 95973

APRIL 2016

CITY OF YREKA
ADDENDUM TO THE
FRUIT GROWERS SUPPLY COMPANY
SAWMILL PROJECT
INITIAL STUDY/MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Prepared for:

CITY OF YREKA
701 FOURTH STREET
YREKA, CA 96097

Prepared by:

MICHAEL BAKER INTERNATIONAL
140 INDEPENDENCE CIRCLE, SUITE C
CHICO, CA 95973

APRIL 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1.0-1
1.1	Introduction	1.0-1
1.2	Project History and Background	1.0-1
1.3	Purpose of an Addendum	1.01
1.4	Organization and Scope	1.0-2
2.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	2.0-1
2.1	Location and Setting	2.01
2.2	Revisions to Proposed Project	2.0-1
2.3	Purpose of this Addendum	2.0-2
3.0	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	3.0-1
3.1	Basis for Decision to Prepare Addendum	3.0-1
3.2	Discussion of Findings	3.0-3
3.3	Summary	3.0-12
4.0	REFERENCES	4.0-1

ATTACHMENTS

Attachement A: *Fruit Growers Sawmill Noise Analysis City of Yreka, CA.*

TABLES

Table 3.0-1 Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND Impact Determination..... 3.0-4

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This document is an Addendum to the 2014 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project, SCH No. 2014042061. The IS/MND was prepared by the City of Yreka pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code 21000 et seq., circulated for public review and comment, and adopted by the City on May 21, 2014. This Addendum has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15162 and 15164. The City of Yreka is the lead agency for the environmental review of this Addendum.

This addendum has been prepared to support an application to the City of Yreka by the Fruit Growers Supply Company to modify approved Conditional Use Permit #4197 to allow for the option of operating the existing facility on a 24 hours per day / 7 day basis. The existing approved facility is only approved to operate for up to 10 hours per day / 5 days per week. The application to the City of Yreka for which this document was determined to be necessary is a request to amend an existing approved Conditional Use Permit.

1.2 PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

In January of 2014, the Fruit Growers Supply Company submitted a Conditional Use Permit application (CUP #4197) to the City of Yreka for the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill project. As part of the environmental review process for the proposed project, an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND #4196) was prepared.

On May 21, 2014, the City of Yreka Planning Commission adopted Resolution 2014-03, approving the CUP, certifying the IS/MND, and adopting findings and the mitigation monitoring program for the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill project.

On October 10th, 2015 the City received a request for a modification to CUP #4197 to allow for the Fruit Growers sawmill facility to operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The original hours of operation approved for the site under CUP #4197 are 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM, five days per week.

1.3 PURPOSE OF AN ADDENDUM

In determining whether an addendum is the appropriate document to analyze the modifications to the project and its approval, CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration) states:

- The lead agency or a responsible agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified EIR if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR have occurred.
- An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.
- An addendum need not be circulated for public review but can be included in or attached to the final EIR or adopted negative declaration.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the final EIR or adopted negative declaration prior to making a decision on the project.
- A brief explanation of the decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to Section 15162 should be included in an addendum to an EIR, the lead agency's required findings on the project, or elsewhere in the record. The explanation must be supported by substantial evidence.

1.4 ORGANIZATION AND SCOPE

Section 1.0 – Introduction

Section 1.0 provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the IS/MND Addendum.

Section 2.0 – Project Description

This section provides a detailed description of the proposed extended hours of operation.

Section 3.0 – Environmental Analysis

Section 3.0 contains an analysis of environmental topic areas that were addressed in the Fruit Growers Company Sawmill Project IS/MND. This section also provides substantial evidence to support the conclusion that none of the circumstances set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 would result from approval of the proposed project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 and the Addendum's consistency with these guidelines are addressed.

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This section provides a detailed description of the proposed changes to the original IS/MND proposed hours of operation for the Fruit Growers sawmill facility. The reader is referred to Section 3.0, Environmental Analysis, for the analysis of environmental effects of this project relative to the previous analysis provided in the Fruit Growers Company Sawmill Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (SCH No. 2014042061) (2014).

2.1 LOCATION AND SETTING

PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is located in the City of Yreka in Siskiyou County, California. Yreka is located approximately 21 miles south of the California-Oregon border. Interstate 5, State Route 3, and State Route 263 pass through and provide regional access to the city. The project area, which totals approximately 79 acres, is located at 229 South Phillippe Lane adjacent to the eastern boundary of the city limits. The project site is accessed via South Phillippe Lane, which connects with State Route 3 approximately 0.2 miles north of the project site. Specifically, the project is situated on APNs 053-681-060, 053-681-070, and 013-100-140 in Section 24 of Township 45 North, Range 7 West of the Mount Diablo Meridian (Latitude 41°43'47.15"N, Longitude 122°35'451.22"W).

PROJECT SETTING

The proposed project site is located on the existing Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill, in an industrial area at the eastern edge of the Yreka city limits. The site is bordered on the north by the Yreka Western Railroad tracks. Immediately north of this railway are industrial uses, including a concrete batch plant, industrial storage as well as a meat processing/packing plant, with North Foothill Drive and State Route (SR) 3 beyond. To the east of the project site are South Phillippe Lane, a Veneer Mill (Timber products), and agricultural lands beyond. Vacant land predominates to the south and west of the project site, though there is a scattering of residences located in both of these directions. To the west, these residences are on Clark Way, while the residences to the south are accessed from South Phillippe Lane. Oberlin Road is located approximately 1.1 miles south of the project site.

2.2 REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

As discussed previously, the proposed Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND was adopted by the City Council on May 21, 2014. No new construction is proposed for the project site with this Addendum. The component of the project that is proposed to be altered and is the subject of this IS/MND Addendum is the change in hours of operation for the sawmill facility from 7:00AM to 5:00PM for five days a week, to 24 hours a day for seven days a week. The extended operating hours would apply only to the sawmill facility and would not increase the hours of operation for truck trips. The increase in hours of operation could also result in an increase in the number of employees at the project by 40 to 44 persons.

Because of the change in hours of operation at the sawmill facility, an increase in nighttime noise was considered to be a potential impact area. As such, a noise analysis was completed to determine the resultant noise levels due to the proposed increase of operating hours. This analysis, *Fruit Growers Sawmill Noise Analysis*, (j.c. brennan & associates, Inc., 2015), determined that overall noise levels at the nearest residences would increase nighttime noise levels by no more than 3 dBA. The predicted noise levels would be in compliance with the City of Yreka General Plan

2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

nighttime noise level criteria. Additionally, the increase in noise would be within the guidelines of the Federal Interagency Committee on Noise (FICON) in assessing the changes in ambient noise levels. As such, the increase in overall noise levels would not be considered significant. The noise analysis is included in this Addendum as Attachment A.

2.3 PURPOSE OF THIS ADDENDUM

As stated previously, the revised hours of operation for the sawmill facility would go from a 10 hour per day / five days a week operation, to a 24 hours per day / seven day per week operation. Following a detailed review of the approved Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration for the original sawmill project, an Addendum to the 2014 Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was determined to be the appropriate analysis tool pursuant to the requirements of the Public Resources Code and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in support of the consideration of the request. No other components of the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project have been changed. No increase in truck trips or hours would occur with this project.

This Addendum addresses the proposed changes associated with the operating hours of the Fruit Growers sawmill facility relative to the previous environmental review for the IS/MND. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 describes an addendum as:

- (a) An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred.*

The analysis provided in this Addendum (see Section 3.0 for the technical analysis) provides substantial evidence to support that none of the circumstances set forth in CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162(a) through (d) would result from adoption of the proposed project.

Information and technical analyses from the 2014 Fruit Growers Company Sawmill Project IS/MND are utilized throughout this Addendum. Relevant passages from this document are cited and available for review at:

City of Yreka
Planning Department
701 Fourth Street
Yreka, CA 96097

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.1 BASIS FOR DECISION TO PREPARE ADDENDUM

When an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been adopted for a project, Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 through 15164 set forth the criteria for determining whether a subsequent EIR, subsequent negative declaration, addendum, or no further documentation should be prepared in support of further agency action on the project. In determining whether an addendum is the appropriate document to analyze the modifications to the project and its approval, CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 (Addendum to an EIR or Negative Declaration) states, "An addendum to an adopted negative declaration may be prepared if only minor technical changes or additions are necessary or none of the conditions described in 15162 calling for the preparation of a subsequent EIR or negative declaration have occurred." Under the CEQA Guidelines, a subsequent EIR or negative declaration shall be prepared if any of the following criteria are met. Text in italics is from the CEQA Guidelines, while the text following each quoted subsection provides the substantial evidence supporting the City's decision to prepare an addendum.

- (a) *When an EIR has been certified or negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:*
 - (1) *Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*

A modification to the operating hours of the Fruit Growers sawmill facility would not result in any changes to existing land uses that were not already identified in the project IS/MND, nor would the extension of operating hours result in any significant changes to impacts or mitigation measures identified in the adopted IS/MND, or adopted IS/MND Findings. None of the changes result in physical changes to the environment nor raise any new environmental areas of concern and therefore do not affect the impact analysis contained in the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND.

- (2) *Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*

The Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND was adopted by the City of Yreka Planning Commission on May 21, 2014. Since that time, none of the physical project components have changed in any way. The potential for increased noise impacts on the surrounding environment from extended facility hours was evaluated as a part of the Noise Analysis done by j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. and determined to be less than significant. The proposed change in operating hours at the sawmill facility is consistent with the land use assumptions and analysis of the adopted IS/MND. Additionally, no changes to the environmental conditions or circumstances have occurred that would affect the analysis or conclusions of the adopted IS/MND.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

(3) *New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:*

(A) *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;*

As discussed in this Addendum, the proposed extension to the facility's operational hours would not significantly increase the level of any environmental impact identified in the adopted Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND. The proposed extended hours are compatible with the industrial uses surrounding the project site. The change in operating hours would not affect the existing or future environment, as existing and proposed land uses are not proposed to be changed. Furthermore, the proposed change would not result in significant effects not discussed in the adopted IS/MND.

(B) *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;*

The proposed extension to operating hours of the sawmill facility would not increase the severity of any of the environmental impacts identified in the adopted Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND, as the proposal would not cause changes to the existing or proposed land uses.

(C) *Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or*

No new mitigation measures are proposed as a result of the extended operating hours for the sawmill facility. The change in hours of operation would not result in infeasible mitigation or new feasible mitigation. Furthermore, no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found to be infeasible are now feasible.

(D) *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.*

The proposed extended operating hours would not significantly change the environmental conditions in the project's vicinity, and there is no need to modify the mitigation measures contained in the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND. No new mitigation measures or alternatives are necessary and none have been identified.

(b) *If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise, the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, and addendum, or no further documentation.*

As summarized above and further discussed in this Addendum, the proposed changes to the hours of operation at the Fruit Growers sawmill facility do not meet the criteria for preparing a subsequent negative declaration. An addendum is appropriate here because, as further explained in this section, none of the conditions calling for preparation of a subsequent negative

declaration have occurred. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15164(c) and (d), this IS/MND Addendum will not be circulated for public review but will be attached to the IS/MND.

3.2 DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

As demonstrated in this Addendum, the changes proposed to the hours of operation at the Fruit Growers sawmill facility do not meet the criteria for preparing a supplemental or subsequent IS/MND. First, this modification does not propose substantial changes to the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project. Extending the operating hours would not result in any significant physical changes to the existing or surrounding environment, nor would it increase the severity of any previously identified significant impact from the adopted Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND that would require major revisions to the adopted IS/MND (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][1]). Therefore, with the exception of potential new noise impacts associated with the extended operating hours, the proposed operational modification does not affect the impact analysis contained in the adopted Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND.

Second, the proposed increase in operating hours would not result in changes in physical circumstances that would cause a new significant impact or substantially increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact as no new physical construction or site disturbing activities would occur on the site as a result of the request to the City. There have been no other changes in the circumstances that meet this criterion (CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][2]). Therefore, there have been no changes in the environmental conditions not contemplated and analyzed in the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill IS/MND that would result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts.

Third, as documented in this Addendum, there is no new information of substantial importance (which was not known or could not have been known at the time of Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND adoption by the City of Yreka in 2014) that identifies a new significant impact (condition "A" in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3]); there would not be a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact (condition "B" in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3]); and there are no mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible that would now be feasible and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the proposed project, or mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those analyzed in the EIR which would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment (conditions "C" and "D" in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3]). The proposed modification to the hours of operation at the sawmill facility would not change any physical components of the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project other than an increase of operating hours. None of the "new information" conditions listed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162[a][3] would be caused by the proposed change that would require a subsequent or supplemental IS/MND.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

**TABLE 3.0-1
FRUIT GROWERS SUPPLY COMPANY SAWMILL PROJECT IS/MND IMPACT DETERMINATION**

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
Aesthetics		
A) Would the project have a significant adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No impact	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project create a source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact
Agricultural Resources		
A) Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No impact	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?	No impact	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 1222(g), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 51104(g))?	No impact	Does not change the impact
E) Would the project result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Air Quality		
A) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
C) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	No impact	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
E) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
Biological Resources		
A) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	No impact	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	No impact	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
E) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No impact	Does not change the impact
F) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Cultural Resources		
A) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
C) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geological feature?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact
Geology/Soils		
A-i) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
A-ii) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving strong seismic ground shaking?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
A-iii) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
A-iv) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving seismic-related ground failure, including landslides?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
E) Would the project Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Greenhouse Gases		
A) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?	No impact	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
A) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No impact	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	Less than significant with mitigation	Does not change the impact
E) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No impact	Does not change the impact
F) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No impact	Does not change the impact
G) Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
H) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
Hydrology and Water Quality		
A) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
C) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
E) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
F) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
G) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	No impact	Does not change the impact
H) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?	No impact	Does not change the impact
I) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of a failure of a levee or dam?	No impact	Does not change the impact
J) Would the project inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Land Use and Planning		
A) Would the project physically divide an established community?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	No impact	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Mineral Resources		
A) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	No impact	Does not change the impact

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
Noise		
A) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or of applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
E) For a project located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or a public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact	Does not change the impact
F) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Population and Housing		
A) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No impact	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Public Services. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:		
Fire Protection	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
Police Protection	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
Schools	No impact	Does not change the impact
Parks	No impact	Does not change the impact
Other Public Facilities	No impact	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
Recreation and Open Space		
A) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	No impact	Does not change the impact
B) Does the project include recreational facilities, or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Transportation and Circulation		
A) Would the project cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	No impact	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No impact	Does not change the impact
E) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?	No impact	Does not change the impact
F) Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	No impact	Does not change the impact
Utilities and Service Systems		
A) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
B) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
C) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
D) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

CEQA Environmental Checklist – Potential Impacts	IS/MND Determination	Impact Determination – Extended Operating Hours of Sawmill Facility
E) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand, in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
F) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact
G) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	Less than significant	Does not change the impact

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

3.3 SUMMARY

The proposed expansion of operating hours would not result in changes to the existing land uses and would be consistent with those assumed and analyzed in the adopted IS/MND. In addition, the expansion of operating hours would not result in development of any additional uses that could contribute to impacts beyond those analyzed in the IS/MND. Since the proposed changes are consistent with the development identified for the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project in the adopted IS/MND, no additional area is proposed for urban development, and no changes are proposed to the project's permitting and approval process, the proposed project revisions would not result in new or more severe impacts beyond those analyzed and mitigated in the Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project IS/MND.

4.0 REFERENCES

j.c. brennan & associates, Inc. 2015. *Fruit Growers Sawmill Noise Analysis City of Yreka, CA*. jcb Project # 2015-219. November 30, 2015.

City of Yreka. 2009. *Fruit Growers Supply Company Sawmill Project Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration* (SCH No. 2014042061).

4.0 REFERENCES

This page is intentionally left blank.