



State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife
2024 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEE
CASH RECEIPT
 DFW 753.5a (REV. 01/01/24) Previously DFG 753.5a

Print [REDACTED] **Save**

RECEIPT NUMBER:
 47-06/24/2024-028
 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (If applicable)
 2012032053

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY CITY OF YREKA	LEAD AGENCY EMAIL	DATE 06/24/2024
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING SISKIYOU COUNTY	DOCUMENT NUMBER 2024-47-028	
PROJECT TITLE		

FALL CREEK WATER PERMIT EXTENSION

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME CITY OF YREKA	PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL jlucchesi@ci.yreka.ca.us	PHONE NUMBER (530) 841-2324
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS 701 FOURTH STREET	CITY YREKA	STATE CA
		ZIP CODE 96097

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box)

- Local Public Agency
 School District
 Other Special District
 State Agency
 Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

- Environmental Impact Report (EIR) \$ 4,051.25 \$ _____
- Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND) \$ 2,916.75 \$ 2,916.75
- Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW \$ 1,377.25 \$ _____

- Exempt from fee
 - Notice of Exemption (attach)
 - CDFW No Effect Determination (attach)
- Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy)

- Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only) \$ 850.00 \$ _____
- County documentary handling fee \$ 50.00 \$ 50.00
- Other \$ _____

PAYMENT METHOD:

- Cash
 Credit
 Check
 Other 000121720
 TOTAL RECEIVED \$ 2,966.75

SIGNATURE X ENDORSED-D. BROOKS	AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE Dana Brooks Deputy Clerk
---	---

JUN 24 2024

Notice of Determination

BY: LAURA BYNUM, CLERK ENDORSED-D. BROOKS

Appendix D

To:

Office of Planning and Research
U.S. Mail: P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, CA 95812-3044
Street Address: 1400 Tenth St., Rm 113 Sacramento, CA 95814

County Clerk
County of: Siskiyou
Address: 311 Fourth Street Yreka, CA 96097

From: Deputy Clerk
Public Agency: City of Yreka
Address: 701 Fourth Street Yreka, CA 96097
Contact: Juliana Lucchesi
Phone: 530-841-2324

Lead Agency (if different from above):
Address:
Contact:
Phone:

SUBJECT: Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

State Clearinghouse Number (if submitted to State Clearinghouse): 2012032053

Project Title: Fall Creek Water Permit Extension

Project Applicant: City of Yreka

Project Location (include county): Siskiyou County; APNs 004-370-010 and 030

Project Description:

The City of Yreka is requesting from the State Water Resources Control Board an extension of time under the City's water permit No. 15379 for the City to divert up to 6,300 acre feet per year (afy) from Fall Creek. The City is requesting the term of the permit be extended to the year 2042.

This is to advise that the City Council of the City of Yreka has approved the above (Lead Agency or Responsible Agency)

described project on 06/18/2024 and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project.

- 1. The project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures were made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A mitigation reporting or monitoring plan was adopted for this project.
5. A statement of Overriding Considerations was adopted for this project.
6. Findings were made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval, or the negative Declaration, is available to the General Public at:

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

Signature (Public Agency): [Signature] Title: Community Development Director

Date: 06/24/2024 Date Received for filing at OPR:

**ADDENDUM #1 TO THE FALL CREEK WATER PERMIT EXTENSION NEGATIVE
DECLARATION (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2012032053)**



City of Yreka
Community Development Department

June 14, 2024

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Yreka (City) provides domestic water for utility rate payers within the City of Yreka Water Services Area (WSA). In an effort to continue to provide reliable and high-quality water, the City is requesting that the time for it to put the full amount of its authorized diversion (i.e., 6,300 afy) to beneficial use be extended until the year 2042.

- 1. Project title:** City of Yreka Fall Creek Water Permit Extension
- 2. Lead agency name and address:** City of Yreka
701 Fourth Street
Yreka, CA 96097
- 3. Contact person and phone number:** Jason Ledbetter, City Manager
701 Fourth Street
Yreka, CA 96097
(530) 841-2326
- 4. Project location:** NW corner Section 30, Township 48 North, Range 4 West, MDM. Latitude 41°59'6.68"N, Longitude 122°21'34.90"W (APNs 004-370-010 and 030). Also, the project location includes the place of use, as indicated in the water service area map (**Figure 3.0-2**).
- 5. Project sponsor's name and address:** City of Yreka
701 Fourth Street
Yreka, CA 96097
- 6. General plan designation:** N/A
- 7. Zoning:** Non-Prime Agricultural, 40 acre minimum (AG-2-B-40) at the diversion site and, for the water service area, as shown on the attached County of Siskiyou zoning map (**Figure 4.0-1**).
- 8. Description of project:** The City of Yreka is requesting from the State Water Resources Control Board an extension of time under the City's water permit No. 15379 for the City to divert up to 6,300 acre feet per year (afy) from Fall Creek. The City's permit, issued in 1967, authorized the City to divert 15 cubic feet per second (cfs), up to a maximum of 6,300 afy, from Fall Creek to supply the City's municipal water system. The permit states that the City was to complete full beneficial use of the diverted water by December 31, 2012. The City constructed the diversion facility and is fully capable of diverting the full amount; no new construction is proposed. The City requests that

1.0 INTRODUCTION

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:

- Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous ND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous ND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- 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 ND was certified as complete, shows any of the following:
 - The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous ND;
 - Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous ND;
 - 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
 - Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous ND would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

The City of Yreka determine that an Addendum to the certified ND is appropriate for the subsequent extension of the Fall Creek Water Permit. Overall, there are no proposed changes to type, location, and nature of the project. Therefore, the project is consistent with the overall certified ND. The changes in the project timeframe do not warrant a subsequent CEQA document per CEQA Guidelines Section 15612 as explained in this Addendum. The environmental analysis in this Addendum examines whether the extension of the Fall Creek Water Permit would result in any new significant impacts that were not previously identified in the prior ND or would result in any substantial increases in the severity of previously identified effects. The information contained in this Addendum is provided to be consistent with Section 15614 of the CEQA Guidelines and would allow the City to make an administrative determination that the prior ND and environmental determinations fully address the Fall Creek Water Permit Extension.

1.2 INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

This Addendum has incorporated by reference the Fall Creek Water Permit Extension ND (State Clearinghouse Number 2012032053), certified by the City of Yreka in September 2012, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15150. Information from this document incorporated by reference into this Addendum has been summarized in the appropriate sections which follow, and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this Addendum have been described.

2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

development and growth demand in the City required diversion of that amount by 2022).

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

3.2 Environmental Analysis

This comparative analysis follows the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the City with the factual basis for determining whether any changes in the project, any changes in circumstances, or any new information since the IS/MND was adopted require additional environmental review or preparation of a Subsequent MND or EIR the IS/MND previously prepared.

1. AESTHETICS.				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact	No. The diversion site is not readily visible to the public and the project (i.e., the extension of time in which to put the authorized diversion to maximum beneficial use) has no physical components that would alter the appearance of the stream or existing diversion system.	No. The diversion site is not readily visible to the public and the project (i.e., the extension of time in which to put the authorized diversion to maximum beneficial use) has no physical components that would alter the appearance of the stream or existing diversion system.	No. The diversion site is not readily visible to the public and the project (i.e., the extension of time in which to put the authorized diversion to maximum beneficial use) has no physical components that would alter the appearance of the stream or existing diversion system.
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.	No. There are no scenic resources in the project area.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	No impact	No. The project has no features that would noticeably alter the appearance of the existing diversion system and thereby degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	No. The project has no features that would noticeably alter the appearance of the existing diversion system and thereby degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	No. The project has no features that would noticeably alter the appearance of the existing diversion system and thereby degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	No Impact	No. The project does not propose to add any new light features or components that would add glare to the existing diversion facility.	No. The project does not propose to add any new light features or components that would add glare to the existing diversion facility.	No. The project does not propose to add any new light features or components that would add glare to the existing diversion facility.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would have no significant impacts to aesthetic resources. No additional activities will occur that will impact aesthetics. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. The Project impact remains as "No Impact".

Conclusions Relating to Aesthetics:

The proposed project will have **no impact** concerning visual resources and remain unchanged from the originally adopted IS/ND.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

incorporated lands, does include Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance as identified in the 2000 Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program GIS data (www.consv.ca.gov). Impacts on agricultural resources from development pursuant to the General Plan was considered in the General Plan Update EIR. Additionally, there are no sites on lands with a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, there is no impact to agricultural resources as a result of the proposed extension of time relative to the use of water.

Conclusions Relating to Agriculture and Forest Resources:

The project will have **no impact** to agricultural or forest resources and remain unchanged from the originally adopted IS/ND.

3. AIR QUALITY				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No Impact	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.	No. The project would not create new significant increases in air emissions that would conflict or obstruct implementation of an available air quality plan.
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	No Impact	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard	No. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations	No impact	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	No. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?		description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.	description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.	description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.
c) 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, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Less than Significant	No. There No changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.	No. There No changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.	No. There No changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.
d) 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?	No Impact	No. There No changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.	No. There No changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.	No. There No changes to the Project description that would result in an increase in biological impacts from the previous IS/ND.
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree	No Impact	No. The Project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinance.	No. The Project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinance.	No. The Project does not conflict with any local policies or ordinance.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in § 15064.5?	No Impact	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	No Impact	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.	No. There are no known historic or archaeological resources exist on site.
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	No impact	No. There are no known human remains known to be on site.	No. There are no known human remains known to be on site.	No. There are no known human remains known to be on site.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any cultural resources. Additionally, AB 52 does not apply to projects that had a Notice of an IS/ND filed or issued before July 1, 2015. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

Conclusions Related to Cultural Resources:

The project will have **no impact** on historical, archaeological, paleontological resources or human remains and the conclusions from the IS/ND remain unchanged.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. 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.	No Impact	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture.	No. The project would not be exposed to fault rupture.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	No Impact	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking.	No. The project would not increase exposure to risks associated with strong seismic ground shaking.
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	No Impact	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.	No. The project would not increase exposure to seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction.
iv. Landslides?	No Impact	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.	No. The project would not increase exposure to landslides.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	No Impact	No. The project would not result in soil	No. The project would not result in soil	No. The project would not result in soil

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The proposed project consists of an extension of time (i.e., from 2012 to the year 2042) under the City's water permit to put to full beneficial use the previously-approved amount of 6,300 acre feet per year. The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any geology and soil resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as "No Impact".

Conclusions Related to Energy:

The project will have **no impact** related to geology and soils and the conclusions from the IS/ND remain unchanged.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	No Impact	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.	No. The project would not generate a significant amount of greenhouse gas emissions.
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	No Impact	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.	No. The project would not conflict with an applicable GHG reduction plan.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The Governor of California signed Executive Order S-3-05 (EO) in June 2005 which established statewide reduction targets for greenhouse gases. The EO states that emissions shall be reduced to year 2000 levels by 2010, to 1990 levels by 2020, and by 2050 reduced to 80 percent of the 1990 levels. Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, 2006 (AB 32), was signed into law in September 2006. AB 32 finds that global warming poses a serious threat to the economic wellbeing, public health, natural resources, and the California environment. It establishes a state goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2020, which would be a 25 percent reduction from forecasted emission levels.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		are nearby or onsite.	are nearby or onsite.	are nearby or onsite.
d) 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?	No Impact	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5	No. The project is not designated as a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	No. The Project is not within an Airport Influence Area and therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	No. The Project is not within an Airport Influence Area and therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.	No. The Project is not within an Airport Influence Area and therefore, the proposed project does not have a significant impact.
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.	No. The project would not impair emergency evacuation or response.
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact	No. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires.	No. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires.	No. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	No Impact	No. The project does not include the creation of housing and therefore would not result in the placement of housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.		
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	No Impact	No. The existing Fall Creek facility is already designed and constructed to divert 6,300 acre feet per year at a rate of up to 15 cubic feet per second. No new construction or alteration of the site is proposed, nor does the diversion facility have any components that could result in polluted runoff. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute runoff water that would impact stormwater drainage or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.	No. The existing Fall Creek facility is already designed and constructed to divert 6,300 acre feet per year at a rate of up to 15 cubic feet per second. No new construction or alteration of the site is proposed, nor does the diversion facility have any components that could result in polluted runoff. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute runoff water that would impact stormwater drainage or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.	No. The existing Fall Creek facility is already designed and constructed to divert 6,300 acre feet per year at a rate of up to 15 cubic feet per second. No new construction or alteration of the site is proposed, nor does the diversion facility have any components that could result in polluted runoff. Therefore, the project will not create or contribute runoff water that would impact stormwater drainage or provide additional sources of polluted runoff.
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	No Impact	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.	No. The project would not impede or redirect flood flows.
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk	No Impact	No. The project would not release	No. The project would not release	No. The project would not release

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any land use and planning resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

Conclusions Related to Land Use and Planning:

The proposed project, if approved, will have **no impact** on land use and planning. However, if the project is not approved, the City of Yreka will have to take other measures (with related expense and impacts) to obtain the amount of water it needs to serve the expected growth of the City. The conclusions in the IS/ND remain unchanged.

12. MINERAL RESOURCES				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) 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	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.
b) 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	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.	No. The project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any mineral resources. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

Conclusions Related to Mineral Resources:

The project will have **no impact** on mineral resources within the area, and the conclusions in the IS/ND remain unchanged.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	Less than Significant	No. The extension of time in which to allow the City to divert its permitted amount of 6,300 afy is consistent with, and is scaled to help serve the population and land use build-out projections of, the City's General Plan. The project will not directly nor indirectly result in induced growth that is not already expected in the City's General Plan.	No. The extension of time in which to allow the City to divert its permitted amount of 6,300 afy is consistent with, and is scaled to help serve the population and land use build-out projections of, the City's General Plan. The project will not directly nor indirectly result in induced growth that is not already expected in the City's General Plan.	No. The extension of time in which to allow the City to divert its permitted amount of 6,300 afy is consistent with, and is scaled to help serve the population and land use build-out projections of, the City's General Plan. The project will not directly nor indirectly result in induced growth that is not already expected in the City's General Plan.
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.	No. The project will not displace existing housing.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on population and housing. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

Conclusions Related to Population and Housing:

The conclusions from the IS/ND remain unchanged.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

The project will have **no impact** on public services. The conclusions in the IS/ND remain unchanged.

16. RECREATION				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
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	No. The project will not result in the increased use of any existing parks or other recreation facilities.	No. The project will not result in the increased use of any existing parks or other recreation facilities.	No. The project will not result in the increased use of any existing parks or other recreation facilities.
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	No. The project does not include new recreation facilities, nor will it require the construction or expansion of any recreation facilities.	No. The project does not include new recreation facilities, nor will it require the construction or expansion of any recreation facilities.	No. The project does not include new recreation facilities, nor will it require the construction or expansion of any recreation facilities.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on population and housing. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

Conclusions Related to Recreation:

The conclusions from the IS/ND remain unchanged.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	No Impact	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1 (k), or	No Impact	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.	No. There are no structures or historical resources on the project site.
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	No Impact	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.	No. There are no identified Tribal Cultural Resources in the area.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

wastewater treatment provider which 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?		increase demand substantially	increase demand substantially	increase demand substantially
D) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	No Impact	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.	No. The project would not generate excess solid waste.

Discussion of Checklist Answers:

The previously adopted IS/ND determined that the Project would not have an impact on utilities and service systems. There are no changes to the Project description that would cause an increase in impacts beyond what was analyzed. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

Conclusions Related to Utilities and Service Systems:

The proposed project will have **no impacts** concerning utilities and service systems.

20. WILDFIRE				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	N/A	No. The Project will not impair emergency plans.	No. The Project will not impair emergency plans.	No. The Project will not impair emergency plans.
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	N/A	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.	No. The project would not exacerbate wildfire risks.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
	Adopted IS/ND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	Less than Significant	No. The project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	No. The project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.	No. The project would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	No Impact	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.	No. The project would not have cumulatively considerable impacts.

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL FEE FORM

On 06/24/2024, City of Yreka filed an application
(Date) (Name)
for development with the City of Yreka. Before the application
(Name of City)

is accepted as complete for processing, fees in the following amount(s) must be deposited with the County Clerk.

- Clerk Processing Fee \$50.00
- Negative Declaration \$2,916.75*
- EIR \$4,051.25
- Categorically Exempt \$0.00
- Statutorily Exempt \$0.00
- Fee Exemption issued by the DFG \$0.00
- Other _____ \$ _____

No project shall be operative, vested or final until the required fee is paid. *Public Resources Code §21089 (b)*

On 6/24/24, City of Yreka deposited \$ 2966.75,
(Date) (Name)

with the Siskiyou County Clerk _____
ENDORSED-D. BROOKS
(Attest)

Application No. N/A Receipt # 2024003382/
(To be completed when application is received for processing) 47-06/24/2024-028

* If it is determined by Siskiyou County that the fee required for a Negative Declaration does not apply to your project a refund will be granted.
2024 Fee Form

Laura Bynum
Siskiyou

County Clerk/Registrar of Voters
311 4th St., Rm. 201
Yreka, CA 96097
(530) 842-8084

Public

Receipt No.: RPT2024000000431

Finalization No.: 2024003382

Cashier: 29

Register: CLK-044

Date/Time: 06/24/2024 02:13 PM

Description	Fee
Negative Declaration	
Filing Time: 02:13 PM	
Filing Total: \$2,966.75	
Filing Fee: \$2,966.75	
Total Amount Due: \$2,966.75	

Total Paid

Check Tendered: \$2,966.75

#000121720

Amount Due: \$0.00

THANK YOU

PLEASE KEEP FOR REFERENCE





State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife
2024 ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT FILING FEE
CASH RECEIPT
 DFW 753.5a (REV. 01/01/24) Previously DFG 753.5a

RECEIPT NUMBER:
 47 — 06/24/2024 —
 STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (If applicable)
 2012032053

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY City of Yreka	LEAD AGENCY EMAIL jlucchesi@yrekaca.gov	DATE 06/24/2024
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING Siskiyou	DOCUMENT NUMBER	

PROJECT TITLE

Fall Creek Water Permit Extension

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME City of Yreka	PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL jlucchesi@yrekaca.gov	PHONE NUMBER (530) 8412324
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS 701 Fourth Street	CITY Yreka	STATE CA
		ZIP CODE 96097

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box)


- Local Public Agency School District Other Special District State Agency Private Entity

CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

- | | | | |
|---|------------|----|----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR) | \$4,051.25 | \$ | 0.00 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND) | \$2,916.75 | \$ | 2,916.75 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW | \$1,377.25 | \$ | 0.00 |
|
 | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Exempt from fee | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption (attach) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CDFW No Effect Determination (attach) | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy) | | | |
| <hr/> | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only) | \$850.00 | \$ | 0.00 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> County documentary handling fee | | \$ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | | \$ | |

PAYMENT METHOD:

- Cash Credit Check Other **TOTAL RECEIVED** \$ 2,916.75

SIGNATURE 	AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE Juliana Lucchesi, Community Development Director
--	---