

Addendum #1 to the Mitigated Negative Declaration
(State Clearinghouse No. 2008082014)



Siskiyou County
Community Development Department
Planning Division

February 2024

Table of Contents

Section One – Introduction	3
1.1 Background	3
1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance	3
1.3 Incorporation by Reference.....	4
1.4 Addendum Process.....	4
Section Two – Project Description.....	5
2.1 Previously Evaluated Project	5
2.2 Modified Proposed Project.....	5
Section Three – MND CEQA Consistency Checklist	6
3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories	6
Section Four – Environmental Analysis	7
4.1 Aesthetics.....	7
4.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources.....	8
4.3 Air Quality.....	9
4.4 Biological Resources.....	10
4.5 Cultural Resources.....	11
4.6 Energy	12
4.7 Geology and Soils	13
4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions	15
4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	16
4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality	18
4.11 Land Use and Planning.....	19
4.12 Mineral Resources	20
4.13 Noise	20
4.14 Population and Housing	21
4.15 Public Services.....	23
4.16 Recreation.....	23
4.17 Transportation	24
4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources.....	26
4.19 Utilities and Service Systems.....	27
4.20 Wildfire	28
4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance	29
Section Five – Overall Conclusion of Impacts on the Proposed Project	30

Section One – Introduction

1.1 Background

This document constitutes Addendum #1 to the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Weed Berean Church (State Clearinghouse No. 2008082014), adopted by the County of Siskiyou on October 1, 2008. The MND evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the construction and operation of a new church. The Weed Berean Church project (UP-08-01) expired after being approved in 2008. In 2011, the project was reapproved with a new project number (UP-11-02) and utilized the same MND (State Clearinghouse No. 2008082014) as the original project.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and regulations implementing CEQA, known as the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.), serve as the main framework of environmental law and policy in California. CEQA applies to most public agency discretionary actions that have the potential to adversely affect the environment. CEQA requires public agencies to inform decision makers and the public about the potential environmental impacts of proposed projects and to avoid or reduce those environmental impacts to the extent feasible. A public agency shall prepare a proposed negative declaration or a mitigated negative declaration for a project when 1) the initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment; or 2) the initial study identifies potentially significant effects, but revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur, and when there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment (Section 15070).

Pursuant to Section 15164(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, the lead agency shall prepare an addendum to a previously certified MND if some changes or additions are necessary but none of the conditions described in Section 15162 calling for preparation of a subsequent MND have occurred. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, no subsequent MND 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 MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;*
2. *Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous MND due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or*
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 MND was certified as complete, shows any of the following:*

- a. *The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous MND;*
- b. *Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous MND;*
- 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*
- d. *Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous MND would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.*

The County has determined that an Addendum to the certified MND is the appropriate environmental documentation for the proposed Weed Berean Church Use Permit Modification (UP-11-02-2M) project. Overall, the type, location, and nature of the project is consistent with the overall certified MND. The changes in the project description do not warrant a subsequent CEQA document per CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 as explained in this Addendum. The environmental analysis in this Addendum examines whether the revisions to the project description would result in any new significant impacts that were not previously identified in the prior MND 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 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines and will allow the County to make an administrative determination that the prior MND and environmental determinations fully address the Weed Berean Church Use Permit Modification project.

1.3 Incorporation by Reference

In compliance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this Addendum has incorporated by reference the *Use Permit UP-08-01 (Weed Berean Church) MND* (State Clearinghouse No. 2008082014), adopted by the County of Siskiyou on October 1, 2008. Information from this document incorporated by reference into this Addendum have been briefly summarized in the appropriate section(s) which follow, and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and this Addendum have been described.

1.4 Addendum Process

As described in Section 1.2, 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 Negative Declaration. The decision-making body shall consider the addendum with the Final EIR or adopted Negative Declaration prior to making a decision on the project. Once adopted, the Addendum, along with the original EIR or Negative Declaration, is placed in the Administrative Record, and the CEQA process is complete. A copy of the Addendum will be transmitted to the State Clearinghouse.

Section Two – Project Description

2.1 Previously Evaluated Project

The project site is located at the existing Weed Berean Church, 2515 Highway 97, north of the city of Weed; APN: 020-400-200 (previously APN: 020-400-150); T42N, R5W, S36; 41.4460°N, -122.3702°W. Surrounding land uses included agriculture, agricultural residences, the Carrick Subdivision, the city of Weed, and State Highway 97.

The Weed Berean Church sought approval to establish a church for gatherings, services, and events at various times throughout each week. The proposed church included classrooms, offices, restrooms, a conference room, a nursery, a fellowship hall, mechanical rooms, storage rooms, and a foyer. Maximum occupancy was limited to 334 people. Church facilities included a carport and a gravel parking lot with 120 spaces.

2.2 Modified Proposed Project

The proposed project includes increasing the permitted size of the church from 15,625 square feet to 19,949 square feet (4,324 square foot increase), and an increase to the permitted parking spaces to bring the total up to 150 permitted spaces (30 space increase). The permitted occupancy of 334 people is not proposed to change as part of this project.

Section Three – MND CEQA Consistency Checklist

3.1 Checklist Evaluation Categories

Conclusion in Prior IS/MND – This column provides a cross reference to the section of the IS/MND where the conclusion may be found relative to the environmental issue listed under each topic.

Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(1), this column indicates whether the changes represented by the revised project will result in new significant environmental impacts not previously identified or mitigated by the IS/MND, or whether the changes will result in a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

New Circumstances Involving New Impacts? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(2), this column indicates where there have been substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that will require major revisions to the IS/MND, due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification? – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3)(A-D), this column indicates whether new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time of the previous FEIR or MND was certified as complete.

Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures – Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162(a)(3), this column indicates whether the IS/MND provides mitigation measures to address effects in the related impact category.

Section Four – Environmental Analysis

This comparative analysis has been undertaken pursuant to the provisions of CEQA Sections 15162 and 15164 to provide the County 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.

4.1 Aesthetics

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Aesthetics					
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	Less Than Significant Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No..	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure I-d.

4.1.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a Less than Significant Impact with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure I as it relates to subsection d. Subsections a through c had no impacts to aesthetics. The IS/MND identified that:

The project may produce a new light and glare source. The existing vegetation on the site and topography would buffer most sources of light from the adjacent parcels.

Due to this reasoning, Mitigation Measure I-d was included as part of the adopted IS/MND.

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 Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

4.1.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

- **AES-1** (Formerly named Mitigation Measure I-d): All lighting shall be hooded and directed on site to prevent glare onto surrounding properties and roadways.

4.1.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Agricultural and Forestry Resources					
a. 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 non-agricultural use.	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.2.1 Discussion

The Agriculture and Forest Resources impact section did not include sections d. and e. at the time of the original Initial Study. The expansion of the church and parking spaces will not impact any agriculture or forestry 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.

4.2.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures
None.

4.2.3 Conclusion
The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.3 Air Quality

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Air Quality					
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	No Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	No Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.3.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would not impact air quality. Changes to the proposed project include the expansion of the existing church and 30 additional parking spaces, which will not increase any air quality impacts in any significant manner. Therefore, the Project impact remains as No Impact.

4.3.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures
None.

4.3.3 Conclusion
The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.4 Biological Resources

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Biological Resources					
a. 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or 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?	No Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
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?	Less Than Significant	No.	No.	No.	None.
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	Less Than Significant	No.	No.	No.	None.

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
f. 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	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.4.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would not impact biological 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.

4.3.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.3.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.5 Cultural Resources

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Cultural Resources					
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure V-a.
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.5.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a Less than Significant impact with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure V-a. The IS/MND identified that:

There are no known historical structures or monuments on the site. The project site has been historically disturbed by farming and development. Julie Cassidy, professional Archaeologist, conducted a surface survey of the project site. As the result of that survey, no areas containing significant prehistoric, historic or cultural resources were identified. There could be a disturbance or destruction of cultural or historic resources resulting from the construction activities associated with the project. Although there is no

evidence of archaeological sites on the project site, there is the potential during project-related excavation and construction for the discovery of cultural resources. This impact is potentially significant, but can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

Due to this reasoning, Mitigation Measure V-a was included as part of the adopted IS/MND.

Additionally, AB 52 does not apply to projects that had a Notice of an IS/MND 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 Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

4.5.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

- **CUL-1** (Formerly named Mitigation Measure V-a): If, in the course of project construction or operation, any archaeological or historical resources are uncovered, discovered, or otherwise detected or observed, activities within fifty (50) feet of the find shall cease. A qualified archaeologist shall be contacted and advise the County of the site’s significance. If the findings are deemed significant by Siskiyou County Planning, appropriate mitigation measures shall be required prior to any resumption of work in the affected area of the project.

4.5.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.6 Energy

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Energy					
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.6.1 Discussion

The Energy impact section was not analyzed at the time of the original Initial Study. The expansion of the church and parking spaces will not impact any energy resources due to inefficient or wasteful use during construction or operation. The Project does not conflict with or obstruct any plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, the Project impact is No Impact.

4.6.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.6.3 Conclusion

The Project impact is No Impact.

4.7 Geology and Soils

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Geology and Soils					
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	Less Than Significant Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
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.	Less Than Significant Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less Than Significant Impact.	No.	No.	No.	None.
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
iv. Landslides?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure VI-b.
c. 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?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- 1-B of the most recently adopted Uniform Building Code creating substantial risks to life or property?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
e. 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	No.	No.	No.	None.

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.7.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a Less than Significant impact with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure VI-b. The IS/MND identified that:

The project is within an identified Erosion Hazard Area. General Plan Policy 7 requires that erosion control measures be implemented into the construction process that lessen soil erosion.

Mitigation Measure: A certain amount of cutting and filling may be necessary as the new interior access road is developed. In order to minimize erosion of disturbed soils, the developer shall seed and mulch all areas disturbed as a result of road construction (and cut and fill along the roadways exceeding two feet). Application rates will be per Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) guidelines. Seeding will occur with one to two tons per acre of small straw mulch (clean of noxious weeds) applied after broadcast seeding and stabilized with a suitable roller device (e.g., sheep’s foot roller). Performance will equal 75 percent cover at the end of two years and be self-sustaining after five years. These preventive measures may include contour grading, compaction and time of development, to lessen the effects of seasonal factors (rainfall and wind), to the satisfaction of the Siskiyou County Planning Department.

Effectiveness of Measure: This measure will assure that impacts from erosion are reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation/Monitoring: This requirement shall be included in the conditions of approval and shall be implemented by Siskiyou County Planning and the construction contractors. Monitoring shall be performed by the Building Division of the Siskiyou County Public Health & Community Development Department during project construction.

Due to this reasoning, Mitigation Measure VI-b was included as part of the adopted IS/MND.

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 Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

4.7.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

- **GEO-1** (Formerly named Mitigation Measure VI-b): A certain amount of cutting and filling may be necessary as the new interior access road is developed. In order to minimize erosion of disturbed soils, the developer shall seed and mulch all areas disturbed as a result of road construction (and cut and fill along the roadways exceeding two feet). Application rates will be per Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) guidelines. Seeding will occur with one to two tons per acre of small straw mulch (clean of noxious

weeds) applied after broadcast seeding and stabilized with a suitable roller device (e.g., sheep’s foot roller). Performance will equal 75 percent cover at the end of two years and be self-sustaining after five years. These preventive measures may include contour grading, compaction and time of development, to lessen the effects of seasonal factors (rainfall and wind), to the satisfaction of the Siskiyou County Planning Department.

4.7.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Greenhouse Gas Emissions					
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.8.1 Discussion

This resource was not specifically discussed in the original IS/MND as it was added to CEQA requirements after the project was adopted. Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) were added to the CEQA checklist in 2018. Therefore, it is being included in the environmental evaluation within this Addendum.

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.

Greenhouse gases (GHGs), as defined by Health and Safe Code, include but are not limited to water vapor, carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), ozone (O3), and chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) (Health and Safety Code §38500 et seq.). These gases all act as effective global insulators, reflecting back to earth visible light and infrared radiation.

The project cannot generate enough GHG emissions to influence global climate change on its own. The primary source of GHG emissions associated with the project may result from the transportation of materials for the construction of the addition. However, this is insignificant and does not create any quantifiable impact. The project is consistent with the AB 32 goal of reducing GHG emissions and is not in conflict with existing guidelines or standards.

4.8.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures
None.

4.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. 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?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. 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	No.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
g. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure VII-h.

4.9.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a Less than Significant impact with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure VII-h. The IS/MND identified that:

The project site is located in an area that is provided with fire protection services by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE). CALFIRE imposes Public Resources Code 4290 to ensure each building site can be reached by emergency response equipment, adequate clearance is provided between structures and surrounding vegetation. The project site is within 5-miles of the Weed California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection unit. The project has been identified as being located with the Wildfire Hazard Area. The location could possibly expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. CALFIRE requires conformance with Public Resources Code 4290 (Fire Safe Regulations) at the time of development. These regulations ensure that adequate access exists to any development and sufficient area is available for maneuvering of emergency response vehicles. The project is located on State Highway 97. The following requirements must be met at the time of development and would ensure compliance with the 4290 regulations for access and roads:

Mitigation Measure: All new construction shall be subject to the requirements of Public Resources Code 4290, including driveway design and surface requirements, signage, an on-site water supply for fire suppression purposes and fuel modification standards, to the satisfaction of CALFIRE.

Effectiveness of Measure: This measure will assure that risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires are reduced to a less than significant level.

Implementation/Monitoring: This requirement shall be included in the conditions of approval and shall be implemented by Siskiyou County Planning and the construction contractors. Monitoring shall be performed by the Building Division of the Siskiyou County Public Health & Community Development Department and CALFIRE during project construction.

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 Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

4.9.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

- **HAZ-1** (Formerly named Mitigation Measure VII-h): All new construction shall be subject to the requirements of Public Resources Code 4290, including driveway design and surface requirements, signage, an on-site water supply for fire suppression purposes, and fuel modification standards, to the satisfaction of CALFIRE.

4.9.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Hydrology and Water Quality					
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less Than Significant Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. 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:					
i. result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.10.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on any hydrology and water quality 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 Less Than Significant.

4.10.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.10.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.11 Land Use and Planning

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Land Use Planning					
a. Physically divide an established community?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure VI-b.

4.11.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a Less than Significant Impact with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure VI-b. The IS/MND identified that:

The proposed project is consistent with the Siskiyou County General Plan and the Siskiyou County Zoning Ordinance. The applicable general plan policies are found in the Siskiyou County General Plan. The Land Use Element of the General Plan identifies the project site as being within four (4) mapped resource constraints: Erosion Hazard Area, Wildfire Hazard Area, Woodland Productivity Area and Surface Hydrology. The minimum parcel size has been maintained for all mapped resources and is consistent with the regulations required by all agencies with jurisdiction over the project. With mitigation measures contained within this document [See Mitigation Measure contained in Substantiation for Section VI. b)] [GEO-1], all impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Article 49, Section 10-6.4903(a) of the Non-Prime Agricultural (AG-2) District lists church as a conditional use subject to obtaining a use permit.

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 Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

4.11.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.11.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.12 Mineral Resources

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Mineral Resources					
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.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.

4.12.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND 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.

4.12.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.12.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.13 Noise

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Noise					
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in the ambient noise levels in vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Less than Significant	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. For a project located within a private airstrip or 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.13.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a Less than Significant Impact with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure XI-d. The IS/MND identified that:

Construction activities will increase noise levels at the project site. The type and number of equipment to be used are unknown. However, it is expected that the primary sources of noise during construction will include trucks, tractors, backhoes, compressors and similar equipment. However, construction activities will be temporary in nature and will generally occur during daylight hours. Construction noise impacts could result in annoyance or sleep disruption for nearby residents if nighttime operation were to occur or if equipment is not properly muffled or maintained.

Mitigation Measure: *Noise producing equipment used during construction shall be restricted to the hours from 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturday and Sunday. Effective mufflers shall be fitted to gas-powered and diesel-powered equipment.*

Effectiveness of Measure: *These measures will reduce noise impacts during construction to a less than significant level.*

Implementation/Monitoring: *This requirement shall be included in the conditions of approval and shall be implemented by Siskiyou County Planning and the construction contractors. Monitoring shall be performed by the Building Division of the Siskiyou County Public Health & Community Development Department during project construction.*

4.13.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

- **NOI-1** (Formerly named Mitigation Measure XI-d): Noise producing equipment used during construction shall be restricted to the hours from 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M., Monday through Friday, and 9:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. on Saturday and Sunday. Effective mufflers shall be fitted to gas-powered and diesel-powered equipment.

4.13.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.14 Population and Housing

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Population and Housing					
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)?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.14.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any population and housing 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.

4.14.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.14.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.15 Public Services

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Public Services					
a. 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 public services:					
Fire protection?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
Police protection?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
Schools?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
Parks?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
Other public facilities?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.15.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any population and housing 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.

4.15.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.15.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.16 Recreation

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Recreation					
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.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	None.

4.16.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would not have an impact on any recreation 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.

4.16.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.16.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.17 Transportation

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Transportation					
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This question was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure XV-a.
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	Mitigation Measure VII-h.

4.17.1 Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on any transportation resources with the incorporation of Mitigation Measure XV-a. The IS/MND identified that:

The project site is located in the north Weed area adjacent to the west side of US Highway 97 (US 97), approximately 2/10-mile north of its intersection with Angel Valley Road. Caltrans has stated that they have concerns with the potential increased vehicles that would be turning left into the church from the northbound downhill grade. The concerns of Caltrans are from the amount of interstate trucks that use US 97, local truck traffic, highway speed of through traffic, and the downhill grade.

Mitigation Measure: The applicant shall be required to provide turn lane channelization, at the existing driveway connection to US 97, to the satisfaction of Caltrans. The applicant shall be required to obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right-of-way.

Effectiveness of Measure: These measures will reduce traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

Implementation/Monitoring: This requirement shall be included in the conditions of approval and shall be implemented by Siskiyou County Planning and the construction contractors. Monitoring shall be performed by Caltrans and the Building Division of the Siskiyou County Public Health & Community Development Department during project construction.

Additionally, the IS/MND also noted that:

*The proposed use, any development associated with the proposed uses, and the proposed access road(s) must conform to the California Public Resources Code Section 4290 and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Fire Safe Regulations. Adherence to the Fire Safe Regulations would ensure that the proposed development contains adequate emergency access. The Mitigation Measure contained in the Substantiation for Section VII. h) **[HAZ-1]** reduces this impact to a level that is less than significant.*

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 Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.

4.17.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

- **TRAF-1** (Formerly named Mitigation Measure XV-a): The applicant shall be required to provide turn lane channelization, at the existing driveway connection to US 97, to the satisfaction of Caltrans. The applicant shall be required to obtain an encroachment permit from Caltrans for any work within the State right-of-way.

4.17.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Tribal Cultural Resources					
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:	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
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	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
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.	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.18.1 Discussion

This resource was not specifically discussed in the original IS/MND as it was added to CEQA requirements after the project was adopted. Tribal Cultural Resources were added to the CEQA checklist in 2016. Therefore, it is being included in the environmental evaluation within this Addendum. Additionally, AB 52 does not apply to projects that had a Notice of an IS/MND 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.

4.18.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.18.3 Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Utilities and Service Systems					
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Less than Significant	No.	No.	No.	None.
c. Result in a determination by the 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?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.
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?	Less than Significant	No.	No.	No.	None.

Discussion

The previously adopted IS/MND determined that the Project would have either no impact or less than significant impacts 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.

Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

Conclusion

The conclusions from the IS/MND remain unchanged.

4.20 Wildfire

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Wildfire					
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.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
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.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	N/A	No.	No.	No.	This requirement was not included in the 2008 IS/MND.

4.20.1 Discussion

This factor was not specifically discussed in the original IS/MND as it was added to CEQA requirements after the project was adopted. Wildfire was added to the CEQA checklist in 2022. Therefore, it is being included in the environmental evaluation within this Addendum. Although the church is classified as being in a very high fire severity zone, the property is within the lowest percentiles on the Wildfire Suppression Difficulty Index created by the US Forest Service in 2022, with 0 being the lowest difficulty and 100 being the highest difficulty. The physical location of the church does not have any topographical properties that will exacerbate a wildfire. The church addition does not require infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk. The project will not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of runoff, post-fire slopes instability, or drainage changes. Lastly, there is no occupancy increase as part of this project.

4.20.2 Final IS/MND Mitigation Measures

None.

4.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Adopted IS/MND Conclusion	Do Proposed Changes Involve New Impacts?	New Circumstances Involving New Impacts?	New Information Requiring Analysis or Verification?	Adopted IS/MND Mitigation Measures
Mandatory Findings of Significance					
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 with Mitigation Incorporation	No.	No.	No.	None.
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.	No.	No.	
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	No Impact	No.	No.	No.	None.

4.21.1 Discussion

The proposed project would not significantly affect the quality of the environment, reduce wildlife habitat, reduce rare plant or animal species, or eliminate important cultural or historic resources because implementation of recommended mitigation measures would reduce any potential impacts to levels that are less than significant. The review of this application has not revealed that there would be impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. There have been no impacts discovered through the review of this application demonstrating that there would be substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

Section Five – Overall Conclusion of Impacts on the Proposed Project

The original Project resulted in ten potential significant impacts unless mitigated, related to aesthetics, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, and transportation impacts. All other impact areas were measured at 'No Impact' or 'Less than Significant'. MND mitigation measures were included to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Changes and proposed updates to the Project would not be considered substantial. The church addition and increase in allowed parking spaces would not cause any new significant impacts or substantial increases in the severity of a previously identified significant impacts (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a)(1)) that would require major revisions to the MND. All new impacts associated with the church addition and increase in allowed parking spaces would be similar to the impacts previously analyzed in the MND.

There is sufficient evidence in support of the County of Siskiyou's determination that the minor changes to the Project do not meet the conditions for preparing an EIR or subsequent MND under CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162, and Section 15164.