

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY UNIFIED AIR POLLUTION CONTROL DISTRICT

INITIAL STUDY

A. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. **Project Title:** CertainTeed – Chowchilla Plant Expansion

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address**

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District
1990 E. Gettysburg Ave.
Fresno CA 93726

3. **Contact Person:**

CEQA: Hector R. Guerra
(559) 230-5800
Permit: Errol Villegas
(559) 230-6000

4. **Project Location:**

CertainTeed Corporation
17775 Avenue 23½
Chowchilla, CA 93610

Plant is located in Madera County, California

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District
1990 E. Gettysburg Ave.
Fresno CA 93726

6. **Project Applicant:** CertainTeed Corporation

7. **Description of Project:**

This facility produces fiberglass insulation. The project entails the modification of one fiberizer line to allow an increase in fiberglass production.

The facility has proposed modifications to the existing permit units C-261-1 (Batch Material Handling Operation), C-261-2 (Main Furnace), C-261-3 (C-11 Production Line), and C-261-4 (C-12 Production Line). The modifications consist of the following:

C-261-1: (Batch Material Handling Operation)

- Increase annual throughput limits from 105,374.6 tpy to 170,820 tpy.
- Limit annual post project PM10 emissions to the pre-project limit of 959 lb/year, to avoid an annual increase in emissions.

C-261-2: (Main Furnace)

- Increase the daily glass production limit from 325 metric tons/day to 390 metric tons/day.
- Increase the annual glass production from 118,625 metric tons/year to 142,350 metric tons/year.
- With the 20% increase in glass production, the facility has also proposed to increase their final stack hourly and daily emission limits proportionally by 20% (for all pollutants).
- Limit annual post project emissions (for all pollutants) to the pre-project limits, to avoid an annual increase in emissions.
- No increase in PM emissions is proposed for the Dry Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP).

C-261-3: (C-11 Production Line)

- There is no physical modification proposed for this permit unit. The facility has only proposed to modify the permit conditions that contain the hourly emission rates from the final stack. Although, there are no modifications proposed, there are a few discrepancies which exist and will be corrected with this project. The discrepancies are as follows:
- The facility has identified that the current heat input rating of 51.44 MMBtu/hr is incorrect and should actually be 55.24 MMBtu/hr (consisting of a 7.34 MMBtu/hr forehearth, 8 – 3.8 MMBtu/hr fiberizers, and a 17.5 MMBtu/hr curing oven (with 5 – 3.5 MMBtu/hr burners). The difference between the 51.44 MMBtu/hr rating and the proposed rating of 55.24 MMBtu/hr is 3.8 MMBtu/hr, which appears as if the original rating was based upon a production line equipped with seven (7) 3.8 MMBtu/hr fiberizers. However, according to the applicant, this production line has always had 8 fiberizers. After conducting some research, the District has found a 1995 inspection report and a 1995 engineering evaluation (Attachment B), which validates the applicant's claim. In addition, prior to the 1996 consolidation of the permit units at this facility, the C-11 production line was permitted as multiple permit units (C-261-5, -9, -12, -14, -15, -17, & -20), and permit unit C-261-5, identified the glass fiberizing and mat forming operation as having a total heat input of 30.4 MMBtu/hr consisting of 8 St. Gobain burners (Attachment C). Therefore, the District will administratively correct the total heat input rating for this permit unit from 51.44 MMBtu/hr to 55.24 MMBtu/hr.
- Currently, this permit unit includes a baghouse which serves portions of this production line (in addition to portions of the C-12 line); however, the baghouse

is not addressed by any permit conditions on this permit unit, while there are references of this baghouse on the permit unit for the C-12 production line (C-261-4). Therefore, the District will include permit conditions within the C-11 permit, addressing the requirements applicable to baghouse #2.

C-261-4: (C-12 Production Line)

- Install two (2) new 4.8 MMBtu/hr fiberizers (for a total of 8 fiberizers for this production line).
- Install a new Fisher-Klostermann wet cyclonic scrubber serving as a material collector (for a total of 4 wet cyclonic scrubbers).
- Increase the C-12 wet Electrostatic Precipitator (ESP) PM emissions from 4.5 lb PM/hr and 108 lb PM/day to 5.4 lb PM/hr and 129.6 lb PM/day.
- The facility had initially proposed a post project heat input rating of 38.5 MMBtu/hr. However, the post project rating should actually be 37.06 MMBtu/hr (consisting of a 4.66 MMBtu/hr forehearth, 6 – 3.8 MMBtu/hr fiberizers, and 2 (new) – 4.8 MMBtu/hr fiberizers).

8. Other Agencies Whose Approvals Is Required and Permits Needed:

A building permit from the County of Madera will be required for small construction related to project. An application for this permit will not be submitted until after the air permit is approved. The County of Madera has provided written notification to the District that the building permit would require only a ministerial action on their part; therefore, the District will be the lead agency regarding CEQA.

Issuance of District Authorities to Construct (ATC) and Permits to Operate (PTO) will not affect any land use zones or plans.

General Plan/Zoning Designations: Heavy Industrial

General Plan Designation: Heavy Industrial

Assessors Parcel Number: 027-051-025

Adjacent Properties Zoning and Existing Land Use:

North Zoning: Agricultural

East Zoning: Agricultural

North Current Uses: Agricultural

East Current Uses: Agricultural

South Zoning: Agricultural

West Zoning: Agricultural

South Current Uses: Agricultural

West Current Uses: Agricultural

9. Project Compatibility with Existing Zones and Plans:

Area is already zoned for industrial use, as listed on the County of Madera zoning map. Project will occur at existing facility.

10. Name of Person Who Prepared Initial Study:

Hector R. Guerra
Senior Air Quality Planner

B. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by the proposed project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated”, as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Land Use and Planning
- Geophysical
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Hazards
- Public Services
- Aesthetics
- Recreation

- Population and Housing
- Water
- Transportation/Circulation
- Energy and Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Cultural Resources
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

C. DETERMINATION

I certify that this document reflects the independent judgment of the District.

X I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

_____ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

_____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

_____ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

Signature: [Original signed by Hector R. Guerra] Date: May 17, 2005

Printed name: Hector R. Guerra

Title: Senior Air Quality Planner

D. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST

Explanations of all answers on the check off list are located in Section E.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Geologic Problems: <i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i>				
a) Fault rupture?				X
b) Seismic ground shaking?				X
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?				X
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?				X
e) Landslides or mudflows?				X
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?				X
g) Subsidence of the land?				X
h) Expansive soils?				X
i) Unique geologic or physical features?				X
II. Air Quality. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?				X
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?				X
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?				X
d) Create objectionable odors?				X
III. Water. <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?				X
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?				X
c) Discharge into surface water or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?				X
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?				X
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?				X
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations, or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of ground waters?				x
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?				x
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of water otherwise available for public water supplies?				x
IV. Biological Resources <i>Would the proposal result in impacts to:</i>				
a) Endangered, threatened, or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?				x
b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?				x
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?				x
d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian, and vernal pool)?				x
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?				x
V. Noise. <i>Would the proposal result in:</i>				
a) Increases in existing noise levels?				x
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?				x
VI. Land Use and Planning. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?				x
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?				x
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?				x
d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?				x
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?				x
VII. Energy and Mineral Resources. <i>Would the proposal:</i>				
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?				x
b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?				x
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?				x

XVI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

- a) **Potential to degrade:** 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?
- b) **Short-term:** Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively, brief, definitive period of time. Long-term impacts will endure well into the future.)
- c) **Cumulative:** Does the project have impacts which 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.)
- d) **Substantial adverse:** Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
			x
			x
			x
			x

San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District

Attachment "A"

COMMENTS TO ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Name: CertainTeed – Chowchilla Plant Expansion

E. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT CHECKLIST COMMENTS

I. Geologic Problems

There is an extremely low chance of geologic hazards due to the project location toward the center of the San Joaquin Valley floor. There are no known faults or unstable geologic features in the vicinity of the project site.

The project site is located approximately 50 miles west of the Great Valley Fault. The probabilistic ground motion value for the site is 13%g, with a 10% chance of exceedence in 50 years.

The land in the vicinity of the site is essentially flat and with well-compacted natural sediment so landslides or collapse are unlikely.

The primary soil types on the project site are Fresno and El Peco fine sandy loam. The project is not located in a known earthquake fault zone. It is not subject to landslides nor will it result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil. The major structures for the project already exist and meet building code requirements.

II. Air Quality

Project stationary equipment will be equipped with Best Available Control Technology. Expected emissions are as follows (see Application for Authority to Construct for detailed emission calculations)

NOx	251.9 tons per year
VOC	79.4 tons per year
CO	197.3 tons per year
SOx	109.1 tons per year
PM10	50.9 tons per year

The project will not violate any air quality standard, result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutants or create any objectionable odors. The project emissions will be under the District threshold, as described above, and is considered less than significant.

III. Water

There are no water quality or water use impacts associated with the proposed the modification of one fiberizer line to allow an increase in fiberglass production. There is no adverse impact to

storm water that accumulates at the facility resulting from the change in permit conditions. There is no offsite discharge of storm water from this facility.

IV. Biological Impacts

A substantial portion of the site has already been developed with industrial uses. Due to the historic industrial uses of the site where development is proposed it does not have any habitat value. The project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the habitat of sensitive species, riparian areas, federally protected wetlands, or interfere with any migratory fish or wildlife species with established migratory corridors. The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources or conflict with any Habitat Conservation Plan. The project will not conflict with the Madera County General Plan.

V. Noise

There will be no increase in area noise levels. As noted in Section X (Transportation/Circulation), below, there will be no additional vehicle trips will occur as a result of the project. . Noise levels will remain below significant levels and no adverse impacts are anticipated

VI. Land Use and Planning

The site is in area zoned for heavy industrial uses. Current surrounding land uses are primarily agricultural. The project site is zoned correctly, already in use as an existing industrial facility. The proposed project will not result in any alteration of the present or planned land use.

VII. Energy and Mineral Resources

There are no energy or mineral resources impacts associated with the proposed project. There are no known mineral resources on the site or in the immediate vicinity of the site. No impact on mineral resources is anticipated.

VIII. Hazards

The proposed project will utilize hazardous materials, however, there is no change in hazardous materials used, relative to the baseline. Each material will be handled and contained with all required technology to minimize the chances of a release. Specific hazardous materials to be present in the proposed project and mitigation measures included in the project design are discussed in this section. The following potentially hazardous materials will be stored and utilized on the project site:

<u>Material</u>	<u>Storage Method</u>
Furnace slag	Not stored, recycled back into furnace
Electrostatic Precipitator (EP) dust	Stored in silos with double-containment areas, recycled back into furnace
Ammonia	Stored in tanks in quantities under 5,000 gal
Caustic soda	Stored in tanks

Employees will be trained in the proper use, handling, and storage of potentially hazardous materials.

The site is surrounded by primarily agricultural areas.

The project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The project is not located on a site included on the list of hazardous materials sites.

Proper training, handling techniques, and buffers will be utilized to ensure that any potential hazards or hazardous materials spills are minimized to the extent practicable. The project is not located on a private airstrip and the existing buildings are in compliance with the applicable airport and land use plan. This project will not interfere with an adopted emergency response/evacuation plan.

IX. Population and Housing

The facility currently employs approximately 246 individuals, and no more will be added to the workforce as a result of this project. No impact on local population or the need for housing is anticipated.

X. Transportation and Circulation

No change in average daily traffic at this facility is anticipated as a result of this project. No impact on local street segments or intersections is anticipated.

XI. Public Services

The facility does not have the potential to increase the demand for local fire protection services. The facility will be designed to meet all local fire safety codes. The on-site well will be available to provide water should the need for fire-fighting purposes occur. All fire safety measures will require approval by the California Department of Forestry which contracts with Madera County for fire protection in this area.

The project is not expected to produce an increase in the demand for other public services.

XII. Utilities and Service Systems

The project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements or require that new wastewater treatment facilities be built. Construction of new storm water drainage facilities will not be

required. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the project with existing resources. Waste disposal needs can be met for this project as required by the County of Madera.

XIII. Aesthetics

There will be no adverse aesthetic impact of the proposed project because the site is already developed to an industrial facility that has significant aesthetic impacts. The site currently includes five buildings: the main building, a maintenance shed, a water pump building, the back pumphouse, and the Batch House. These range between approximately 35 to 110 feet in height. No new buildings will be added.

The proposed construction for this project consists of elevating a 20 foot by 20 foot square area of the roof of the Main Building to accommodate a new piece of equipment. The proposed construction will not obstruct existing views of the Sierra or the agricultural open space.

The project would not create aesthetically offensive sites visible to the public. No significant adverse aesthetic impacts are anticipated.

XIV. Recreation

The project is an industrial facility and will not result in any increase in local population or the demand for recreation services.

XV. Cultural Resources

There are no known cultural resources or features on the project site. The site is already established with structures. There is no possibility that this project could have any adverse effect on cultural resources including: historical resources, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, geologic features or the disturbance of any human remains. The proposed uses do not include any substantial excavation, however, in the unlikely event that any archeological or paleontological resources or buried human remains are uncovered at the project site, excavation activities will cease immediately. Any unearthed resources will not be disturbed and the proper authorities/agencies will be notified.

XVI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

- a. The project does not 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.
- b. The project does not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals.
- c. The project does not have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- d. The project does not have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.