

**San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District  
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

**1. Project title: Pactiv Corporation Facility 2001 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 and phone number:**

Tom Jordan – (559) 230-5802

**4. Project location:**

2024 Norris Road, Bakersfield, CA 93308

**5. Project sponsor's name and address:**

Jim Wakeman  
661-392-4021  
Pactiv Corporation  
2024 Norris Road  
Bakersfield, CA 93308-2297

**6. General plan designation: S. I.**

**7. Zoning: M-2**

**8. Description of project:**

Pactiv Corporation (formerly Tenneco Packaging) operates a polystyrene foam manufacturing facility in Bakersfield, CA. Currently, the facility operates 8 extruder lines and 15 thermoformer lines with associated ancillary permitted equipment. This application requests approval for the following facility modifications to allow for facility expansion:

- Modification of throughput limit of 8 existing foam extruders from 1,200 pounds per hour capacity each to 1,500 pounds per hour capacity each,
- Installation of 4 additional foam extruders with 1,500 pounds per hour throughput capacity,
- Installation of 4 additional virgin resin use bins with bin-vent filters, and
- Installation of 4 additional reclaim use bins with bin-vent filters.

The modifications proposed will result in a calculated increase in potential emissions of 190.6 tons per year VOC and 5.1 pounds per day PM10 after the fifth phase is implemented. Pactiv

Corporation proposes to mitigate all increases in excess of offset thresholds with Emission Reduction Credit Certificates and BACT will be provided for all emissions unit increases in excess of two pounds per day. Pactiv is a Title V facility. A Title V application and certificate of conformity have been submitted as part of this project.

**9. Surrounding land uses and setting:** *(Briefly describe the project's surroundings)*

The area is currently zoned for medium industrial use. Pactiv's project will remain compatible with current zoning and land use designing for this region.

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:** *(e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)*

This project does not involve any significant changes, which would affect other permitting authorities. Therefore, approval from other public agencies is not required.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources          | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources             | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services               | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |   |

**DETERMINATION:** *(To be completed by the Lead Agency)*

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED 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 “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact 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. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

**Name: Tom Jordan**

**Date: August 13, 2001**

**For: San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District**

### **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a

“Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analyses Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>I. AESTHETICS -</b> Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project’s Effects on Aesthetics:**

The proposal will not result in the obstruction of any scenic vista or view open to the public, or create an aesthetically offensive site that is open to the public view. All operations proposed in this project are manufacturing operations, which will be housed within the confines of existing structures.

This project will not impact Aesthetics.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES –</b> In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agricultural farmlands. Would the project:				
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Agricultural Resources:**

This is an existing facility with no planned land expansion. The facility is located in an area zoned for light industry. No conversion from farmland to non-agricultural use is associated with this project.

This project will not impact Agricultural Resources.

III. <b>AIR QUALITY</b> – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project’s Effects on Air Quality:**

The modifications proposed will result in a calculated increase in potential emissions of 190.6 tons per year VOC and 5.1 pounds per day PM10. Pactiv Corporation proposes to mitigate all increases in excess of offset thresholds with Emission Reduction Credit Certificates and Best Available Control Technology (BACT) will be provided for all emissions unit increases in excess of two pounds per day.

To satisfy BACT requirements for VOC emissions, all capturable emissions will be collected and routed to a regenerative thermal oxidizer for destruction. The proposed PM10 increase will not result in emissions in excess of the thresholds; therefore, BACT for PM10 emissions will not be required.

There are no increases in toxic or hazardous air pollutants proposed. The District’s Risk Management Policy requires an evaluation of the risk associated with increases in hazardous air pollutants. There are no increases in any hazardous air pollutants, therefore an evaluation of the associated health risk is not required. The plant has submitted the 1993 “Hot Spots” inventory, which was reviewed and approved by SJVUAPCD.

Increase in VOC emissions will be mitigated through the purchase and submittal of emission reduction credit certificates (ERCs). Emission reductions banked as ERCs are subject to a 10% air quality improvement deduction. The ERCs to be purchased were generated and banked at a source within 15 miles of Pactiv. Reductions to be used as offsets that were generated offsite, but within 15 miles of the source are effectively decreased in value by 20%; therefore, an additional quantity of offsets will be purchased to satisfy the requirements of a 1.2 to 1 offset ratio. Because this project will be using ERCs generated offsite, this equates to an additional 30% of banked ERCs that will be purchased, taken out of circulation, and relinquished to mitigate the project increase. Offsite ERCs are considered a valid CEQA mitigation for VOCs because VOCs have no specific Health Standard but are only of a concern on a regional basis in its participation in the formation of ozone, therefore there is no perceived localized health problem. Conditions will be incorporated into the permits to ensure continuous compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal air pollution rules and regulations.

In addition, PM10, SOx, NOx, VOC, and CO air emissions are being reduced through the establishment of a Pactiv Corporation employee Rideshare program. Approximately 10% of Pactiv’s employees have been regular participants, with a concurrent reduction in emissions of 8,550 lb. per year.

The overall impacts on air quality are expected to be less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>	- Would the project:				

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) | Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) | Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Biological Resources:**

No developmental effect on existing wildlife is anticipated from this project. Modifications only will occur within the confines of the existing facility, with no new development on adjacent areas to take place.

This project is will not impact plant life. There are no plants, which have official State or Federal rare, threatened, or endangered status located on the project site. The facility location and the surrounding adjacent areas are exclusively zoned for industrial use and/or development; therefore, the proposed project is in accordance with the requirements of the County of Kern's Department of Planning and Development Services.

This project will not impact Biological Resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Cultural Resources:**

This site/facility does not have any known historical or archaeological significance. There are no changes to undeveloped areas of land at this facility.

This project will not impact any Cultural Resources.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a)	Expose people or structures to 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv)	Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Geology and Soils:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment. Exposure of people or structures to adverse effects is minimal and designed into the operation of the plant.

There will be no quantifiable permanent changes in the earth conditions, no project induced geological hazards are expected, and the project will not result in exposure of the people or property to geological hazards. The project will be constructed within the confines of the existing Pactiv Corporation manufacturing facility. Kern County Health Department has determined that this site is considered a non-environmentally sensitive area.

Because there are no changes to undeveloped areas of land at this facility, this project will have no impact on Geology and Soils.

- | <b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -</b>   | Potentially<br>Significant<br>Impact | Less Than<br>Significant<br>With Mitigation<br>Incorporation | Less Than<br>Significant<br>Impact  | No Impact                |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>Would the project:</b>   |                                      |  |                                     |                          |
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?   | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/>             | <input type="checkbox"/>                                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65965.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project’s Effects of Hazards and Hazardous Materials:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment. Additional exposure of people or structures to adverse effects is minimal. Safety is designed into the operation of the plant.

While there is always some risk involved with the types of materials stored and handled at a polystyrene manufacturing facility, the risk of any large scale upset is minimal due to the many established safeguards and procedures that are in place and enforced. The facility participates in the OSHA and Cal-OSHA Voluntary Protection Program (a.k.a. STAR program) and has been certified since 1986. The plant holds routine drills and crisis management exercises with the participation of local agencies. All projects of this nature are subjected to management of change reviews at several stages of the project.

Under the federal and California Occupational Safety and Health Administrations (OSHA), regulations have been promulgated that require polystyrene manufacturers to prepare and implement a Process Safety Management (PSM) Program. The federal requirement is identified under Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 1910, Section 119 (29 CFR 1910.119) and the California regulation is found under Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), Section 5189 (8 CCR 5189). This program considers facility design, process hazard analysis, operating procedures, training, mechanical integrity, contractor safety, process safety information, management of change, emergency procedures, chemical and material use, maintenance procedures, and pre-startup safety review. The PSM program requires participation of employees and experts in the process, and process design and safety.

Extensive safety controls exist in this polystyrene manufacturing facility to control potential sources of ignition. These controls include equipment safeguards, monitoring for hazards with equipment designed to detect sources of flammable gases and vapors, written procedures, training, and a formal procedure authorizing the use of such equipment by way of a written permit from the appropriate regulatory agency, the San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District. Because of these stringent controls, no increase in the risk of upset is expected at the polystyrene plant.

This project will not result in significant exposure of people to Hazards and Hazardous Materials.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as an result of the failure of a levee or dam?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Hydrology and Water Quality:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment.

The extruders utilize domestic water supplied by Oildale Mutual. Monthly averages of water consumption indicates that Pactiv Corporation uses are approximately 5,300 gal/day of domestic water for restrooms, vending machines, breakrooms, extruders, thermoformers, and reclaim production. The proposed project will show a 20% increase in water usage and will not significantly impact services provided by Oildale Mutual.

There are no changes to undeveloped areas of land at this facility and water quality services will not be affected.

This project will not impact Hydrology and Water.

IX. <b>LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Land Use and Planning:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land. The entire Pactiv property is presently zoned for industrial use. This project is compatible with current zoning and land use for the area.

This project will not impact Land Use and Planning.

X. <b>MINERAL RESOURCES</b> - Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Mineral Resources:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land. Existing mineral resources will not be disturbed.

The project will not impact Mineral Resources.

- | XI. NOISE - Would the proposal result in: | Potentially Significant Impact   | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |                                     |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a)  | Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?   | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b)  | Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?   | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c)  | A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d)  | A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f)  | For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Noise:**

The proposal involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land.

Although noise levels are not expected to significantly increase over the long-term, there exists the potential for some short-term noise level increase that could result from the installation of the new extruders. The impact to employees and contractors working on the site due to these noise level increases will be minimized through an existing ear plug program which is required to gain entrance to the manufacturing areas. To further ensure the hearing protecting to employees and contractors, Pactiv Corporation performs noise dosimetry measurements on an annual basis; to verify CAL/OSHA permissible exposure limits within the facility. Additionally, an audiometric hearing examination is included as part of the annual update by Pactiv Corporation's medical group to each employee's medical records. Thus, Pactiv Corporation complies with all applicable state and federal requirements as it pertains to noise level exposures. Sensitive receptors (including residential areas) are not located in the immediate construction area and no significant impacts to sensitive receptors are expected.

The project will not significantly impact Noise.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Population and Housing:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land.

This project will not result in the relocation of individuals, impact housing, commercial or industrial facilities, or change the distribution of population. The project will require only 4 additional extruder operators for each of 4 shifts to work in manufacturing.

No significant effects are expected on housing in the Bakersfield area. The project will require less than 20 permanent workers at the existing facility.

This project will not significantly impact Population and Housing.

**XIII. 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:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Fire Protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police Protection	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Public Services:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land.

This project will not have any impacts to Public Services.

<b>XIV. RECREATION</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Recreation:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land.

This project will not have any impacts on Recreation.

<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:</b>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Transportation/Traffic:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land.

No significant impacts are expected on transportation or circulation in the Bakersfield area. No additional truck loading facilities are required. No significant change from past truck loading activities is expected from this project. The isopentane used in the process is delivered by rail car. The increase in throughput will result in an increase in one to two rail cars per year.

This project will not have any significant impacts on Transportation/Traffic.

- | <b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --</b> Would the project:  | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact                           |
|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?  | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?          | <input type="checkbox"/>       | <input type="checkbox"/>                            | <input type="checkbox"/>     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) 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 providers existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project's Effects on Utilities and Service Systems:**

The proposal strictly involves the addition of four extruder lines, and ancillary equipment within the confines of buildings on previously developed land.

With the proposed project, Pactiv Corporation plans to apply for the PG&E Incentive Program for industry expansions, which reduces the utility rate for incremental increases in electricity. The increased usage of electricity is estimated at 20%. This amount does not require any changes to public service supply systems and will not represent a substantial change in the plant's current electricity usage.

The extruders use domestic water supplied by Oildale Mutual. Monthly averages of water consumption indicates that Pactiv Corporation uses 5300 gal/day of domestic water for restrooms, vending machines, breakrooms, extruders, thermoformers and reclaim production. The proposed project will show a 20% increase in water usage and will not significantly impact services provided by Oildale Mutual. **No hazardous materials will be discharged into the waste water system.** The increase in water is for cooling. Excess water will be discharged in the public waste water discharge system.

This project will not have any impacts on Utilities and Service Systems

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) | Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**Explanation of Project’s Effects on :**

- (a) The project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of 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 major periods of California history or prehistory.
- (b) The project does not have the potential to achieve short-term goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.
- (c) The project does not have impacts, which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Cumulative reductions are discussed previously.
- (d) The project does not have environmental effects which cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.