SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON BARRE PEAKER PROJECT IN STANTON

SCH No. 2006121114

April 2007

Executive Officer

Barry Wallerstein, D. Env.

Deputy Executive Officer, Planning, Rule Development, and Area SourcesElaine Chang, DrPH

Assistant Deputy Executive Officer, Planning, Rule Development, and Area Sources Laki Tisopulos, Ph.D, P.E.

Planning and Rules Manager CEQA and Socioeconomic Analyses Susan Nakamura

Submitted to:

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Prepared by:

ENSR Corporation

Reviewed by: Michael Krause – Air Quality Specialist

Steve Smith, Ph.D. – Program Supervisor Mike Harris – Senior Deputy District Counsel Marcel Saulis – Assistant Air Quality Engineer

SOUTH COAST AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT GOVERNING BOARD

Chairman: WILLIAM A. BURKE, Ed.D.

Speaker of the Assembly Representative

Vice Chairman: S. ROY WILSON, Ed.D.

Supervisor, Fourth District Riverside County Representative

MEMBERS

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH

Supervisor, Fifth District

Los Angeles County Representative

BILL CAMPBELL

Supervisor, Third District Orange County Representative

JANE W. CARNEY

Senate Rules Committee Appointee

RONALD O. LOVERIDGE

Mayor, City of Riverside

Cities Representative, Riverside County

GARY OVITT

Supervisor, Fourth District

San Bernardino County Representative

JAN PERRY

Councilmember, Ninth District

Cities Representative, Los Angeles County, Western Region

MIGUEL A. PULIDO

Mayor, City of Santa Ana

Cities Representative, Orange County

TERESA REYES-URANGA

Councilmember, City of Long Beach

Cities Representative, Los Angeles County, Eastern Region

CYNTHIA VERDUGO-PERALTA

Governor's Appointee

DENNIS YATES

Mayor, City of Chino

Cities Representative, San Bernardino County

EXECUTIVE OFFICER

BARRY WALLERSTEIN, D. Env.

PREFACE

This document constitutes the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Southern California Edison Barre Stanton Peaker Project. The Draft MND was released for a 30-day public review and comment period on December 27, 2006. The comment period ended on January 25, 2007. Three comment letters were received during the public comment period. The comment letters and responses are included in Appendix G of this document. The analyses of air quality impacts in the Final MND were modified from those in the Draft MND due to a minor revision to the proposed site layout by the applicant. None of the modifications alter any conclusions reached in the Draft MND, nor provide new information of substantial importance relative to the draft document that would require recirculation of the Draft MND pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15073.5. Therefore, this document is now a Final MND. To facilitate identification, modifications to the document are included as underlined text and text removed from the document is indicated by strikethrough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FINAL NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON BARRE PEAKER PROJECT

		Page No.
CHADTED 1.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
	ction	1.1
	ory Authority	
	ed Permits	
-		
	Location	
	Schedule	
· ·	Description	
	ent Description	
	Description	
Operati	ng Schedule	1-13
CHADTED 2.	ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	
	ction	2-1
	Information	
	ally Significant Impact Areas	
	ination	
	nmental Checklist and Discussion	
1.	Aesthetics	
2.	Agriculture Resources	
3.	Air Quality	
3. 4.	Biological Resources	
5.	Cultural Resources	
5. 6.	Energy	
7.	Geology and Soils	
7. 8.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	
9.	Hydrology and Water Quality	
10.	Land Use and Planning	
10.	Mineral Resources	
12.	Noise	
13.	Population and Housing	
14.	Public Services	
15.	Recreation	
15. 16.	Solid/Hazardous Waste	
16. 17.	Transportation/Traffic	
17.	Mandatory Findings of Significance	
18. 19.	Conclusion	
	Conclusion	
ACTOHYIHS		

FIGURES:

	Figure 1	Site Location Map	1-4
	Figure 2	Aerial Photograph of Facility with Plot Plan	
	Figure 3	Relative Location of Five Proposed Peaker Plants	
	Figure 4	Pipeline Route	
	Figure 5	Process Flow Diagram	. 1-12
TABL	ES:		
	Table 1	Process Rates	. 1-13
	Table 3-1	SCAQMD Significance Thresholds	. 2-10
	Table 3-2	California Clean Air Act Planning Requirements	. 2-11
	Table 3-3	Construction Peak Daily Emissions Summary	. 2-14
	Table 3-4	Construction NOx Mitigation	
	Table 3-5	LM6000 Turbine Maximum Hourly Emissions During	
		Normal Operations	. 2-17
	Table 3-6	LM6000 Turbine Maximum Hourly Emissions During	
		SU/SD Conditions	. 2-18
	Table 3-7	LM6000 Turbine Commissioning Emission Rates	. 2-19
	Table 3-8	LM6000 Emissions for First Year and Subsequent	
		Years of Operation	. 2-20
	Table 3-9	Waukesha ICE Maximum Hourly and Annual Emissions	. 2-20
	Table 3-10	Proposed Facility-Wide Criteria Pollutant Emissions During	
		Normal Operations	. 2-21
	Table 3-11	Indirect Operational Emissions	
	Table 3-12	Operational Emissions Significance Evaluation	. 2-22
	Table 3-13	Normal Operations Modeling Results	
	Table 3-14	Startup Modeling Results	
	Table 3-15	Commissioning Modeling Results	
	Table 3-16	Cumulative Construction Emission Evaluation	
	Table 3-17	Facility-Wide TAC Emissions During Normal Operations	
	Table 3-18	Maximum Predicted Risks	
	Table 6-1	Projected Natural Gas Supplies for California	. 2-41
	Table 8-1	Schools within One-quarter Mile of Project Site	
	Table 8-2	Schools Along the Pipeline Route	
	Table 12-1	Estimated Noise Levels Generated by Onsite Construction Equipment	
	Table 12-2	Estimated Noise Levels Generated by Pipeline Construction	
		Equipment	. 2-74
	Table 12-3	Distance Attenuated Noise Levels Generated by Construction	
		Equipment	. 2-74
	Table 12-4	Maximum Sound Pressure Levels Proposed Project Equipment	
	Table 16-1	Summary of Construction Waste Streams and Management Methods	
	Table 16-2	Summary of Operational Waste Streams and Management Methods	
	Table 16-3	Local Solid Waste Disposal Facilities	
	Table 18-1	Cumulative Construction Emission Estimates	

APPENDICES:

Appendix A	California Public Utilities Commission Assigned Commissioner's Ruling
Appendix B	Visual Simulations
Appendix C	Air Quality Impacts Analysis Methodologies
Appendix D	Biological Resources Assessment
Appendix E	Archaeological Paleontological Assessment
Appendix F	Acoustical Analysis Report
Appendix G	Comments and Responses to Comments on the Draft MND