

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS ON THE REVISED STAFF WORKING DRAFT OF THE TENTATIVE NPDES PERMIT
AES ALAMITOS LLC
ALAMITOS GENERATING STATION
NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0001139**

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	1	AES Alamitos intends to achieve compliance with the Statewide Water Quality Control Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling (OTC Policy) by eliminating once-through-cooling (OTC) when it retires the exiting generating units and replaces the generating capacity with combined cycle gas turbine power blocks that utilize dry-cooling and battery energy storage systems. In addition to the elimination of cooling water discharge from the site, the replacement of the generating units will also result in a new sewer interconnection being constructed that will eliminate the low-volume waste discharges to the San Gabriel River estuary. Upon compliance with the OTC policy, the only effluent discharge resulting from the AES Alamitos site will be storm water runoff. These same changes that ensure compliance with the OTC Policy will also allow AES Alamitos to meet all of the new discharge limitations that are associated with the redetermination of the designation of the AES Alamitos outfall. Since AES Alamitos intends to fully comply with the effluent limitations of the proposed NPDES permit renewal through compliance with the OTC Policy by elimination of the discharges, AES Alamitos requests a compliance schedule within the Draft Permit or within the draft TSO that reflect the compliance dates	Comment noted and compliance schedule request addressed in response to comment 2 below.	None taken

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		of the OTC Policy as to any new or revised effluent limit, receiving water limit or water quality objective.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	2	<p>Deadline for Compliance</p> <p>In both the Draft Permit and the Draft TSO, the deadline for ultimate compliance has been established as October 31, 2020. This deadline is contrary to the existing deadline of December 31, 2020 established in the Statewide Water Quality Control Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling ("OTC Policy") adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board as recognized on page 15 of the draft permit. The revised deadline is a deadline that AES Alamitos cannot likely achieve and AES Alamitos respectfully requests that the deadline remain as established by the OTC Policy.</p>	<p>Staff agrees. The effective date of this Order is changed from November 1, 2015, to January 1, 2016 and the expiration date is changed from October 31, 2020, to December 31, 2020.</p> <p>The TSO is edited to reflect the effective date of January 1, 2016, and the final compliance date of December 31, 2020, at the following locations:</p> <p>Finding 30, Requirement 1, Requirement 2, Requirement 3, Requirement 4, Requirement 5, Requirement 6, Requirement 9 and Requirement 11.</p>	<p>Changed effective date and expiration date in Table 3 of the Order.</p> <p>Changed dates in Finding 30, Requirement 1, Requirement 2, Requirement 3, Requirement 4, Requirement 5, Requirement 6, Requirement 9 and Requirement 11 of the TSO.</p>
AES	3	Low Volume Wastes	The technology-based effluent limitation for pH for	None taken

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
Alamitos (Discharger)		<p>AES Alamitos has both low volume and high volume discharges associated with operation of the facility, with the flows of the high volume discharges being roughly 50,000 times greater than the flows of the low volume discharges. The two streams are commingled before final discharge. The existing NPDES permit for AES Alamitos does not have pH limits for low volume discharges, whereas the Draft Permit contains pH limits of 6-9. AES Alamitos cannot achieve the low volume pH limits being proposed in the draft permit. AES requests that the pH limits of the Draft Permit be applied after AES Alamitos commingles its discharge or, in the alternative, that the pH limits for the low volume wastes be included in the time schedule order, allowing AES Alamitos until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.</p>	<p>low volume wastes are effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) taken from 40 C.F.R. section 423.12 (b) (1). This ELG applies to all inplant waste streams, including low volume wastes. The ELG for pH is not applicable to once-through cooling (OTC) water, which is the high volume discharge referenced in the comment. Therefore the ELG shall be applied to the low volume wastes after treatment but prior to commingling with other internal process waste streams or OTC water.</p> <p>The prior Order included an effluent limitation that stated: "The effluent pH shall at all times be within the range of 6.0 to 9.0 pH units." The prior Order did not specify pH limitations for individual waste streams.</p>	
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	4	<p>Temperature</p> <p>The current discharge for temperature, regardless of the time of year, is 105°F. In its comment letter dated June 10, 2015, AES Alamitos indicated that a temperature limit of 103°F would be an acceptable discharge limitation for the entire year but only if that limitation is based on a 15-minute rolling average. AES Alamitos continues to request this as its preferred discharge limitation. In the alternative, AES Alamitos requests that the existing discharge limitation of 105°F, regardless of the time of year, remain in place until AES Alamitos is able to make the changes necessary to comply with the OTC</p>	<p>The Discharger may request an interim limitation for a pollutant that is at least as stringent as the effluent limitation in the prior Order. The Discharger originally requested an interim effluent limitation for temperature of 92°F during winter months and 103°F during summer months. After this was established as the interim limitation, however, the Discharger requested to apply the 103°F limitation as a rolling average. The Regional Board determined that doing so would be less stringent since it would allow for exceedances of the 105°F effluent limitation for temperature in the prior Order.</p> <p>The request for a continuation of the existing effluent</p>	<p>Changed interim effluent limitation for temperature in the TSO to 105°F.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		Policy.	limitation for temperature of 105°F at all times is therefore granted.	
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	5	<p>Regional Monitoring Program—Southern California Bight</p> <p>The Draft Permit requires AES Alamitos participation in “each Bight Regional Monitoring Program”, requiring AES Alamitos to complete collection and analysis of samples in accordance with the schedule established by a steering committee. The Draft Permit further requires a level of participation”similar to that provided by the Discharger in previous regional surveys conducted in 1998, 2003, 2008 and 2013.” AES Alamitos has no objections to similar participation in this program but since the goal of AES Alamitos is the elimination of its discharge, AES Alamitos does not want to be committed to an alteration of its monitoring program when the resulting sampling would have no future value to either the regulators or AES Alamitos.</p>	This comment is repeated in more detail by the Discharger and addressed by Regional Board staff in response to comment 42 below.	See response to comment 42 below.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	6	<p>TSO for Ni, pH, NH₃ and bis(2-ethylhexyl phthalate)</p> <p>AES Alamitos request to be relieved of certain limits being proposed in its draft Permit. For four of those constituents, Ni, pH, NH₃ and bis(2-ethylhexyl phthalate), the Draft TSO included a finding (No. 19) addressing the frequency to which AES Alamitos remains in compliance, which was used to justify denial of the request. AES Alamitos renews its request for a time schedule order for the reasons that this is once through cooling; AES Alamitos adds</p>	Field measurements submitted by the Discharger indicated that they would have complied with the effluent limitations established in this Order for nickel in 49 out of 50 samples, for pH in 905 out of 906 samples, for ammonia in 30 out of 30 samples, and for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate 24 out of 25 samples. These results do not indicate that the Discharger will not be able to comply with the new limitations and therefore no interim limitations were required for these pollutants.	None taken

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		nothing to this stream that would cause a violation and has no feasible controls to address the concentration levels of these constituents. For another of the constituents that is not discharged by AES Alamitos and AES Alamitos has no ability to control, 2,3,7,8-TCDD, AES Alamitos requests that either the discharge limitation for 2,3,7,8-TCDD be removed from the permit or alternatively the Draft TSO include a provision for 2,3,7,8-TCDD.	As discussed in response to comment 20 below, the effluent limitation for 2,3,7,8-TCDD is removed from this Order.	See response to comment 20 below.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	7	Similarly, the Draft Permit contains limits for other parameters, including dissolved oxygen, and bacteria, which are parameters that are not affected by the operations of AES Alamitos. There are times, however, when the bacteria or dissolved oxygen concentration of the source water for the OTC may not be in compliance with the discharge limits, thereby subjecting AES Alamitos to violations of discharge or receiving water limits but which AES Alamitos has no ability to control.	Where the upstream dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration is already less than the 5.0 mg/l criteria, the effluent from the downstream Facility would not be the cause of the noted DO concentration. See response to comment 18 below regarding bacteria.	None taken See response to comment 18 below.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	8	Order Location: Global Comment General Issue: The new Order is intended to be implemented in November 2015. November is mid-quarter and late in the calendar year, both of which are monitoring periods specified in the new Order. This could lead to confusion over the initial implementation. Solution: Specifying that all quarterly, semi-annual and annual monitoring requirements should be implemented beginning January 1, 2016 would clarify all issues.	As discussed in the response to comment 2 above, the effective date of the Order is changed to January 1, 2016. This aligns with the reporting schedule establish in Table E-8 of Attachment E.	See response to comment 2 above.
AES	9	Order Location: Global Comment	Table E-8 specifies the monitoring periods and	Added row

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
Alamitos (Discharger)		<p>General Issue: More clarity on the Receiving Water Monitoring Report submittal schedule would be welcomed. Table E-8 is confusing as some receiving water monitoring parameters are sampled 1/year, 2/year, and 1/2-year. Similar to the existing Order, AES presumes the annual Receiving Water Monitoring report submittal would be due February 1st for the preceding calendar year.</p> <p>Solution: A clear statement clarifying the annual Receiving Water Monitoring report submittal would benefit all users and remove ambiguity.</p>	<p>reporting schedule for all required monitoring, including receiving water monitoring. According to Table E-8, receiving water monitoring reports are due February 1 for the preceding calendar year as in the previous permit. A row is added to Table E-8 to clarify the monitoring period and reporting schedule for semi-annual monitoring.</p> <p>Item 3 is added to section X.D of Attachment E which specifies that the annual Receiving Water Monitoring Report must be submitted to the Regional Water Board on February 1 of each year.</p>	<p>to Table E-8 for semi-annual monitoring requirements.</p> <p>Added item 3 to section X.D of Attachment E.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	10	<p>Order Location: Page 1, Table 1</p> <p>General Issue: The zip code is inaccurate and needs to be revised to 90803.</p>	<p>The zip code for the Facility address in Table 1 is corrected to 90803.</p>	<p>Zip code corrected in Table 1</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	11	<p>Order Location: Page 1, Table 2</p> <p>General Issue: Table 2 includes O-76 (D2) as a discharge point of stormwater runoff and this discharge point no longer is representative of industrial activity at the facility since the decommissioning of Unit 7 (i.e. peaker unit) in January 2004. Some equipment remains in place, but is indoors and covered. Since the decommissioning of Unit 7, discharge point O-76 discharges stormwater from non-industrial activity areas, including a large parking lot.</p> <p>Solution: An addendum to the ROWD has been attached per the LARWQCB's request. Please revise Table 2 accordingly and make changes to the discharge points throughout the entire Order. AES Alamitos can provide updated site maps for inclusion</p>	<p>Due to the decommissioning of Unit 7 the material nature of the discharge from Discharge Point O-76 has been altered and is no longer expected to be similar to that of Discharge Points O-48 and O-84, which continue to discharge storm water runoff from industrial areas whereas O-76 drains a parking lot. However, the potential exists for pollutants to be contained in this runoff to the Los Cerritos Channel Estuary. The monitoring requirements, however, are edited to be specific to this discharge point. Therefore, a footnote is added to Table E-3 to indicate that monitoring for BOD, total coliform, fecal coliform and enterococcus is not required for Discharge Point O-76.</p> <p>Section II.A.3 of Attachment F is also edited to</p>	<p>Edited Table E-3. Edited section II.A.3 of Attachment F.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		into the final Order.	explain the difference in the storm water discharge at sampling point O-76.	
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	12	<p>Order Location: Page 3, Section III.A and Page E-5, Table E-1</p> <p>General Issue: The description of the commingled wastewater being discharged from Discharge Points 001, 002, and 003 includes metal cleaning wastes and sanitary wastes; however, in accordance with the schedule stipulated in the TSO these two waste streams will be eliminated by December 1, 2015 and June 30, 2018, respectively. In fact, AES Alamitos has already eliminated the discharge of metal cleaning wastes and currently contains and transports it offsite to an authorized waste facility. Additionally, the retention basin formerly used for this waste stream is no longer in use.</p> <p>Solution: Remove any reference to monitoring location INT-001B for chemical and non-chemical cleaning wastes and also revise descriptions of this waste stream throughout the permit to state that AES Alamitos has eliminated the discharge of metal cleaning wastes and currently contains and transports it offsite to an authorized waste facility. In addition, include a footnote that references the TSO and removal of the sanitary waste stream by 2018.</p>	<p>In a meeting with Regional Board staff on August 19, 2015, the Discharger stated that the discharge of metal cleaning wastes has ceased and these wastes are currently contained and transported offsite to an authorized waste facility.</p> <p>The tentative permit is updated to reflect that the discharge of metal cleaning wastes has ceased. Limits and monitoring requirements are removed and a statement is added that the discharge of metal cleaning wastes is now prohibited. The tentative TSO is also updated to reflect that the discharge of metal cleaning wastes has ceased.</p> <p>The permit is also updated to reflect that the Facility plans to discontinue the discharge of treated sanitary waste by June 30, 2018.</p>	<p>Made edits at the following locations to reflect the discharge of metal cleaning wastes has ceased: section III.A, and Table 4 of the Order; Table E-1 and Table E-3 of Attachment E; section II.A.2, section II.A.2.b, Table F-4, section IV.B.2, section IV.B.2.a.iv, Table F-5, section</p>

AES Alamos LLC
 Alamos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
				IV.B.2.b.iii, Table F-6, Table F-9, Table F-13 and section VII.B.3 of Attachment F. Findings 2 and 24 of the TSO are edited. Requiremen t 1 of the TSO deleted.
AES Alamos (Discharger)	13	Order Location: Page 3, Section III.A General Issue: The permitted flow for Discharge Point 002 (states 398.00 MGD but should be 389) is inconsistent with other areas of the Order (e.g. footnote 1 of page 6). Solution: Confirm permitted flow is consistent throughout the Order.	The permitted flow for Discharge Point 002 is corrected to 389 MGD.	Corrected flow value for Discharge Point 002.
AES Alamos (Discharger)	14	Order Location: Page 4, Section IV.A.1 General Issue: The header for this section is inaccurate. Solution: Revise header so that it reads "The Final Effluent Limitations- Discharge Points No. 001, 002 , 002, and 003."	The header for this section is corrected as requested.	Corrected header of section IV.A.1.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	15	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4 General Issue: The discharge limits do not reference the applicable TSO. Solution: Throughout the new Order all limits for total residual chlorine, copper, and temperature should include a clarifying reference indicating each is subject to the TSO and interim limits are applicable per the TSO.</p>	<p>Table 4 accurately reflects the effluent limitations established based on standard procedures. The TSO is a separate document requested by the Discharger to allow additional time to comply with these requirements. A reference to the TSO is added to Table 4 to ensure that persons reviewing the document are aware of the interim limits and time schedule order.</p>	<p>Reference to TSO added to Table 4.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	16	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4 General Issue: The maximum daily effluent limitation for Free Available Chlorine is listed as 0.20/0.50. The maximum daily limitation is denoted as being 0.20 and the 0.50 concentration value should instead be placed as the instantaneous maximum. Solution: Please revise accordingly.</p>	<p>The comment is correct that 0.50 is an instantaneous maximum effluent limitation and Table 4 is updated accordingly.</p>	<p>Table 4 updated.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	17	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4 General Issue: Radioactivity is a sampling parameter included within Table 4 and is not a pollutant of concern at AES Alamitos. Solution: Please include a provision similar to the existing Order that states the following, “A statement certifying that radioactive pollutants were not added to the discharge may be submitted in lieu of monitoring” or, in the alternative, provide reference to Attachment E/Table E-3.</p>	<p>Footnote 9 of Table E-3 is edited to include the following statement: “In lieu of monitoring, compliance with this effluent limitation may be demonstrated through the submission of a statement certifying that radioactive pollutants were not added to the discharge.”</p>	<p>Edited footnote 9 of Table 4.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	18	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4 General Issue: Based on this table it appears the new Order warrants sampling of bacteria at all the discharge locations, whereas Table E-3 indicates AES Alamitos is required to sample bacteria at the outfall the sanitary waste is being directed to.</p>	<p>The effluent limitation for bacteria is based on the Basin Plan and applies to all discharges from the Facility to the receiving water. The comment is accurate, however, in stating that the only onsite source for bacteria is the waste treatment plant. Therefore, bacteria sampling of the treated sanitary</p>	<p>Removed bacteria monitoring requirement for Discharge</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>Furthermore, the new Order requires bacteria to be sampled at the waste treatment plant which is the only potential source of bacteria from onsite operation; therefore, the sampling of bacteria at the discharge points is not representative of the onsite operation and has the potential to be impacted by elevated bacteria concentrations within the OTC water. Taking into account there has been a TMDL established for bacteria and known sources of bacteria in the Los Cerritos Channel (the cooling water intake for AES Alamitos), AES Alamitos is concerned there is no intake credit for this parameter. In the past, upon reporting elevated results at the discharge points AES Alamitos has collected samples at the intake and have determined elevated results at the discharge points were directly attributed to the OTC water coming from the intake point (i.e. Los Cerritos Channel). Although this exceedance was entirely out of AES Alamitos's control, this perceived violation included a mandatory minimum penalty in the Settlement Offer No. R4-2015-0117, dated June 15, 2015.</p> <p>Solution: Since the only onsite operation to potentially contribute to elevated levels in our wastewater is the waste treatment plant, AES Alamitos requests the sampling requirement be reduced to only the discharge point of the waste treatment system. If this is not a feasible option, AES Alamitos requests this item be added to the TSO to help avoid future violations that are out of AES Alamitos's control. Additionally, a statement should be included in Table 4 similar to the footnote in Table</p>	<p>waste effluent at monitoring location INT-001C is sufficient to demonstrate compliance with this limitation. Monitoring requirements for bacteria at Discharge Points 001, 002 and 003 are removed. Receiving water monitoring requirements for bacteria, however, are retained.</p>	<p>Points 001, 002 and 003.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		E-3 or, in the alternative Table 4 should reference Attachment E/Table E-3.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	19	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4</p> <p>General Issue: The new Order prescribes a new instantaneous maximum effluent limitation for temperature of 86°F for discharges to the San Gabriel Estuary. The existing order included an instantaneous maximum effluent limitation for temperature of 105°F since this limitation was allowed under the Thermal Plan for <i>existing</i> dischargers to coastal waters.</p> <p>Solution: AES Alamitos requests the temperature limitation of 103°F with a 15 minute rolling average, or in the alternative, the new Order maintain the existing permit effluent limitation for temperature of 105°F, for both summer and winter. The anti-backsliding definition states that the effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the prior permit, <i>with some exception in which limitations may be relaxed</i>. AES Alamitos is not requesting a less stringent standard, just an alternative interpretation of the limit. Furthermore, wherever the new Order prescribes a new instantaneous maximum effluent limitation for temperature of 86°F, it should include a clarifying reference indicating interim limits are detailed in the TSO.</p>	Table 4 accurately reflects the effluent limitations established based on the Thermal Plan. The TSO is a separate document requested by the Discharger to allow additional time to comply with these requirements. A reference to the TSO is added to Table 4 to ensure that persons reviewing the document are aware of the interim limits and time schedule order.	Reference to TSO added to Table 4.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	20	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4</p> <p>General Issue: The new order proposes an effluent limitation for 2,3,7,8 TCDD of 1.4×10^{-8} µg/l and 2.8×10^{-8} µg/l for average monthly and maximum daily, respectively. According to Attachment J (Draft Reasonable Potential Analysis), this limit was based</p>	Staff agrees with the comment. The reason that an effluent limitation was calculated for 2,3,7,8-TCDD, as indicated in Table F-11 and Attachment J, was Trigger 1: the maximum effluent concentration exceeded the water quality criteria. A monitoring report submitted by the Discharger on March 31,	Removed 2,3,7,8-TCDD from Table 4 of the Order; and Table

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>on a maximum background concentration of 6×10^{-6} µg/l. AES Alamitos is concerned with the source of this background concentration since it did not come from AES Alamitos. In all of the analyses performed by AES Alamitos, the result has always been “None Detected.” Furthermore, this effluent limitation is significantly lower than any detection limit that currently exists. US EPA method 613 lists the method detection limit as 2×10^{-3} µg/l. While the laboratory AES Alamitos utilizes can get a method detection limit that is several orders of magnitude lower than that listed in Method 613, it is still several orders of magnitude higher than the effluent limit in the proposed Order.</p> <p>Solution: AES Alamitos requests that the effluent limitation and the requirement to sample for 2,3,7,8 TCDD be removed from the Order, or in the alternative, included in the TSO, allowing AES Alamitos until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.</p>	<p>2011, for testing performed by Edison ESI indicated a result of 1.4×10^{-6} µg/l for 2,3,7,8-TCDD at Outfall 003 on February 8, 2011. This exceeded the CTR criteria of 1.4×10^{-8} µg/l. Therefore, effluent limitations were calculated according to SIP procedures.</p> <p>Upon further review, the Regional Board notes that the February 8, 2011 result was flagged as “detected, but not quantified” (DNQ) and was reported as an estimated concentration. This estimated concentration will not be used to determine reasonable potential. Subsequently, annual monitoring has occurred at Discharge Points 001, 002 and 003 during the years 2012, 2013 and 2014. All of these results have been non-detect (ND). Therefore, the Discharger has not demonstrated reasonable potential for 2,3,7,8-TCDD.</p> <p>The effluent limitation for 2,3,7,8-TCDD is therefore removed from Table 4 of the Order. This pollutant is also removed from Attachment F at the following locations: Table F-10, section IV.C.3.d, Table F-11, section IV.C.4.b, Table F-12, section IV.D.3, Table F-13 and section VII.B.1. Sampling frequency for this pollutant is changed to semiannually in Table E-3.</p>	<p>F-10, section IV.C.3.d, Table F-11, section IV.C.4.b, Table F-12, section IV.D.3, Table F-13 and section VII.B.1 of Attachment F.</p> <p>Changed monitoring frequency for 2,3,7,8-TCDD to semiannually in Table E-3.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	21	<p>Order Location: Page 5, Table 4</p> <p>General Issue: The new Order prescribes a new instantaneous minimum and maximum effluent limitation for pH of 6.0 and 9.0, respectively, for low volume wastes. The existing Order does not have pH limits for low volume discharges. AES Alamitos</p>	<p>The technology-based effluent limitation for pH for low volume wastes are effluent limitation guidelines (ELGs) taken from 40 C.F.R. section 423.12 (b) (1). This ELG applies to all inplant waste streams, including low volume wastes. The ELG for pH is not applicable to OTC water.</p>	None taken.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>cannot achieve the low volume pH limits being proposed in the new Order. Since low volume waste commingles with OTC water prior to discharge offsite, sampling pH at the point of discharge from the retention basins is not representative of the quality of wastewater being discharged from the facility.</p> <p>Solution: AES Alamitos requests that the pH limits of the new Order be applied after AES Alamitos commingles its discharge or, in the alternative, that the pH limits for the low volume waste be included in the TSO, allowing AES Alamitos until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.</p>	<p>The prior Order included an effluent limitation that stated: "The effluent pH shall at all times be within the range of 6.0 to 9.0 pH units." The prior Order did not specify pH limitations for individual waste streams.</p>	
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	22	<p>Order Location: Page 7, Section V.A.2</p> <p>General Issue: The surface water limitations indicate the discharge from AES Alamitos shall not cause the "Surface water temperature to rise greater than 4° above the natural temperature of the receiving waters at any time or place. Elevated temperature waste discharges either individually or combined with other discharges shall not create a zone, defined by water temperature of more than 1° above natural receiving water temperature, which exceeds 25 percent of the cross-sectional area of a main river channel at any point." This surface water limitation is very subjective and will likely be problematic to AES Alamitos. Because of the location of the facility and the amount of dischargers located upriver and in the vicinity of AES Alamitos that have the potential to contribute to elevated temperatures, it will be difficult to define what the natural temperature of the river is and is likely that the temperatures will exceed this limitation.</p>	<p>The Regional Board met with the Discharger on August 19, 2015, and staff agreed that they cannot immediately comply with the new receiving water limitation for temperature. An interim receiving water limitation for temperature is added to the TSO.</p>	<p>Added interim receiving water limitation to the TSO.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>Solution: This surface water limitation should be omitted or added to the TSO, allowing AES Alamitos until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.</p>		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	23	<p>Order Location: Page 7, Section V.A.4 General Issue: This surface water limitation prohibits depressing the dissolved oxygen concentration to less than 5.0 mg/L, but the concentration in the area, especially upriver of the discharges, often falls below 5.0 mg/L, especially in the summer. Although, it's perceived that AES Alamitos's discharge should not cause the depression, this limitation could be problematic because of the low DO detection common within the area of the discharges and the potential for low DO within OTC (ie. originating in the Los Cerritos Channel). Solution: Please omit this limitation or allow an intake credit as requested in comment No. 43.</p>	Where the upstream dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration is already less than the 5.0 mg/l criteria, the effluent from the downstream Facility would not be the cause of the noted DO concentration.	None taken.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	24	<p>Order Location: Page 11, Section C.1.b General Issue: RPA is not defined. Solution: Clearly define RPA.</p>	RPA stands for "Reasonable Potential Analysis". This section refers to using results from the monitoring program to conduct a RPA according to the procedures outlined in the SIP. The section is edited to provide more clarity.	Section C.1.b of the Order edited for clarity.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	25	<p>Order Location: Page 11, Section C.2.a General Issue: The new Order states that the TRE Workplan shall describe steps AES Alamitos intends to follow in the event that a violation of the acute or chronic toxicity limits occurs. Solution: Acute toxicity monitoring is not required per the new or existing Order and all reference to acute testing should be removed to avoid confusion.</p>	No acute toxicity effluent limitations or monitoring requirements are included in this Order and, therefore, the reference to acute toxicity in this section is deleted.	Acute toxicity reference deleted from section C.2.a of the Order.
AES	26	<p>Order Location: Page 12, Section C.3.b</p>	The Discharger has not previously submitted a	Edited

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
Alamitos (Discharger)		<p>General Issue: The new Order requires an updated Best Management Practices Plan (BMPP) be incorporated into the SWPPP. The BMPP is new terminology that AES Alamitos is unfamiliar with and the BMPP is historically not a stormwater permit condition. The SWPPP has recently been revised for the facility and includes all of the potential pollutant source areas and their associated BMPs but does not include a section referred to as the BMPP since it is not a permit condition within the General Permit. In addition, this section indicates that the BMPP shall be developed in accordance with requirements in Attachment G, but there is no reference to the BMPP in this attachment.</p> <p>Solution: Remove all reference to an updated BMPP to avoid uncertainty of SWPPP requirements or reference the Summary Table on page G-6 instead.</p>	<p>BMPP. Hence the reference to an “updated BMPP” is modified to read “BMPP”. The BMPP may be submitted as a separate document or included within the SWPPP as a list of best management practices (BMPs). Attachment G does not reference the BMPP but provides instructions for including a list of BMPs within the SWPPP. Section C.3.b is therefore edited to clarify the distinction between the BMPP as a separate document or the inclusion of a list of BMPs within the SWPPP. The reference to Attachment G is corrected to reflect that Attachment G provides instructions for developing a list of BMPs.</p> <p>Similar edits are applied to section VI.B.3.b of Attachment F for clarity.</p>	<p>section C.3.b of the Order to explain BMPP requirements.</p> <p>Edited section VI.B.3.b of Attachment F to explain BMPP requirements.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	27	<p>Order Location: Page 12, Section C.3.c</p> <p>General Issue: The requirements for the Pollutant Minimization Program have been removed from Appendix F; however, remain in this section.</p> <p>Solution: Remove all reference to the PMP.</p>	<p>The Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) requirement does not apply to this Facility and therefore, section C.3.c is removed as requested.</p>	<p>Section C.3.c removed.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	28	<p>Order Location: Page 13, Section C.4.b</p> <p>General Issue: The new Order requires AES Alamitos to develop and maintain a record of <i>all</i> spills, overflows, or bypasses from the facility and requires us to submit a quarterly report of <i>all</i> spills that occurred at the facility to the RWQCB and USEPA. There is no clear definition of spills, overflows or bypasses. Currently as written, it appears <i>all</i> spills that occur anywhere on the property require</p>	<p>The following statement is added to section C.4.b of the Order to define spills:</p> <p>“For the purposes of this Order a spill is defined as any unauthorized release of sewage or other waste that causes, or probably will cause, a discharge to any waters of the state. (Health and Safety Code section 5411.5)”</p>	<p>Spill definition added to section C.4.b of the Order.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		reporting. Solution: Spills should be clearly defined and should include a quantity and location, such as “all spills of reportable quantity that could have potential environmental impact.”		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	29	Order Location: Page 15, VII.F.2 and Attachment E-I.P General Issue: States if there is an exceedance of the AMEL for any constituent, that AES Alamitos “shall collect four additional samples at approximately equal intervals during the month.” Because of the turnaround time to receive results, this often limits the time to resample and then requires samples to be collected for 4 consecutive days. The existing permit requires only three additional samples to be collected which often allows for a longer duration between the sampling events. Additionally, in the new Order it is not clear whether or not the sum of duplicate samples should be used to determine the requirement for additional sampling or if one of the results exceeds the average monthly effluent, will AES Alamitos be required to collect additional samples? Solution: AES Alamitos requests the RWQCB reconsider the additional sampling requirements and that the new Order be consistent with the existing permit requirements. Additionally, please clarify whether or not AES Alamitos is required to collect additional samples if one of the results for duplicate samples exceeds the average monthly effluent limit.	Section VII.F.2 is standard practice required in NPDES permits for additional monitoring when an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) is exceeded. The sampling requirement is for four additional samples to be collected at approximately equal intervals during the month. The requirement is not dependent on the turnaround time for results. The four additional samples are used to calculate an average value for the month that determines whether compliance with the AMEL is demonstrated. When duplicate samples are collected, both results shall be considered in determining compliance with the AMEL.	None taken.
AES	30	Order Location: Page 16, Section VII.J	IWC is the in-stream waste concentration for	Section

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
Alamitos (Discharger)		<p>General Issue: IWC is not defined. Solution: Clearly define IWC.</p>	<p>discharges from the Facility, and is set at 100% effluent. This section is edited to provide more clarity regarding the IWC.</p>	<p>edited for clarity.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	31	<p>Order Location: Page E-5, Table E-1 General Issue: Historically AES Alamitos has sampled each of our three basins separately and has reported each result within the PET tool and DMRs separately (ie. north, south and center basins). It wasn't until the electronic DMRs that we began to report the max values. It is not clear if AES Alamitos should continue to sample each basin and report it similarly to how we have been in the PET tool and DMRs or if we are supposed to collect a composite sample and report only one value. Solution: AES Alamitos requests we continue monitoring and reporting consistent with current practices.</p>	<p>Low volume wastes can be collected in three retention basins: the North Basin, the Central Basin and the South Basin. Monitoring is conducted at the retention basins prior to commingling with other internal process waste streams or OTC water.</p> <p>Table E-1 of Attachment E includes the following monitoring station locations:</p> <p>INT-001A: low volume wastes INT-001B: metal cleaning wastes INT-001C: treated sanitary wastes</p> <p>The comment has correctly pointed out that in order to continue the current monitoring and reporting practices there should be three locations for low volume wastes. Also, the Discharger has ceased the discharge of metal cleaning wastes so a monitoring station for that waste stream is no longer needed. Therefore, the monitoring station locations in Table E-1 are edited as follows:</p> <p>INT-001A: low volume wastes (North Basin) INT-001B: low volume wastes (South Basin) INT-001C: low volume wastes (Central Basin) INT-002: treated sanitary wastes</p> <p>Conforming edits are also made to Attachment E at</p>	<p>Edited monitoring station locations in Attachment E at: Table E-1, section IV.A and Table E-3 of Attachment E; and section VII.B.2, section VII.B.3 and section VII.B.4 of Attachment F.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
			section IV.A, Table E-3; and to Attachment F at section VII.B.2, section VII.B.3 and section VII.B.4.	
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	32	<p>Permit Location: Page E-6, Table E-2 and Page E-15, Section VIII.B.1.a</p> <p>General Issue: There is Benthic Station disagreement between Table E-2 and Section VIII.B.1.a of the MRP. Table E-2 identifies all 12 RSW monitoring locations and indicates all 12 have a BEN monitoring location directly beneath it, while Section VIII.B.1.a indicates no benthic fauna sampling is needed at Stations BEN-002 and BEN-006.</p> <p>Solution: The table should be revised to denote that no benthic sampling (biological or sediment chemistry/grain size) is required at Stations BEN-002 and BEN-006. Furthermore, these two stations can be listed as no longer occupied.</p>	Benthic monitoring requirements at stations BEN-002 and 006 are discontinued in this Order. Therefore, Table E-2 is updated to remove these stations.	Removed stations BEN-002 and 006 from Table E-2.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	33	<p>Permit Location: Page E-7, Table E-3</p> <p>General Issue: Table E-3 indicates that chronic toxicity shall be collected by 24-hour composite monitoring. 24-hr composite samples will likely require an auto sampler to be installed. There is a tidal component to some of the sampling, especially at Discharge 003 and at low tide; the sampler will be unable to draw water. Using an auto sampler could also be problematic because Topsmelt require a large volume of water, possibly more than an auto sampler can handle. In order to collect 24-hour composite samples AES Alamitos would need to install a sample pump at all three discharge sampling points that can draw with sufficient power to sample at all but the lowest spring tides. Sampling would also have to be</p>	<p>The Regional Board notes that a 24-hour composite sample does not require the installation of an auto sampler. A 24-hour composite sample may also be obtained through the manual collection of samples during a 24-hour period.</p> <p>Where it is not practical to obtain a 24-hour composite sample, however, it is acceptable to meet the monitoring requirement for chronic toxicity with the collection of a grab sample. Table E-3 is updated to include the option of collecting a grab sample for chronic toxicity.</p>	Sample type changed to "24-hour composite or grab" for chronic toxicity in Table E-3.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>scheduled around spring tides. Additionally, the auto samplers would need to have sufficient capacity to hold large volumes and whenever Topsmelt tests are needed, the auto samplers would be emptied and additional volume would likely need to be collected. Otherwise, the Topsmelt could not be run simultaneously with kelp and an invertebrate during most sensitive species test periods. Another obstacle with performing 24-hour composite monitoring is due to infrequent run time of units. Due to this, it becomes essential for us to complete monitoring during critical maintenance activities which limits the run time of the cooling water circulators (per our OTC implementation plan) and does not allow for 24-hour monitoring.</p> <p>As discussed during our meeting on August 19, 2015, it was advised AES Alamitos grab samples while chlorination events take place. Chlorination is normally a spontaneous activity based on the growth that occurs and usually is performed more frequently during the summer months. There are months that chlorination does not occur at all. Since chronic toxicity testing is performed by a contractor and normally requires a couple days to prepare for and to obtain testing species there can be some challenge to coordinating it when chlorination takes place.</p>		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	34	<p>Permit Location: Page E-7, Table E-3 and Page E-9, Section V.E General Issue: Table E-3 indicates that the sampling frequency for chronic toxicity is 1/quarter after the initial 3 species sensitive screening. Section V.E</p>	The comment is correct that this Order requires quarterly monitoring for chronic toxicity as indicated in Table E-3. Section V.E of Attachment E is corrected to read “quarterly monitoring”. Section VII.C of Attachment F is also corrected to read “requires	Edited section V.E of Attachment E, and

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>states, “The species that exhibits the highest “Percent (%) Effect” at the discharge IWC during species sensitivity screening shall be used for routine annual monitoring.” This can have multiple interpretations. Solution: Clarify that sampling is quarterly and “routine annual monitoring” should say “routine quarterly monitoring.” Terminology should be consistent and standardized throughout the permit to avoid future confusion or disagreement over permit interpretation. For instance, in Attachment F, Section VII.C it indicates this Order requires <i>annual monitoring for chronic toxicity</i>.</p>	<p>routine quarterly monitoring”.</p>	<p>section VII.C of Attachment F to reflect a quarterly monitoring requirement for chronic toxicity.</p>
<p>AES Alamitos (Discharger)</p>	<p>35</p>	<p>Order Location: Page E-7, Table E-3 General Issue: In the last column there is reference to footnote number 2 (which states “Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 C.F.R, part 136...””) for several reporting parameters it does not apply to, such as flow. Solution: Please revise accordingly.</p>	<p>40 C.F.R. does not include methods for analyzing flow or pH. Therefore, reference to footnote 2 for these parameters is removed throughout Table E-3.</p>	<p>Removed footnote 2 for flow and pH in Table E-3.</p>
<p>AES Alamitos (Discharger)</p>	<p>36</p>	<p>Order Location: Page E-7, Table E-3 General Issue: For total recoverable copper, the footnote indicates that on days when copper sampling occurs, AES Alamitos shall report the corresponding flow rate measured at flow gage F354-R in Coyote Creek (operated by LACDPW), but does not provide direction to obtain this data or a link to the website. This flow gage is referenced multiple times throughout the new Order. Solution: Please define the source of this data since this is a new compliance point for the facility or direct the permit user to the location within the new Order</p>	<p>Data for flow gage F354-R can be obtained from the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, Water Resources Division, Hydrologic Records Unit ((626)-458-6120). Section IV.C.3.d of Attachment F is updated to include this contact information.</p>	<p>Contact information added to section IV.C.3.d of Attachment F.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		that provides the source.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	37	<p>Order Location: Page E-7, Table E-3</p> <p>General Issue: What is the basis for increased sampling of 2,3,7,8-TCDD, benzo(a) anthracene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, and PCBs? The existing permit currently requires these parameters to be sampled once per year. Additionally, AES Alamitos made a request to be relieved of certain limits being proposed in its comment letter dated June 10, 2015. For four of those constituents, Ni, pH, NH3 and bis(2-ethylhexyl phthalate), the Draft TSO included a finding (No. 19) addressing the frequency to which AES Alamitos remains in compliance, which was used to justify denial of the request. AES Alamitos renews its request for a time schedule order for the reasons that this is once through cooling; AES Alamitos adds nothing to this stream that would cause a violation, and has no feasible controls to address the concentration levels of these constituents.</p> <p>Solution: Please include Ni, pH, NH3, and bis(2-ethylhexyl phthalate) in the time schedule order and revise the sampling frequency for all of the above referenced constituents to make it consistent with the existing permit.</p>	<p>2,3,7,8-TCDD, benzo(a) anthracene, bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, dibenzo(a,h)anthracene, indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene, and PCBs were reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) at reporting limits greater than the applicable criteria in monitoring results submitted by the Discharger. Therefore, this Order establishes monitoring requirements using sufficiently sensitive test methods (Attachment E, section I.H) to ensure that these pollutant concentrations are below the established effluent criteria.</p> <p>Field measurements submitted by the Discharger indicated that they would have complied with the effluent limitations established in this Order for nickel in 49 out of 50 samples, for pH in 905 out of 906 samples, for ammonia in 30 out of 30 samples, and for bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate 24 out of 25 samples. These results indicate that the Discharger will be able to comply with the new limitations and therefore no interim limitations were required for these pollutants.</p> <p>The sampling frequency for 2,3,7,8-TCDD, benzo(a) anthracene and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate in Table E-3 is reduced to semiannually for consistency.</p>	<p>Reduced sampling frequency to semiannually for 2,3,7,8-TCDD, benzo(a) anthracene and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate in Table E-3.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	38	<p>Order Location: Page E-8, Table E-3</p> <p>General Issue: The stormwater monitoring at locations D1, D2, and D3 requires the continuous monitoring of flow. What is the basis for this requirement? This is a new requirement and also is</p>	<p>As discussed during the August 19, 2015 meeting with the Discharger and the Regional Board, temperature for storm water may be reported as a daily maximum on days when a discharge occurs. Table E-3 is updated to reflect the daily maximum</p>	<p>Edited Table E-3 to reflect storm water monitoring</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>not required within the General Permit. The monitoring locations are located in swale/v-ditches and stormwater has to be manually released and then sampled, making it difficult to monitor the flow. As discussed during our meeting on August 19, 2015, temperature is not expected to continuously be monitored and is required to be an instantaneous value. Please modify accordingly. Lastly, Table E-2 indicates that four of the parameters required to be monitored at D1, D2, and D3 (ie. BOD, TSS, O&G, and pH) are required to be sampled once/month. This requirement is arduous and it's not understood what is gained by requiring this capacity of monitoring. Solution: Please remove flow from the parameters that are required to be maintained for storm water. AES Alamitos also requests the requirement for temperature monitoring be revised accordingly. Additionally, AES Alamitos recommends the above 4 constituents requested to be sampled once/month be revised to 4 times per year, consistent with the General Permit requirements.</p>	<p>monitoring requirement for temperature in footnote 3.</p> <p>The continuous flow requirement for storm water was intended to monitor the flow volume of storm water being discharged to the Los Cerritos Channel Estuary. Where continuous flow monitoring is problematic because of sheet flow conditions, the Discharger may provide a calculated estimate of the flow volume on days when discharge occurs. Table E-3 is updated to reflect that an estimated daily flow volume is acceptable for storm water.</p> <p>The monthly monitoring requirements for BOD, TSS, oil and grease, and pH are changed to 4/year as requested for storm water.</p>	<p>requirements of maximum daily for temperature, estimated daily flow and 4/year for BOD, TSS, oil and grease, and pH.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	39	<p>Order Location: Page E-9, Section V.C. General Issue: Indicates that, "Sufficient sample volume shall be collected to perform the required toxicity test and Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) studies." Composite samplers are unlikely to be able to do this and the TIE samples would be out of compliance by the time the initial tests indicated a problem. Solution: Toxicity and TIE samples need to be collected independently to avoid hold time issues and</p>	<p>Staff concurs. If the Facility continues to operate and there is flow, a separate sample must be collected. However for storm water discharges, which are episodic, that may not be possible and enough sample must be collected to do all of the required analysis during the discharge event.</p>	None taken.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		collection volume restrictions.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	40	<p>Order Location: Page E-9, Section V.D. General Issue: Red abalone, sea urchin, and sand dollar are listed as invertebrate test species for toxicity testing. This limits testing to animals that can be seasonal or otherwise unavailable in good, test-worthy condition. Solution: AES Alamitos requests the list be expanded to include mussels and oysters, as in the current methods and permit, to maximize available species so seasonal or test organism supplier issues do not disrupt testing.</p>	<p>The species listed in section V.D of Attachment E are taken from <i>Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms</i> (EPA/600/R-95/136, 1995). This document also includes a test method for the requested mussels and oysters species. Therefore, the following clause is added to section V.D.2 of Attachment E:</p> <p>“; or a static non-renewal test with the pacific oyster, <i>Crassostrea gigas</i>, and a mussel species, <i>Mytilus edulis</i>, <i>M. californianus</i>, <i>M. galloprovincialis</i>, or <i>M. trossulus</i> (Embryo-Larval Development Test Method).”</p>	Edited section V.D.2 of Attachment E.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	41	<p>Order Location: Page E-13, Table E-4 General Issue: The footnote for chronic toxicity states, “Monitoring is required solely at Monitoring Location RSW-011.” The sample type specifies that this testing needs to be completed by 24-hour composite sampling. AES Alamitos is concerned with how to complete this sampling requirement using the 24-hour composite auto sampler in the river without being susceptible to vandalism or complications and does not understand what is gained from the tests. Solution: As discussed during our meeting on August 19th, AES Alamitos requests the sample type by revised to “Grab” instead of “24-hour composite.”</p>	See Response to Comment 33 above.	Already addressed by Response to Comment 33.
AES Alamitos	42	<p>Order Location: Page E-18, Section VIII.D.2 General Issue: The next Bight Regional Monitoring</p>	The comment is correct that the next Southern California Bight regional monitoring is expected to	Section VIII.D.2 of

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
(Discharger)		<p>Program is not 2016 and is supposed to be 2018. The program runs on a 5-year cycle and the last one was 2013. Most of the Bight 2013 reports will not be published until mid to late 2016. The new Order also requires AES Alamitos participate in “each Bight Regional Monitoring Program,” and it states the level of participation shall be similar to that provided in previous regional surveys. In contrast, the annual Receiving Water Monitoring program for AES Alamitos has been reduced in the new Order in comparison to the existing Order. As specified in the new Order, AES Alamitos has previously participated in prior Bight programs via a monitoring resource exchange, but with a smaller Receiving Water Monitoring program there will be less effort available to shift in a resource exchange. Besides, since the goal for AES Alamitos is the elimination of its discharge, AES Alamitos does not want to be committed to an alteration of its monitoring program when the resulting sampling would have no future value to either the regulators or AES Alamitos.</p> <p>Solution: Revise the text so it states Bight’1618 is expected to take place during 20162018. Additionally, AES Alamitos requests the removal of the sentence regarding level of participation cited. The next paragraph details the monitoring resource exchange and how it shall be negotiated with the Regional Water Board and USEPA.</p>	<p>take place in 2018. The comment is also correct that receiving water monitoring requirements have been reduced in this Order and that participation through data exchange would not necessarily be considered participation at a level similar to that provided by the Discharger in previous surveys. Therefore, section VIII.D.2 of Attachment E is edited as requested. References to 2016 are changed to 2018, and the sentence regarding level of participation is deleted.</p>	<p>Attachment E edited as requested. References to 2016 are changed to 2018, and the sentence regarding level of participation is deleted.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	43	<p>Order Location: Page E-18, Section IX.A General Issue: The visual monitoring of the receiving water sampling points is a new requirement and</p>	<p>As discussed at the August 19, 2015 meeting between the Discharger and the Regional Board, the discharge from the Facility is continuous and</p>	<p>Edited section IX.A.2 of</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>historically these observations were required only at the receiving water monitoring locations. It's not clear whether the monitoring is expected to occur every time AES Alamitos discharges or once a month. Nonetheless, this requirement seems arduous and is very subjective and can cause perceived violations of receiving water quality. For instance, the color, turbidity, and odor are highly subjective and can be easily misinterpreted. In the San Gabriel River there are numerous discharges upriver of the Alamitos Generating Station effluent points, including a waste treatment plant, where odor, color, and turbidity may have numerous natural and anthropogenic causes. Aside from these concerns, it's also difficult to perform the monitoring because the effluent discharge locations are not on AES Alamitos property and it's difficult to observe the discharge from the facility.</p> <p>Solution: As discussed during our August 19th meeting, AES Alamitos requests the new Order specify that observations are expected only at the time of receiving water monitoring. Receiving water monitoring however, is tidal dependent (i.e. monitoring is required as near to the start of the flood and ebb tides as possible) and the run profile of our units is out of AES Alamitos's control, so it's possible that receiving water monitoring is completed on a day there are no units running.</p>	<p>therefore the requirement to conduct visual monitoring at each discharge point when discharges occur would also be continuous. Furthermore, effluent sampling occurs within the Facility property at locations where the discharge points are not visible since they are on the other side of the wall.</p> <p>The Regional Board finds that it is sufficient to conduct visual monitoring of the receiving water at each discharge point during regular receiving water monitoring. Section IX.A.2 of Attachment E is edited accordingly. Receiving water monitoring shall occur at a time when the Facility is discharging.</p>	<p>Attachment E to state that visual monitoring at each discharge point shall occur when receiving water monitoring occurs, and this shall occur at a time when the Facility is discharging.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	44	<p>Order Location: Page E-19, Section IX.B General Issue: The new Order requires monitoring of the effluent for discharge of calcareous material. It's</p>	<p>Due to the nature of the discharge and the fact that the discharge itself routinely removes much of the calcareous material, it is infeasible to monitor for</p>	<p>Removed section IX.B from</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>not clear how frequent the monitoring is expected to occur. Nonetheless, this compliance item seems to be excessive because the removal of calcareous material is ongoing whenever the circulator cooling pumps are running. Occasionally the operators will perform a pick and clean, but this is required only when larger shells appear that impede the operation of the circulators. The quantity of material (i.e. shells) is insignificant in comparison to the quantity of OTC and the volume and weight is difficult to estimate as required by the new Order. As mentioned during the August 19th meeting, it is infeasible to estimate the volume or weight of material and therefore, AES Alamitos will report the quantity is insignificant in comparison to the quantity of OTC, as directed by the staff during the meeting.</p> <p>Solution: Similar to item 36 above, AES Alamitos requests the new Order specify that observations are expected only at the time of receiving water monitoring. Again, it shall be noted that receiving water monitoring is tidal dependent and the run profile of our units is out of AES Alamitos's control, so it's possible that receiving water monitoring is completed on a day there are no units running.</p>	<p>calcareous material removal as described in section IX.B of Attachment E. This section is therefore deleted. Instead, another item (k) is added to section IX.A.2 of Attachment E as follows:</p> <p>“k. Description of, and estimation of the amount of any calcareous material observed in the discharge or removed manually from the intake structure.”</p> <p>See Response to Comment 36 above regarding receiving water monitoring.</p>	<p>Attachment E. Added calcareous material requirement to section IX.A.2 of Attachment E.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	45	<p>Order Location: Page E-22, Section X.C.3 General Issue: The new Order indicates that all discharge monitoring results must be reported on the official USEPA pre-printed DMR forms (EPA Form 3320-1). The item contradicts item X.C.1 (Page E-21) which states AES Alamitos shall submit DMRs electronically via CIWQS and will discontinue</p>	<p>Section X.C.1 of Attachment E is correct that DMRs are to be submitted electronically via CWIQS. Section X.C.3 is in contradiction of this requirement and is therefore deleted.</p>	<p>Deleted section X.C.3 from Attachment E.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		submitting paper DMRs. Solution: Please revise accordingly.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	46	Order Location: Page F-4, Section II.A General Issue: The Description of Wastewater and Biosolids Treatment and Controls is inaccurate. The description indicates that the central basin was used to treat metal cleaning wastes but has not been in service for years. This is not accurate. The central basin was historically utilized as backup and could treat waste from any of the units, but currently is not in use or discharging. There is a separate basin located between the central basin and south basin that was used specifically for metal cleaning waste and has not been in service for years. Solution: Please revise accordingly.	The historical description of the central basin is corrected in section II.A of Attachment F.	Edited description of the central basin in section II.A of Attachment F.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	47	Order Location: Page F-5, Section II.A.1 General Issue: The total maximum OTC pumping capacity is not consistent with Table F-1. Solution: Ensure capacities are consistent throughout permit.	The Report of Waste Discharge submitted by the Discharger indicates a maximum discharge of 1,271 million gallons per day (MGD) through Discharge Points 001, 002 and 003. This is listed correctly in section II.A.1 of Attachment F. Table F-1 and section II of Attachment F are corrected to read 1,271 MGD.	Edited Table F-1 and section II of Attachment F to correct maximum discharge volume.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	48	Order Location: Page F-5, Section II.A.2.a.i General Issue: The description of boiler blowdown states that water from Units 1 and 2 is discharged to the retention basins while that from Units 3-6 is discharged directly to the receiving water. This is inaccurate, water from Units 1, 2, 5, and 6 are directed to the retention basins,	The description of boiler blowdown in section II.A.2.a.i of Attachment F is corrected as requested.	Edited section II.A.2.a.i of Attachment F.

AES Alamos LLC
 Alamos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>whereas Units 3 and 4 are directed to the receiving water. Solution: Please revise accordingly.</p>		
AES Alamos (Discharger)	49	<p>Order Location: Page F-18, Section IV.B.2.b General Issue: The first line states that the applicable effluent limitations established on the basis of BPT, but should be BAT. Solution: Please revise accordingly</p>	<p>The comment is correct. The reference to “BPT” in section IV.B.2.b of Attachment F is corrected to “BAT” as requested.</p>	<p>Changed “BPT” to “BAT” in section IV.B.2.b of Attachment F.</p>
AES Alamos (Discharger)	50	<p>Order Location: Page F-25, Section IV.C.3.c General Issue: Section 1.4.4 of the SIP, which applies to toxic pollutants with criteria/objectives established by the NTR, CTR, and the Basin Plans, allows intake credits on a pollutant-by-pollutant or discharge-by-discharge basis, by simultaneously monitoring the intake and effluent or by a RWQCB evaluation of the use of best management practices. Solution: AES Alamos requests the LARWQCB grant intake credits because AES Alamos has already been exposed to instances when pollutants at the discharge are directly attributed to the intake and AES Alamos should not continue to be held accountable and penalized for pollutants that are directly out of its control.</p>	<p>Section 1.4.4 of the SIP allows for intake credits when the intake water is from the same water body as the receiving water body. The intake water is from the Los Cerritos Channel Estuary and the receiving water is the San Gabriel River Estuary. Therefore intake credits cannot be granted as per the SIP.</p>	<p>None taken.</p>
AES Alamos (Discharger)	51	<p>Order Location: Page F-37, Section IV.E General Issue: The calculation for mass-based effluent limits utilizes the maximum permitted flow rate for each discharge point. Typically, isn't the mass-based effluent limitations established using the max daily flow rate?</p>	<p>The mass-based effluent limitations account for the largest amount of a pollutant expected to be present in the discharge. This occurs during the maximum flow rate, which, for this Facility, is the permitted flow rate.</p>	<p>None taken.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	52	<p>Solution: Please clarify.</p> <p>Order Location: Page F-40, Section VI. B3.a</p> <p>General Issue: This paragraph states that the SWPPP will outline site specific management processes for minimizing storm water runoff contamination and for preventing contaminated storm water runoff from being discharged directly into the San Gabriel River Estuary. This should instead state the Los Cerritos Channel Estuary since Los Cerritos is the receiving water for storm water runoff.</p> <p>Solution: Please revise accordingly.</p>	<p>Storm water from the Facility is discharged to the Los Cerritos Channel Estuary, not the San Gabriel River Estuary. Section VI.B.3.a of Attachment F is corrected as requested.</p>	<p>Corrected the receiving water for storm water discharge in Section VI.B.3.a of Attachment F.</p>
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	53	<p>Order Location: Page F-43, Section VII.A</p> <p>General Issue: There is no clear discussion of impingement monitoring. Here it states, "Cooling water intake monitoring requirements have been retained for Order 00-082." This indicates semi-annual impingement monitoring is required; however, Section III of the MRP (page E-6) states that influent monitoring requirements are not applicable. Additionally, the second paragraph states, "Order 00-082 contained semi-annual monitoring for a variety of metals in the intake water which has not been retained in the MRP." This statement is not accurate since the existing permit only required the intake cooling water be analyzed for metals semi-annually for a period of two years following the effective date of the permit. After the two year requirement, AES Alamitos elected to continue to monitor the intake cooling water for metals to obtain record of metal concentrations entering the plant.</p> <p>Solution: The intake monitoring requirement should</p>	<p>The intake water monitoring requirement for the fish impingement program should be included in this Order. The second sentence of section VII.A of Attachment F is replaced with the following:</p> <p>"Impingement sampling for fish and commercially important macroinvertebrates shall be conducted semi-annually at Intake Units Nos. 1-2, 3-4 and 5-6."</p> <p>In addition, section III of Attachment E is edited to remove the "Not Applicable" designation and to include the fish impingement program.</p> <p>The comment is correct that the prior Order contained semi-annual monitoring for metals for a period of two years. This requirement was completed and therefore not carried over to this Order. The second paragraph of section VII.A of Attachment F is therefore deleted.</p>	<p>Edited section VII.A and section III of Attachment E to include fish impingement monitoring. Deleted second paragraph of section VII.A of Attachment F.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		be clarified and revised as necessary to avoid later discussions and debates.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	54	<p>Order Location: Page F-43, Section VII.B.1</p> <p>General Issue: The second paragraph states, “Monitoring for all priority pollutants not possessing effluent limitations shall be conducted once per year during the permit term. Data generated from this monitoring is necessary for evaluating reasonable potential for the <i>new discharge</i> to cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives contained in the SIP during future permit reissuances.” The discharge from AES Alamitos is considered an existing discharge and is not considered <i>new</i>.</p> <p>Solution: Please revise accordingly.</p>	The comment correctly indicates that this is an existing discharge and the word “new” is therefore deleted from the description in section VII.B.1 of Attachment F.	Edited section VII.B.1 of Attachment F.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	55	<p>Order Location: Page F-43, Section VII.D.2</p> <p>General Issue: The new Order requires AES Alamitos to perform general observations of the receiving water when discharges occur and report the observations in the monitoring report.</p> <p>Solution: See item 43 above.</p>	Section VII.D.2 of Attachment F is edited for consistency with the requirements in Attachment E as discussed in Response to Comment 43 above.	Edited section VII.D.2 of Attachment F.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	56	<p>Order Location: General Comment for Attachment G</p> <p>General Issue: The attachment does not discuss the monitoring and reporting requirements for storm water.</p> <p>Solution: As discussed during the August 19th meeting, AES Alamitos will adhere to the requirements outlined in Table E-3; please however, reconsider AES Alamitos’s concerns discussed above in item 31. Within Attachment G, the monitoring and reporting requirements for stormwater are very vague</p>	<p>Attachment G provides the framework for the development of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. Development and implementation of this plan, along with the specified monitoring, will provide the information to evaluate pollutant concentrations in storm water runoff from the Facility.</p> <p>See Response to Comment 38 above.</p>	None taken.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		and more clear direction should be provided or Table E-3 and Table E-8 should be referenced.		
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	57	<p>Order Location: TSO, Page 7, Order Provision No. 1</p> <p>General Issue: The TSO proposes instantaneous maximum temperature limitations for winter (92°F) and summer (103°F). These limits are significantly more restrictive than the existing discharge limitation of 105°F and compliance with these limitations would unduly restrict the production of electricity for the state's power grid.</p> <p>Solution: Maintain an instantaneous maximum effluent limit for temperature of 105°F during the entire year, equal to the existing permit, for the duration of the Time Schedule Order.</p>	<p>The Discharger may request an interim limitation for a pollutant that is at least as stringent as the effluent limitation in the prior Order. The Discharger originally requested an interim effluent limitation for temperature of 92°F during winter months and 103°F during summer months. After this was established as the interim limitation, however, the Discharger requested to apply the 103°F limitation as a rolling average. The Regional Board determined that doing so would be less stringent since it would allow for exceedances of the 105°F effluent limitation for temperature in the prior Order.</p> <p>The request for a continuation of the existing effluent limitation for temperature of 105°F is therefore granted.</p>	Edited interim effluent limitation for temperature in the TSO.
AES Alamitos (Discharger)	58	<p>Order Location: TSO, Page 7, Order Provision No. 2</p> <p>General Issue: The TSO proposes to address the temperature limitations through an effluent limitation but does not clearly indicate that this provision also covers any receiving water limitations for each of these three parameters (temperature, total residual chlorine and copper).</p> <p>Solution: Please change the language of Provision 2 to the following: Achieve full compliance with the final temperature, total residual chlorine and copper discharge limitations to and receiving water limitations of the San Gabriel River Estuary as soon as possible, but no later than October 31, 2020.</p>	<p>The comment is correct that the Discharger cannot immediately comply with the receiving water limitations for the San Gabriel River Estuary. This Order, however, does not include receiving water limitations for either total residual chlorine or copper.</p> <p>To address the issue of compliance with the new receiving water limits for temperature the Regional Board has added the following to the TSO:</p> <p>Finding 12 identifying the applicable WQOs for receiving water limits.</p>	Added findings 12, 13, 14, 24, 25, 26; and requirements 2 and 4 to the TSO.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
			<p>Finding 13 identifying the receiving water limits found in this Order.</p> <p>Finding 14 summarizing receiving water monitoring data for temperature.</p> <p>Finding 24 citing the Discharger's request for additional time.</p> <p>Finding 25 stating that the Discharger cannot comply with the new receiving water limits.</p> <p>Finding 28 discussing the Regional Board response to the findings.</p> <p>Requirement 2 establishing an interim receiving water temperature limitation of 86 °F.</p> <p>Requirement 4 stating a final date of December 31, 2020 for compliance with the final receiving water limitations</p>	
Heal the Bay	1	<p>Heal the Bay was one of many stakeholders, including Coastal Commission, Energy Commission, Public Utilities Commission, as well as other NGOs, that worked together to craft the requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board Policy on the Use of Coastal and Estuarine Waters for Power Plant Cooling, also referred to as the Once-Through Cooling (OTC) Policy. We also served on the Expert Review Panel for the State OTC policy. It is critical, for the health of California's coastal ecosystems, that</p>	The comment is noted.	None taken.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>the timeline in the Policy be followed. With the diversity and expertise of the stakeholders involved in the OTC Policy development, there should be no question that the timeline in the Policy is realistic. Given this, we are pleased to see that the Facility has elected to move to dry cooling through the preferred Track 1 of the Policy by October 31, 2020, which is consistent with the OTC Policy compliance schedule.</p>		
Heal the Bay	2	<p>It is unfortunate however that the proposed TSO is allowing water quality violations to continue throughout the remaining duration of OTC operations. Just as Permittees should move to meeting the requirements of the OTC Policy as quickly as possible, they should also be required to meet receiving water limitations as quickly as possible, and certainly in cases where they have already had years to do so. These discharges threaten the health of the San Gabriel River Estuary, a critical and precious habitat type that has been nearly eradicated from Southern California. Therefore, Heal the Bay does not support the proposed TSO and asks that the Regional Board deny the TSO application or modify it as requested below.</p> <p>At the heart of this TSO application is a change in designation of the receiving water that the Facility discharges into from ocean waters to estuarine waters. This change happened over 14 years ago however, in a memo from the State Water Board. This change was then further supported by a letter dated January 21, 2003 from the Regional Board to</p>	<p>The last permit for this Facility was adopted on June 29, 2000. At that time the receiving waters were considered ocean waters and effluent limitations were established according to the procedures in the Ocean Plan. The comment is correct, on July 18, 2001, the State Water Resources Control Board changed the designation of the receiving water from ocean waters to estuarine waters. The Discharger was made aware of this receiving water designation in a Regional Board letter dated January 21, 2003.</p> <p>The renewal of the permits for coastal power plants was delayed as a result of the development of the OTC Policy, which was adopted on October 1, 2010, and amended on June 18, 2013. This is the first permit renewal for this Facility since the change in designation of the receiving waters and the adoption of the OTC Policy, and, as a result, the Regional Board implemented the procedures of the SIP that apply to the inland surface waters, enclosed bays and estuaries of the state.</p> <p>While the Facility was aware of the change in</p>	<p>Edit TSO to reflect that interim limitations for copper apply to both wet and dry weather conditions.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>the Facility. The result of this change in designation was modifications to a number of effluent limitations to which the Facility is subject, specifically the limits for temperature, total residual chlorine, pH, copper, nickel, ammonia, and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate.</p> <p>Despite being aware of the change in effluent limitations for over 14 years, it appears that the Facility did nothing to meet them, and instead applied for a TSO in May of this year to establish interim limits for the aforementioned seven constituents. Based on a review of historical monitoring data, Regional Board staff determined that the Facility was in compliance with the new limitations for pH, nickel, ammonia, and bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate, and proposed that the TSO only be granted for the remaining three constituents: copper, total residual chlorine, and temperature.</p> <p>We agree with the staff's determination that a TSO is inappropriate for the constituents whose limitations the Facility is almost always in compliance with and we commend them for this decision, however, we believe that granting a TSO for total residual chlorine and temperature is inappropriate as well.¹ Although these new limits were only recently incorporated into a NPDES Permit, the Facility has known about them for over 14 years which should have been more than ample time to treat their effluent to meet the new limits.</p> <p>Based on the time that has passed, we request that</p>	<p>designation of the receiving waters, the actual effluent limitations were recently calculated using the last five years of monitoring data and SIP procedures. This is standard protocol for discharges to inland surface waters. This resulted in a number of new effluent limitations. The Discharger requested a TSO with interim limitations for several constituents. The Regional Board considered this request and granted interim limitations only for the three referenced in the comment.</p> <p>During the time since the adoption of the permit on June 29, 2000, the Discharger has made some major improvements. The Discharger has already ceased the use of heat treatment to remove calcareous shell debris which under the prior Order allowed for temporary exceedances of the temperature limitations. Finally, the Discharger has already ceased the discharge of metal cleaning wastes to the receiving waters. These wastes are now collected and hauled offsite to a disposal facility. The Discharger has also agreed to eliminate the discharge of treated sanitary wastes to the receiving waters by June 30, 2018.</p> <p>Furthermore, in complying with the OTC Policy, the Discharger has agreed with the terms of the TSO to eliminate the discharge from Units 5 and 6 by December 31, 2019. This represents a 53% reduction in the total discharge to the receiving waters prior to the expiration of this Order. The remaining 47% of the discharge will be eliminated by the end of the term of</p>	

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>the Board reject the requests for TSOs for chlorine and temperature. At a minimum, the interim limits for temperature should be lowered to 92 degrees F and defined as a single year-round limit, consistent with both the new and old final limits, rather than a limit that varies seasonally. It should be noted that receiving water temperatures on average vary by less than 5 degrees in the summer versus the winter, whereas the tentative TSO would allow variations of over 10 degrees. The previous effluent limit for temperature provided for a single number year-round of 105 degrees F, and 92 degrees F represents an improvement towards meeting the thermal plan requirement of 86 degrees F, while providing the Facility some flexibility within the TSO to work towards that goal over the next five years.</p> <p>In conclusion, for the reasons discussed above, the Tentative TSO is unjustified and we ask the Regional Board to reject it. At a minimum, the interim limits for temperature in the Tentative TSO should be changed to a year-round goal of 92 degrees F. We understand that TSOs can be a valuable tool for the shared goal of attainment of receiving water limitations; however, as a matter of policy, we believe that these should be used sparingly and in cases where it is clear that a good faith effort has been made by the Permittee to meet the limitations. This is not the case with the Tentative AES TSO.</p> <p>¹ Though we would like to see copper limitations met as soon as possible, we acknowledge that the</p>	<p>this Order.</p> <p>The Discharger cannot immediately comply with the new, more stringent effluent limitations for temperature and chlorine. Therefore, according to California Water Code section 13300 the Regional Board required the Discharger to submit a detailed time schedule with specific actions. The Discharger submitted the plan and requested interim limitations that were at least as stringent as the limits included in Order No. 00-082, and the time requested is as short as possible. Therefore, the Regional Board staff finds that the TSO, including interim limitations and schedule of tasks is appropriate for this Facility.</p> <p>The Order includes effluent limitations for copper for both dry weather and wet weather. The TSO, however, only establishes one interim copper limitation. The TSO is edited to clarify that this interim limitation applies to both dry and wet weather.</p>	

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>timeline in the tentative TSO is consistent with the schedule specified in the San Gabriel River metals TMDL, which applies to dry weather copper discharges. Since dischargers are typically allowed longer periods to comply with wet weather limits than dry weather limits, the proposed timeline seems appropriate for wet weather copper discharges as well.</p>		
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)	1	<p>Regional Board Note:</p> <p>LADWP submitted a letter that included a discussion of the “History of the Lower San Gabriel River”, the “Permitting History of the Power Plants”, and the “LADWP Power System and Grid Reliability”. The conclusions of the letter are presented as the comment below. The full text of the LADWP letter, with enclosures, is available on the Regional Board website.</p> <p>Conclusions of LADWP Letter:</p> <p>The reclassification of the lower San Gabriel River water body as an estuary threatens the future availability of the Haynes Generating Station, due to the inability to be able to meet immediately the stringent requirements that come with the estuary designation, such as the thermal requirements, the potential loss of dilution credits, and the 301(g) chlorine variance, etc. These necessary elements are in the current permit and are necessary for the station to continue to operate. They are allowed and were</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Basin Plan classifies the receiving waters as part of the San Gabriel River Estuary. Therefore, the State Water Resources Board, in a memo dated July 18, 2001, identified the receiving waters for the Alamitos Generating Station as subject to the requirements of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) which is applicable to inland surface waters, enclosed bays and estuaries of the state. Questions regarding the classification of receiving waters within the Los Angeles Region</p>	None taken.

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>granted because the discharge was designated as an ocean discharge, and LADWP's monitoring data indicate that they have not resulted in significant impacts to the biota in the lower San Gabriel River. The chlorine variance was issued based on the demonstration that there were no adverse effects to the environment and human health. Elimination of these critical allowances will shut Haynes down, place the City of Los Angeles in non-compliance with NERC, and threaten the reliability of not only the Southern portion of the City of Los Angeles grid system but the entire grid system.</p> <p>LADWP understands that once the OTC flows from the power plants are eliminated (currently planned to occur by 2029); the lower San Gabriel River hydraulic regime will change. To that end, LADWP is in the process of finding a solution for the in-plant waste streams that will be associated with the dry cooling process. LADWP has contacted the City of Long Beach and is currently in discussions regarding the possibility of sending these flows to the Long Beach sanitary sewer.</p> <p>The change in designation to an estuarine discharge from an ocean discharge is a critical impact to LADWP. LADWP urges the Regional Board to coordinate the re-designation with LADWP's repower schedule, which is a finite time period that has already been agreed upon by the State Board. LADWP is on schedule and such an approach not only makes good sense and is essential to</p>	<p>should be directed to the Basin Planning Unit.</p> <p>The permit that is currently being considered is the tentative requirements for the AES Alamitos Generating Station. The comment presented specifically addresses the LADWP Haynes Generating Station which is not under consideration at this time.</p>	

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>maintaining the reliability and integrity of the LADWP electrical system, but is consistent with the results of the modeling and the river’s hydraulic regime.</p> <p>In closing, it should be emphasized that both LADWP and AES have made the commitment to eliminate OTC at these two generating stations. LADWP strongly believes that protection of the environment is vital and looks forward to working out a solution that takes into account LADWP’s critical reliability issues.</p>		
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)	2	<p>Order - Section VII Compliance Determination J. Chronic Toxicity – page 16 and Monitoring and Reporting Program – Section V. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements A. Definition of Chronic Toxicity – page E-9</p> <p>LADWP has concerns regarding the use of the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) approach to determine the chronic toxicity of the effluent samples. The TST methodology, although supported by Region IX of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), has not been through a federal or state rulemaking process, and is not fully approved for inclusion as part of permit testing requirements. Because of differences between the TST and traditional statistical methods for evaluating effluent toxicity, the TST has the potential to return false positives for toxicity in samples at a significantly higher rate than the design failure rate of 5%. EPA, in its own document describing this methodology (June 2010 Guidance, which has not been through a formal rulemaking</p>	<p>Staff disagrees. The TST approach has been through a federal process. EPA finalized the Test of Significant Toxicity (TST) Method [National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Test of Significant Toxicity Implementation Document and Technical Document (EPA 833-R-10-003/004) in 2010. As stated in the Fact Sheet, the TST approach is superior in that it improves test power, provides the incentive for toxicity laboratories to generate high quality data, streamlines toxicity test data analysis and is more likely to correctly classify toxic and not toxic samples (USEPA, 2010; diamond et al, 2013). The TST-based effluent limits derive from and comply with the underlying water quality standard for chronic toxicity in the Basin Plan.</p> <p>Since it is an accepted methodology, has been evaluated as being superior to the USEPA multi-concentration NOEC-LOEC statistical approach, and has been included in the industrial permits adopted for in excess of two years; the TST method will</p>	None taken.

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>process), indicates in the Notice and Disclaimer section that EPA “believes” this is another statistical approach to determining toxicity but also states that the document “does not and cannot impose any legally binding requirements...on permittees...”. LADWP recommends that, since the TST methodology has not yet been approved and included in the State’s Toxicity Policy (which remains in development) and is also the subject of current litigation, the TST methodology requirement be removed and that the chronic toxicity testing using the <i>Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Water to West Coast Marine and Estuarine Organisms</i> (EPA/600/R-95/136) be retained. This methodology is specific to west coast organisms and applicable to the discharges from the Alamos Generating Station.</p>	<p>remain the proposed permit.</p>	
<p>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Monitoring and Reporting Program – Section VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements A. Surface Water Monitoring at Monitoring Locations RSW001 through RSW-012 –page E-13 Table E-4. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements for RSW-001 through RSW-012</p> <p>This table requires that receiving water station RSW-011 be sampled once per year for chronic toxicity. The sample is to be a 24-hour composite sample. This is a new requirement that has not been present in any of the previous discharge permits. Two issues arise from this requirement. First, neither the Alamos Generating Station nor the Haynes Generating</p>	<p>See Response to Comment 33 from the Discharger above. The type of sample required has been changed to allow for the collection of a grab sample where it is not practical to collect a composite sample.</p>	<p>Sample type changed to “24-hour composite or grab” for chronic toxicity in Table E-3.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>Station can control other sources of water to the San Gabriel River at the prescribed monitoring location. While each generating station can and does perform chronic toxicity testing on their respective outfall discharges, toxicity results from samples collected in the river, while providing a data point of toxicity, would not correlate back to the individual discharges and cannot be accurately interpreted. A positive result for toxicity in the river would not be indicative of a toxicity problem coming from either generating station. Holding the stations responsible for toxicity in the receiving water over which they do not have control is not justified.</p> <p>Second, the monitoring location is located at a roadway overpass that is in the public right-of-way, and it will likely not be possible to deploy the autosampling equipment that would be required to collect a 24-hour composite sample in the river. Providing such a sampling device would be problematic as there is no location that is accessible or available to install such a device, and safety concerns also exist about a long-term presence for sampling equipment and sampling personnel within the roadway or in the river.</p> <p>LADWP requests that the chronic toxicity monitoring requirement for the receiving water station RSW-011 be removed from the permit.</p>	<p>The requirement to monitor for chronic toxicity will provide the basis for determinations regarding potential effects by the discharge on aquatic life in the vicinity of the RSW-011 location, which is the closest receiving water location to the LADWP Haynes</p>	

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
			<p>Generating Station. Staff is aware that toxicity in the receiving water at that location may be attributable to discharges from either of the plants, Haynes or Alamitos, or from toxicity that is present in the receiving water as a result of toxicity in the intake water used at either of the generating facilities. All of the information available will be used to determine the source of any toxicity present in the receiving water.</p>	
<p>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>Monitoring and Reporting Program – Section VIII. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements B. Surface Water Monitoring at Monitoring Locations RSW001 through RSW-012 –page E-14 Table E-5. Harbor Toxics TMDL Monitoring Requirements for RSW-001</p> <p>Table E-5 indicates a minimum sampling frequency of 3 times per year for these sampling locations. The footnote indicates that two of these samples are to be collected during wet weather events and that the “first large storm event” of the season shall be included as one of the wet weather monitoring events. The term “first large storm event” is not defined in the permit. Also, with the ongoing drought situation in the Los Angeles region, rain events are not frequent and it may not be possible to obtain the required number of samples in any given year.</p> <p>Therefore, LADWP recommends this requirement be</p>	<p>The Harbor Toxics TMDL requires that three sampling events occur during the year, with two obtained during the wet season and one during the dry season, and that the “first large storm event” of the season shall be included as one of the wet weather monitoring events. The question of how this is defined was addressed during the approval process of the Coordinated Compliance Monitoring and Reporting Plan (CCMRP), which was finalized in January 2014. The definition established in the CCMRP is therefore incorporated into this Order as indicated below:</p> <p>The following edit is made at Table E-5 and section III.G.1 of Attachment F:</p> <p>Replace</p> <p>“The first large storm event of the season shall be included as one of the wet weather monitoring events.”</p>	<p>Edited Table E-5 and section III.G.1 of Attachment F.</p>

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>revised to require 3 receiving water sample events during the year, with two to be obtained during the defined wet season and one during the defined dry season, independent of rainfall events.</p>	<p>With “The first storm event that has a predicted rainfall of 0.25 inches (within 24 hour period) and at least 70% probability of rainfall at least 24 hours prior to the event would be monitored as a wet weather event. An additional wet weather event would be monitored. Depending on forecasts (drought year vs. wet year) this event must produce at least 0.1 inch of runoff preceded by a 72-hour dry period. Consideration will be given to monitor “larger storm events” (greater than 0.5 inches) if forecasted.”</p>	
<p>Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>Monitoring and Reporting Program – Section IX. Other Monitoring Requirements A. Visual Monitoring of Receiving Water Sampling Point –page E-18</p> <p>The permit requires visual monitoring of the discharge location with a list of several items that need to be recorded with each observation. It is unclear from the list of visual inspection requirements how this information will ensure compliance with the permit or how this additional information will be used over the life of the permit. These inspections are not tied to specific sample times, as the requirement to perform the inspection does not coincide with the required sampling requirements in the permit. Sampling results will not necessarily tie back to the daily inspections, so no meaningful conclusions could be made based on the visual inspections with sample results. This requirement will require significant personnel</p>	<p>See Response to Comment 36 from the Discharger above. The visual monitoring of the receiving water sampling point has been clarified. The visual monitoring provides an assessment of potential effects of the discharge on the receiving water including the presence of debris, solids, and changes in the receiving water color or clarity. This monitoring is to occur when the receiving water monitoring occurs, and the receiving water monitoring shall occur when the Facility is discharging.</p>	<p>Edited section IX.A.2 of Attachment E to state that visual monitoring at each discharge point shall occur when receiving water monitoring occurs.</p>

AES Alamitos LLC
 Alamitos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		<p>resources to perform and organize the results with no obvious benefit. In addition, many of the items to be visually monitored will require subjective determination by each individual who performs the inspection. These individual subjective determinations will also not be able to be compared with any level of confidence, nor will they provide results that will be meaningful when compared with each other.</p> <p>Since this requirement is resource-intensive and without benefit, LADWP recommends that this visual monitoring requirement be removed from the Monitoring and Reporting Program.</p>		
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)	6	<p>Monitoring and Reporting Program – Section X. Reporting Requirements B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs) –page E-20 Table E-8. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule</p> <p>The SMR due dates as indicated in Table E-8 indicate that reports are to be due on the first day of the second month following the close of the reporting period. This reporting deadline does not provide sufficient time to receive laboratory results from testing that may be initiated near the end of a reporting period. Moving the due date to the 15th of the second month following the close of the reporting period provides the needed additional time to complete the analytical testing and to receive the reports from testing laboratories so that they can be included in the appropriate reports.</p>	Comment noted. However, the Discharger did not provide a comment on or indicate that they would not be able to meet the reporting deadline stipulated.	None taken.

AES Alamos LLC
 Alamos Generating Station
 Response to Comments on Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements

Agency/ Letter	No.	Comment	Reply	Action Taken
		LADWP recommends that the due dates for all reports be changed to be the 15th day of the second month following the close of the reporting period, as this will allow for 45 days to receive analytical data from laboratories for inclusion in the monthly reports.		
Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)	7	<p>Monitoring and Reporting Program – Section X. Reporting Requirements</p> <p>C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs) –page E-21</p> <p>Item 1 of this section indicates that the permittee shall submit DMR information electronically and will discontinue paper DMR submittals. Item 3 of this section states that the DMR results must be reported on the official EPA preprinted DMR forms. These two requirements are in conflict with each other. It seems that Item 3 should be removed from the permit since electronic reporting is being required.</p> <p>LADWP recommends that Item 3 of this section be removed from the permit.</p>	See Response to Comment 45 from the Discharger above. Section X.C.1 of Attachment E is correct that DMRs are to be submitted electronically via CWIQS. Section X.C.3 is in contradiction of this requirement and is therefore deleted.	Deleted section X.C.3 from Attachment E.