

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS  
AES REDONDO BEACH LLC  
REDONDO BEACH GENERATING STATION  
TENTATIVE ORDER R4-2016-XXXX  
NPDES PERMIT NO. CA0001201**

This Table (matrix) summarizes the significant comments received on the draft permit that were timely raised during the public written comment period. Each comment presented has a corresponding Regional Water Board response and corresponding action taken, if any. (For permit language, additions are underlined, and deletions are lined over.)

<b>Comments from Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	1	<p>The Regional Board is currently conducting a review supporting a renewal of this permit and is proposing new standards for numerous constituents based on a revised interpretation of where the discharge occurs. Based on the analysis of historic discharge monitoring data, summarized in the proposed order, the future discharges from AES Redondo Beach will be unable to comply with all of the new effluent limits, receiving water limits and water quality objectives within the proposed NPDES renewal permit....</p> <p>By separate letter, AES Redondo Beach has requested a time schedule order to comply with many of the new or revised effluent limits, receiving water limits or water quality objectives. This time schedule order would extend until the date that AES Redondo Beach is required to comply with the OTC Policy. Utilizing the compliance dates of the OTC Policy for purposes of the time schedule order in the NPDES permit renewal should allow the complete elimination of cooling water and low-volume discharges by December 31, 2020.</p>	<p>Regional Water Board staff have proposed that the Regional Water Board issue the Discharger a TSO prescribing interim effluent limitations, specific actions and a schedule for compliance with the final effluent limitations. In most cases the schedule is consistent with the schedule for AES Redondo Beach in the OTC policy. However, the proposed interim limitation for pH prescribed for the low volume waste is scheduled to extend through July 1, 2017; the date when facility modifications can be selected and implemented to control the pH in the retention basin where the low volume wastes are stored prior to discharge.</p>	Staff proposed TSO.

<b>Comments from Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	2	<p>With OTC compliance, AES Redondo Beach will eliminate the necessity for an NPDES permit for cooling water discharges and low volume wastes as these permitted discharges will all be eliminated. For these reasons, AES Redondo Beach requests that the Regional Board retain the monitoring and reporting program that exists in NPDES permit number 00-085 and not implement new enhanced monitoring requirements for receiving waters and effluent discharges.....</p> <p>The draft NPDES Permit renewal contains a significant increase in monitoring and reporting requirements compared to the prior permit. These monitoring and reporting requirements are more suited to address long-term trending and potential changes to future discharge limits. The justification for additional surface water monitoring seems to be lacking given the fact that this discharge will be eliminated in less than five years. Because AES Redondo Beach intends to eliminate these discharges altogether, which would also eliminate the need for a future permit reissuance, AES Redondo Beach supports the retention of the existing monitoring and reporting program as opposed to the enhanced program proposed in the draft Order, or alternatively, a reduction in the proposed monitoring consistent with that recently adopted for AES Alamitos.</p>	<p>In Attachment A to the May 6, 2016 letter the Discharger comments specifically on the monitoring frequency referenced here. Please see the Regional Water Board response to Comment #A16 below.</p> <p>The monitoring requirements included in the proposed permit are designed to provide the data required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent and receiving water limitations included in the permit. Regional Water Board staff are aware of AES Redondo Beach's plans to eliminate the need for future discharges and/or permits. However, during discharges which are anticipated through December 31, 2020, the Facility is required to comply with the requirements included in the permit and to provide the data to demonstrate compliance.</p>	See response to Comment #A16 below.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	3	The change in discharge and receiving water standards proposed for AES Redondo Beach in the renewal NPDES permit results not from a change in	The rationale for the reclassification of the receiving waters in Section II.B.2 of Attachment F (Fact Sheet) of the proposed Order. The text from that section	None.

<b>Comments from Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>the regulatory standards applicable to the facility nor from a change in the point of discharge of the cooling water, but from a revised interpretation of the applicable standard at the point of discharge. The Regional Board has designated King Harbor an "enclosed bay," which makes the discharge to King Harbor no longer an ocean discharge. AES Redondo Beach believes the Regional Board has incorrectly applied the designation of "enclosed bay" to King Harbor when it is nothing more than an artificially created breakwater designed to protect a marina. The artificial wall still allows overtopping during large wave events and is constructed of rock that allows water to flow through the wall. Furthermore, the artificial wall that created the harbor was built around the existing intake pipe when it was completed in 1966, almost twenty years after AES Redondo Beach began producing power.</p>	<p>follows:          "Order No. 00-085 considered the receiving waters (King Harbor) as ocean waters and therefore established permit limitations and conditions to protect beneficial uses and water quality objectives for ocean waters as described by the California Ocean Plan (1997). The Basin Plan (Figure 2-10 and Table 2-3), however, classifies King Harbor as an enclosed bay. The State Water Board, in a memo dated July 18, 2001, identifies the receiving waters for the Facility as subject to requirements of the State Implementation Policy (SIP), which is applicable to the inland surface waters, enclosed bays, and estuaries of the State. In a letter dated January 21, 2003, the Regional Water Board notified the Discharger of the reclassification of the outfall from an ocean discharge to an enclosed bay discharge. This Order reflects the reclassification of the discharge location and therefore implements the SIP."</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	4	<p>The draft Order includes effluent limits and reporting requirements for bacteria. However, AES Redondo Beach requests the removal of monitoring for bacteria within the draft permit. The reason for eliminating the bacteria monitoring is that AES Redondo Beach is not a source for bacteria, and the only possible source for bacteria is the cooling water intake, a source over which AES Redondo Beach has no control and the discharge is not into a waterbody impaired for bacteria.</p>	<p>In Attachment A to the May 6, 2016 letter the Discharger comments specifically on the bacteria monitoring requirement referenced here. Please see the Regional Water Board response to Comment #A9 below.</p>	<p>See response to Comment #A9 below.</p>

<b>Comments from Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	5	AES Redondo Beach pumps groundwater for dewatering purposes beneath its facility. The draft order has monitoring and reporting provisions specific to this source even though there is no contribution from AES Redondo Beach. While AES Redondo Beach will monitor this water as part of its total discharge, it should not be separately monitored since it poses no threat to water quality. During a recent meeting between Regional Board staff and AES Redondo Beach, Regional Board staff appeared receptive to the notion of reducing or eliminating the monitoring for this groundwater since there is no representative location to monitor.	In Attachment A to the May 6, 2016 letter the Discharger comments specifically on the groundwater monitoring requirements referenced here. Please see the Regional Water Board response to Comment #A17 below.	See response to Comment #A17 below.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	6	AES Redondo Beach is committed to maintaining a strong record of environmental compliance and to demonstrating this as it progresses toward elimination of all discharges with the exception of storm water. However, AES Redondo Beach does not believe that implementing new monitoring, standards, or conducting special studies should be pursued as this information will be rendered irrelevant due to the retirement of generating capacity and elimination of once through cooling by December 31, 2020. By the time the information is collected, reviewed, and fully assessed, AES will have eliminated all industrial discharges.	The Discharger proposes to discharge up to 215 million gallons per day (MGD) of OTC water, commingled with low volume wastewaters and groundwater seepage, to the Pacific Ocean via Discharge Point 001. The Discharger also proposes to discharge up to 674 MGD of OTC water, comingled with storm water, to King Harbor via Discharge Point 002.  The proposed Order establishes effluent limitations and monitoring requirements that incorporate current regulations and policies. The monitoring protocol implemented was developed to provide the data necessary to demonstrate compliance with the effluent and receiving water limitations.	None.

<b>Comments from Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	7	Finally, AES Redondo Beach has already eliminated the metal cleaning waste discharge that is currently referenced by this proposed NPDES permit renewal and this regulated discharge can be removed from the proposed permit. Chemical metal cleaning waste from the boilers, if generated, will be contained and transported off site to an appropriate waste facility, eliminating the need for its inclusion in the permit renewal.	The proposed Order references historical metal cleaning wastes effluent limitations and monitoring data, documents new information from the Discharger that indicates the discharge of metal cleaning wastes has ceased, and does not retain the previous requirements for metal cleaning wastes.	None.

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A1	<p><b>Order Location:</b> General Comment</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The new Order is intended to be implemented 1 August 2016. August is mid-quarter, mid-summer, and late in the calendar year, all of which are monitoring periods specified in the new Order. This could lead to confusion over the initial implementation.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> AES recommends that the new Order specify that all 1/quarter monitoring elements be implemented beginning 1 October 2016 and that all annual and semiannual monitoring will commence 1 January 2017.</p>	The request to delay the effective date of this Order by two months to October 1, 2016 so as to coincide with the quarterly monitoring schedule is feasible. The effective date is changed to October 1, 2016 throughout and the expiration date has been changed to September 30, 2021 to provide the five-year permit duration.	Changed effective date of the permit to October 1, 2016 throughout.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A2	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Pages 4 and 7, Section IV.A.1 - Tables 4 and 7, Effluent Limitations for 001 and 002</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Footnote 4 and 6, respectively indicates the mass limitation should be calculated using the permitted discharge flow of 224 MGD for Discharge Point 001. This is inconsistent with the permitted discharge flow reported on page 3 (i.e. 215 MGD), which is the correct flow rate.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Ensure there is consistency of permitted discharge flow throughout the permit. The correct flow for Discharge Point 001 is 215 MGD.</p>	The prior order and the Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) submitted by the Discharger both indicate that the permitted discharge flow should be 215 MGD for Discharge Point 001. References to 224 MGD are corrected to 215 MGD throughout this Order.	Permitted discharge flow for Discharge Point 001 was modified.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A3	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Pages 4 and 7, Section IV.A.1- Tables 4 and 7. PCB Discharge Prohibition</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The Tentative Order proposes a strict discharge prohibition on PCBs in discharges from</p>	As explained in Section .IV.B.2.b.i of Attachment F (Fact Sheet), Effluent Limitation Guidelines (ELGs) at 40 C.F.R. section 423.13(a) state that, with regard to steam electric power generating point sources, "There shall be no discharge of polychlorinated	None.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>AES. This prohibition is inconsistent with the waste load allocations developed for Santa Monica Bay TMDL for DDTs and PCBs. While the Tentative Order Fact Sheet explains that the more stringent technology based effluent limit established by USEPA has been applied as a discharge prohibitions in the Tentative Order, the RWQCB does not appear to account for the background concentrations of PCBs in Santa Monica Bay described in section 6.2 of the Santa Monica Bay TMDL for DDTs and PCBs. AES is unique in that the primary discharge covered under the Order is intake water generated from Santa Monica Bay water used for once through cooling (OTC) water. Because background PCB concentrations have been documented in the TMDL and AES NPDES Permit discharges are directly affected by the quality of Bay water, background concentrations must be accounted for in any effluent limits prescribed for AES. As the RWQCB notes in the Tentative Order Fact Sheet, intake water from Santa Monica Bay represents more than 99% of the permitted discharge flows from the AES site. This process to account for background intake water quality would be similar to the process described in the 2010 USEPA Permit Writers Manual.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> To account for the potential that background concentrations of PCBs in Santa Monica Bay used for once through cooling water could cause a detection of PCBs in effluent discharge samples, the RWQCB should allow for consideration of background concentrations if there is detection of</p>	<p>biphenyl compounds (PCBs) such as those commonly used for transformer fluid.” This ELG has been appropriately applied as a technology-based effluent limitation prohibiting the discharge of PCBs from Discharge Points 001 and 002. Furthermore, PCBs have not been detected during annual effluent monitoring at Discharge Points 001 and 002. Therefore, monitoring data demonstrate that the Discharger is able to meet the effluent limitation for PCBs at Discharge Points 001 and 002.</p>	

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		PCBs from one of the AES effluent discharge locations.		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A4	<p>Note: the table referenced in this comment can be viewed in the comment letter from the Discharger.</p> <p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 6, Section IV.A.1 - Table 5, pH Limitation for Low Volume Wastes</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> 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 wastes. The new Order is intended to be implemented in August 2016 and the new pH limitation requires a costly investment to implement engineering controls in order to manage the retention basin pH levels between 6 and 9. Historical data shows that our pH is always near or slightly above the upper threshold of this limit. As the data below shows, during the last three years there were 16 instances where the pH was above 9, the upper threshold of the new limitation. AES currently cannot comply with the new pH limitation requirement and engineering controls cannot be designed, installed, and put into place by 1 August 2016.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> AES recommends the new Order provide a pH range of 6-10 for low volume waste, or in the alternative, add to the TSO that the pH limitation will have an effective date of 1 July 2017. This recommended compliance schedule will provide AES the time to evaluate potential options, design and</p>	<p>The Discharger also made this request in an updated Request for a TSO. The effluent limitation for low volume wastes for pH of 9.0 s.u. instantaneous maximum for Discharge Point 001 is a new effluent limitation in this Order. Monitoring data indicates that the Discharger will be unable to immediately comply with this new effluent limitation. The tentative TSO was modified to include an interim pH instantaneous maximum effluent limitation for low volume wastes via Discharge Point 001 and time schedule until July 1, 2017 for the Discharger to comply with the final effluent limitation. This time schedule will provide the Discharger time to evaluate potential options and design and construct engineering controls necessary to achieve compliance with the new effluent limit for pH in the permit.</p>	<p>Tentative TSO was modified.</p>

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		construct potential engineering controls.		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A5	<p>Note: the table referenced in this comment can be viewed in the comment letter from the Discharger.</p> <p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 7, Section IV.A.1 - Table 7, pH Limitation for 002</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The new Order prescribes a new instantaneous minimum and maximum effluent limitation for pH of 6.5 and 8.5, respectively, for Discharge Point 002. The existing Order has pH limits of 6.0 and 9.0 which are allowed under the Ocean Plan. Based on historical monitoring data, AES cannot achieve the pH limits being proposed in the new Order. Data shows, AES has exceeded the proposed upper limit five times in 2015 (samples collected in February, March, May and June). Given that these samples were collected early in the year before the long summer run, AES believes that these elevated pH readings were the result of the intake water rather than AES contributions. The effluent monitoring results showing the five results and several others close to the limit are shown in the table below:</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> AES recommends the new Order maintain the existing permit effluent limitation for pH of 6.0 to 9.0 or, in the alternative, that the pH limits for the Discharge Point 002 be included in the TSO, allowing AES Redondo Beach until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.</p>	<p>The Discharger also made this request in an updated Request for a TSO. Discharge Point 002 discharges to King Harbor, an inland surface water. Criteria for pH listed in the Basin Plan are applicable to discharges to inland surface waters. The Basin Plan includes 6.5 -8.5 s.u. as the criteria for pH. The effluent limitation for Discharge Point 002 for pH of 8.5 s.u. instantaneous maximum is a new effluent limitation in this Order. Monitoring data indicates that the Discharger will be unable to immediately comply with this new effluent limitation. The tentative TSO was modified to include an interim pH instantaneous maximum effluent limitation for Discharge Point 002 and time schedule until December 31, 2020 for the Discharger to comply with the final effluent limit by permanently shutting down Units 7 and 8 pursuant to the OTC Water Policy.</p>	Tentative TSO was modified.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A6	<p>Note: the table referenced in this comment can be viewed in the comment letter from the Discharger.</p> <p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 7, Section IV.A.1 - Table 7, Effluent Limitations for 002</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> From 2012 to present, 8 monitoring events have taken place at Discharge 002. For each event, AES has collected intake and effluent samples to evaluate whether the receiving water may be the source of high metals levels. AES has prepared a summary table showing the analytical results from the intake and effluent 002 for Copper, Mercury, Nickel, Silver, Thallium and Zinc. This table, presented below, shows detections that are above a proposed limit. As seen in the table, the majority of times that effluent water has exceeded limits are tied to either detection limits higher than a proposed new limit (Mercury) or detections in the intake water exceeding detections at the outfall (Copper, Nickel, Zinc). AES does not control the quality of the water being drawn in from the Harbor and, based upon the data shown, we believe all of the detections in this table at the Outfall above proposed permit limits may actually be a result of levels occurring in the intake water, even if not instantaneously captured at the time of sampling.</p> <p>The TSO provides some relief for copper, nickel, and temperature for discharge 002, but historic data as shown above still presents some copper exposure. The historic levels as shown in Table F-2 are higher than the TSO allowances. Additionally, the silver</p>	<p>The discharge at Discharge Point 002 is subject to the provisions of the SIP. The SIP allows for the Regional Water Board to establish effluent limitations allowing the Facility to discharge a mass and concentration of a pollutant that is no greater than the mass and concentration of the intake water when certain conditions are met including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The intake water concentration of the pollutant exceeds the most stringent criteria for that pollutant</li> <li>2. The intake water credits provided are consistent with any TMDL applicable to the discharge (Note: there are no effective TMDLs applicable to the discharge of priority pollutants from Discharge Point 002)</li> <li>3. The intake water is from the same water body as the receiving water body</li> <li>4. The facility does not alter the intake water pollutant chemically or physically in a manner that adversely affects water quality and beneficial uses</li> <li>5. The timing and location of the discharge does not cause adverse effects on water quality and beneficial uses that would not occur if the intake water pollutant had been left in the receiving water body</li> </ol> <p>The Discharger has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Board that the discharge from Discharge Point 002 to King Harbor meets conditions #1 through #5 above for copper and zinc. Therefore,</p>	<p>Footnote added to Table 7 of the Order allowing for intake credits for copper and zinc if certain conditions are met.</p>

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>effluent limits in Tables 7 and F-18 for 002 are higher than the historic measurements listed in Table F-2. All of these parameters of concern could be subject to adjustment via intake credits under the SIP (pg. 19) or variances under 40CFR131.10(g). In accordance with the intake credit criteria outlined in the SIP, Discharge Point 002 meets this criterion.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Given the variances in background detections in metals highlighted in the table above, AES requests that intake credits be granted. Further, AES requests that a statistical evaluation be conducted on the intake and discharge concentrations for these detected metals in the dataset provided to evaluate whether there is a significant difference between intake water and outfall concentrations. AES believes that detections of Copper and Zinc above the proposed limits are the direct result of concentrations in the intake water itself and not a contribution from AES systems</p>	<p>if the influent water pollutant concentration of copper or zinc (measured at influent to Units 7 and 8) does not exceed the average monthly effluent limitation, then the effluent limitations are applied as noted in Table 7 of the tentative Order. A footnote was added to the Order that, if the influent water pollutant concentration exceeds the average monthly effluent limitation but does not exceed the maximum daily effluent limitation, then compliance with the average monthly effluent limitation will be determined based on intake water credits and compliance with the maximum daily effluent limitation is applied as noted in Table 7. If the influent water pollutant concentration exceeds the maximum daily effluent limitation, then compliance with both the average monthly and the maximum daily effluent limitations will be determined based on intake water credits.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A7	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 8, Section IV.A.1 - Table 8, Monitoring Location INT-002A</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> It is not clear which in-plant waste stream is considered as monitoring location INT-002A and how the permitted discharge flow was derived. Because it is unclear where this monitoring location is, it is unknown if the flow and mass limitations are accurate.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> AES recommends removal of monitoring location INT-002A because there are no known waste</p>	<p>Monitoring Location INT-002A was included in the draft Order based on an understanding that waste streams were directed from the retention basin to Discharge Point 002. The Discharger has subsequently demonstrated that this does not occur and therefore establishing Monitoring Location INT-002A is not necessary. This monitoring location was removed from the Order.</p>	<p>Monitoring Location INT-002A was removed from the Order.</p>

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		streams directed to Discharge Point 002 that aren't already being characterized during sampling at this point of compliance. This includes removal of this monitoring location from Table E-1 as well.		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A8	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 11, Section V.B.2, Surface Water Limitation for 002</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The surface water limitations indicates the discharge from AES shall not cause “the surface water temperature to rise greater than 4 °F 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 °F above natural receiving water temperature, which exceeds 25 percent of the cross-sectional area of a main river channel at any point.” AES cannot comply with the proposed receiving water limitations.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> The surface water limitation should be omitted or added to the TSO.</p>	<p>The receiving water limitations for temperature for Outfall 002 referenced in the comment have been modified. As per the Basin Plan, the limit was established as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Surface water temperature to rise greater than 5° F above the natural temperature of the receiving waters at any time or place. At no time shall the temperature be raised above 86° F as a result of waste discharged.</i></p> <p>The Discharger has provided monitoring data for Monitoring Location RSW-001 that demonstrate they will be able to comply with these new limitations. Therefore the TSO was not edited.</p>	The receiving water limitation for temperature at Outfall 002 was modified.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A9	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 11, Section V.B.3, Bacterial Objectives</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The bacterial objectives are inconsistent with the sampling objectives discussed on Page 9 and defined in Attachment E. Nonetheless, since AES is not a contributor of bacteria, and there have been no identified bacteria impairments for Santa Monica Bay or King Harbor, bacteria monitoring requirements should be removed from this</p>	The Water Contact Standards for bacteria in Section V.B.3 are for waters designated for non-contact recreation (REC-2), but not designated for water contact recreation (REC-1). The Basin Plan designates both REC-1 and REC-2 beneficial uses for King Harbor. Therefore, the Water Contact Standards in this section do not apply to King Harbor and have been removed from this Order. The Basin Plan, however, establishes water quality objectives (WQOs) for receiving waters designated for REC-1	Corrected receiving water limitations for bacteria to the appropriate Basin Plan WQOs in Section

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Tentative Order.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> The bacterial objectives should be removed from the New Order since AES is not a contributing source of bacteria and the receiving water has not been identified as being impaired, providing no basis for bacteria monitoring requirements.</p>	<p>use. Receiving water limitations based on these REC-1 WQOs have been included in Section V.B.3 of the Order.</p> <p>As explained in Section IV.C.7.b of Attachment F (Fact Sheet) of this Order, bacterial monitoring of the discharge from Discharge Point 002 is included to confirm that the discharge is not a source of bacteria and not contributing to an impairment of the receiving water.</p>	V.B.3 of the Order.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A10	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 16, Section VI.C.2.b, Mixing Zone and Dilution Credit Study</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The new Order requires AES to complete a mixing zone study and dilution credit study workplan. It indicates “The study shall identify the boundary of zone of initial dilution (ZID) based on modeling results, and include monitoring upstream of the discharge point, directly above the discharge location, at the boundary of the ZID, and outside the ZID for the list of constituents included in Table 1 of the Ocean Plan, to confirm the assumptions made by the model.” Most, if not all, of the Table 1 pollutants are not added to the effluent by the plant. Therefore, the system is taking in water with the same pollutant concentrations (+/-) as the receiving waters so no dilution is possible. The whole premise of the monitoring listed is invalidated as no dilution will occur when the concentrations in source and receiving waters are the same with no input from the plant.</p>	<p>For Generating Units 5 and 6, the intake water is different from the receiving water. The facility intakes water from King Harbor and then discharges, through Discharge Point 001, to the Pacific Ocean. Pollutant concentrations in source and receiving waters cannot be assumed to be the same. The existing permit includes a dilution ratio of 11.5:1, which was applied in calculating effluent limits. This Order retains that dilution ratio for Discharge Point 001 only.</p> <p>The dilution ratio estimate previously established was based on memorandums from Southern California Edison in 1979. The estimate used limited ambient temperature data to extrapolate typical plume behavior. Significant changes to the amount of wastewater discharged, the configuration of the outfall, and the composition of the discharge will affect the dilution observed. Therefore, the Discharger would be required to validate the 1979 estimate by conducting an appropriate mixing zone study if the discharge continues.</p>	Requirement for a mixing zone study was edited to indicate that the study is required if the discharge from Discharge Point 001 continues after December 31, 2020.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Furthermore, in the fact sheet (page F-25) it indicates that the dilution ratio has been retained from the previous Order which is inconsistent with the requirements discussed above. If this statement in the fact sheet is inaccurate and a study is required, it not only is an added cost of approximately \$100,000+, (includes workplan development to be submitted to board, field testing, modeling and report compilation) it is redundant work since the study was completed by SCE. The results would be similar since operations and discharge volume have not changed at the plant. Lastly, as noted above, AES Redondo Beach plans to comply with the State's OTC policy by ceasing use of once-through-cooling by 31 December 2020 so if this study is to provide credits for future permit, it is not necessary.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> The dilution ratio used in the existing Order should be maintained as stated in the fact sheet. Alternatively, if the study is required, it is recommended the Table 1 pollutant monitoring provision be removed.</p>	<p>However, since the purpose of the mixing zone study is to validate the dilution ratio estimate that would be used in calculating effluent limitations for the next permit cycle, and the Discharger has indicated that the discharge will cease by December 31, 2020, Regional Water Board staff conclude that the mixing zone study is not necessary. Therefore, the requirement for a mixing zone study was edited throughout the permit to indicate that if discharges from Discharge Point 001 will continue past December 31, 2020, the Discharger must provide advanced notification to the Regional Water Board, as well as a work plan to timely complete a mixing zone study.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A11	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Page 18, Section VI.C.6.a, General Permit Coverage</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> AES has obtained coverage under General Permit No. CAS000001 (IGP) for the area associated with discharge point D1, as previously agreed with the RWQCB. IGP coverage is based on the potential to discharge storm water associated with industrial activities performed at a site. Areas of the AES site where power generating activities take place</p>	<p>The Discharger has documented that continued enrollment under the General Industrial Permit, General Permit No. CAS000001, is no longer necessary and it will submit a Notice of Termination to the Regional Water Board and State Water Board. Therefore, the requirement in Section VI.C.6.a to maintain coverage under General Permit No. CAS000001, was deleted.</p> <p>The requirement to submit an updated Storm Water</p>	Section VI.C.6.a was deleted.

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>and there is potential for exposure of those activities to storm water are covered under an Individual NPDES Permit. The tributary area for discharge point D1 consists of two inactive basins (all storm water contained within basins) and a paved access road. D1 also receives contribution from an area under the control and management of Southern California Edison (SCE).</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> AES plans to terminate coverage under the IGP for this small non-industrial area of the site, but will continue to implement appropriate BMPs for the area and maintain a storm water pollution prevention plan for the entire site. AES will also continue to coordinate with SCE to confirm that appropriate BMPs are implemented for the SCE owned and operated property that contributes the majority of storm water flow to D1. There will be no need to maintain coverage under the IGP as long as industrial activities are not occurring within the tributary area. AES requests that the requirement to maintain coverage under the IGP be removed from the Order, and AES will submit a Notice of Termination for the IGP to the SWRCB and RWQCB. Additionally, the requirement to submit the SWPPP should also be removed, as it's currently publically available through SMARTs and the practices have already been implemented.</p>	<p>Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is retained from the existing permit. The SWPPP must be updated to address the area associated with Discharge Point D1. The SWPPP must list potential pollutants from the area, Best Management Practices implemented, inspections, and upgrades. If there are no changes to the existing SWPPP to meet this requirement, the existing SWPPP may be re-submitted to the Regional Water Board, with notification that the Discharger will continue to implement the existing SWPPP as the Discharger determined no changes are necessary.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A12	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment A, Page A-4, Satellite Collection System</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The definition for satellite collection</p>	<p>Attachment A includes a standard set of definitions routinely attached to all NPDES permits. Not all definitions apply to all facilities and the definitions themselves do not impose any requirements that are</p>	None.

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>system exists in this New Order and likely was incorporated because of cross-over from the AES Alamitos permit. This can cause confusion amongst permit readers and give a false impression that there is a sanitary sewer system onsite.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Remove the definition for satellite collection system.</p>	<p>not applicable to this facility. Note that the term is not used elsewhere in the Order. Hence, the definition of for satellite collection system will not be removed from Attachment A.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A13	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment C, Pages C-1 through C-3, Flow Schematic</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The flow schematic has been updated to show modifications to original operations. The corrections made will impact estimates for internal flow and therefore mass-limitations will need to be revised accordingly.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Include the revised flow schematic (included as an Attachment) and ensure consistency throughout the new Order.</p>	<p>The revised flow schematic provides a more accurate description of waste flow within the Facility as currently operating, including volumes. The revised flow schematic was included in the Order and mass-based effluent limitation calculations have been updated throughout this Order as necessary.</p>	<p>Inserted revised flow schematic and updated mass-based effluent limitation calculations.</p>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A14	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment D, Pages D-7, 8, and 10; Sections V.E. 1, V.H, and VII.B, Standard Provisions</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Sections V.E.1 and V.H about twenty-four hour reporting and reporting instances of noncompliance include reporting requirements for combined sewer overflows and sanitary sewer overflows. Section VII.B. is geared specifically toward Publically-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs). Similar to above, this can cause confusion amongst permit readers and give a false impression that there</p>	<p>Attachment D includes Standard Provisions attached to all NPDES permits, as required by federal regulations. Not all Standard Provisions apply to all facilities and permittees are not required to comply with Standard Provisions that are not applicable to their facility. Hence, the reference to sanitary sewer systems or treatment works will not be removed from Attachment D.</p>	<p>None.</p>

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>is a sanitary sewer system onsite.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Remove any reference to sanitary sewer systems or treatment works treating domestic sewage.</p>		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A15	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section II - Table E-1, Monitoring Locations</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The description for monitoring location 001A does not specify that this is the retention basin. Stating that the sample should be collected <i>at a location from the retention basin where a representative sample of all low flow volume can be obtained</i> would remove ambiguity over whether or not this refers to the retention basin or some other internal waste stream. Additionally, the table includes monitoring location INT-002A; however, it is unclear where this location is onsite. There is no discussion elsewhere in the permit referencing location of this discharge point. The low volume wastes are being captured at INT-001A and is the only retention basin in service.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Revise the description for discharge point 001A and remove monitoring location INT-002A.</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board agree that clarifying language would better describe this waste stream. Therefore, the description for monitoring location INT-001A was modified as requested.</p> <p>As discussed in response to Comment No. 7 above, monitoring location INT-002A was removed from Table E-1 of Attachment E.</p>	Modified description of monitoring location INT-001A; monitoring location INT-002A removed.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A16	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section IV - Tables E-3, E-4, and E-5, Monitoring Requirements</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The RWQCB has significantly increased the minimum sampling frequency for a number of parameters associated with effluent monitoring locations EFF-001, EFF-002, and for the</p>	<p>This Order establishes maximum daily effluent limitations (MDELs) for Discharge Point 001 based on the Ocean Plan WQOs, MDELs for low volume wastes based on 40 C.F.R. section 423.12(b)(3) ELGs and MDELs for Discharge Point 002 based on CTR criteria using SIP procedures.</p>	None.

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>in-plant waste stream monitoring location. The most significant increase is associated with the sampling frequency for metals prescribed for EFF-001, INT-001A, and EFF-002. The existing Order requires a minimum sampling frequency of one time per reporting year, while the Tentative Order proposes to increase the sampling frequency to one time per month without providing an appropriate basis. The proposed increase in monitoring frequency is also inconsistent with the semi-annual monitoring frequency prescribed in Appendix III of the Ocean Plan. To the extent that additional data is necessary to confirm there is no Reasonable Potential for many of the metals to exceed established water quality objectives, Ocean Plan, Appendix III clearly specifies semi-annual monitoring for sites with permitted discharges of 10 MGD or greater.</p> <p>The RWQCB's proposed changes to the monitoring program represent more than 300 additional sample/parameter combinations, and more than \$50,000 annually in laboratory fees alone, not to mention the significant resources needed to collect samples and manage the additional data and reporting obligations. There is not an appropriate basis for the significant increase in sampling frequency, which has a direct and significant impact on AES resources.</p> <p>The increase in minimum sampling frequency for the in-plant waste streams also lacks basis, considering that the waste streams commingle with discharges that are already monitored in the designated effluent</p>	<p>Appendix III of the Ocean Plan specifies <u>at least</u> semi-annual monitoring for sites with permitted discharges of 10 MGD or greater.</p> <p>Section 2.3 of the SIP states "To evaluate compliance with effluent limitations, effluent and ambient monitoring should occur within a brief enough period to be able to evaluate the effect of the effluent on the ambient water quality."</p> <p>The Tentative Order includes instantaneous maximum, daily maximum, 30-day average and 6-month median limits for Outfall 001 and instantaneous maximum, daily maximum, average monthly and average concentration limits for Outfall 002. Monitoring monthly provides the minimum amount of data required to demonstrate compliance with these limits.</p>	

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>monitoring locations. Within the fact sheet, it indicates that low flow volume waste streams are required to have technology based effluent limits, including limits for pH, O&amp;G, and TSS. The sampling of additional parameters is arduous and not required for low volume wastes.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> The minimum monitoring frequency prescribed in the existing Order should be maintained or increased to a semi-annual frequency, if required based on the Ocean Plan.</p>		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A17	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section IV.A.1-Table E-3, Groundwater Dewatering Location (INT-001B)</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The RWQCB has identified new monitoring requirements for groundwater extracted by the well point system. The Tentative Order incorrectly states that the Existing Order did not address this groundwater discharge. To the extent that the groundwater discharge is primarily associated with seawater intrusion barrier injection managed by the LA County Flood Control District (LACFCD), and generates a relatively consistent discharge stream, the groundwater is characterized when discharge samples are collected at EFF-001, which is the point of compliance for the NPDES Permit. Monitoring at EFF-001 provides the RWQCB information to assess the potential impacts to beneficial uses of the receiving water. Furthermore, the source and volume of the groundwater is not generated by or under the control of AES and there is no sample location that would provide results representative of this</p>	<p>Regional Water Board staff agree with the Discharger's request that monitoring requirements for the groundwater discharges at monitoring location INT-001B be removed.</p> <p>Groundwater discharges from the Well Point System dewatering was included in the existing permit as part of the low volume wastes. New information from the Discharger, however, indicates that the groundwater is discharged directly at a rate of up to 5 MGD to the commingled waste stream for Discharge Point 001, independent of low volume wastes. The Discharger also indicates that there is not a sample location that would provide results representative of groundwater prior to commingling with the other waste streams.</p> <p>In consideration of new information provided by the Discharger, the groundwater monitoring requirements have been removed and the descriptions of the groundwater discharge have been corrected throughout the Order.</p>	Groundwater monitoring requirements were removed and descriptions of the groundwater discharge corrected.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>groundwater.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Due to the infeasibility to sample the groundwater, AES recommends removing the monitoring requirements for groundwater discharges (INT-001B).</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board finds that monitoring of the commingled discharge at monitoring location EFF-001 will detect any pollutants contained in the groundwater discharge. Should pollutants contained in the groundwater discharge raise the concentration in the final effluent, a violation of the effluent limitation will result.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A18	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section IV.A.1-Table E-3, Flow Monitoring Requirements</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The new order requires flow to be monitored for the low volume wastes at location INT-001A at a minimum frequency of 1/month.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> The frequency should be revised to continuous.</p>	<p>More frequent monitoring of the flow of low volume wastes from the retention basin at location INT-001A is appropriate. The frequency was changed to “daily” in Table E-3 of Attachment E.</p>	<p>Frequency of flow monitoring at location INT-001A set to “daily”.</p>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A19	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section IV - Tables E-3, E-5 and E-11, Bacteria Objectives</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The RWQCB has incorporated new requirements to collect samples and measure for bacteria (total coliform, fecal coliform, and enterococcus) for EFF-001 and EFF-002. The existing Order does not require bacteria monitoring, and based on a comprehensive review of industrial activities performed at the site and waste streams generated, AES does not perform activities that are expected to generate bacteria. The Tentative Order indicates bacteria monitoring was added to confirm that the discharge is not contributing to an impairment of the receiving water, but Santa Monica Bay (EFF-</p>	<p>The prior permit was issued in 2000, and did not include monitoring requirements for bacteria. At that time, the discharges for both EFF-001 and EFF-002 were considered ocean discharges subject to requirements of the California Ocean Plan.</p> <p>The 2012 California Ocean Plan includes water quality objectives and monitoring requirements for bacteria that apply to the discharge from EFF-001 to the Santa Monica Bay.</p> <p>The discharge from EFF-002 to King Harbor was reclassified as an enclosed bay discharge subject to the requirements of the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan includes water quality objectives and monitoring</p>	<p>None.</p>

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>001) and Kings Harbor (EFF-002) are not listed as impaired for bacteria.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> With <b>no</b> bacteria sources associated with operation of the power generating plant and <b>no</b> identified bacteria impairments for Santa Monica Bay (EFF-001) or King Harbor (EFF-002), bacteria monitoring requirements should be removed from the Tentative Order.</p>	<p>requirements in receiving waters designated for REC-1 use that apply to the discharge from EFF-002 to King Harbor. However, since bacteria were not monitored previously there is no data to evaluate reasonable potential.</p> <p>This Order therefore contains annual bacteria monitoring requirements for EFF-001 and EFF-002. These monitoring requirements are not based on Santa Monica Bay or King Harbor being listed as impaired for bacteria, but rather to ensure that the discharge is not causing or contributing to exceedances of receiving water limitations.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A20	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section IV - Tables E-3 and E-5, Monitoring Requirements</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Footnote 14 (Table 3) and Footnote 12 (Table E-5) state “When unit startup occurs during the month sampling of low volume wastes shall be performed immediately after unit startup.” This request is infeasible for our plant. Unit startup is not at our discretion and often times we obtain less than 24 hour advance notice. Due to the unpredictability of the units running and to assist with managing water levels during the month, it is common practice for AES to sample at the beginning of the month to determine how the basin needs to be managed for the remainder of the month. If there is an exceedance, this method of sampling provides ample time to manage the basin accordingly and to obtain 4 additional samples during the month the exceedance occurred. With the unpredictability of unit start-up, it is</p>	<p>Due to the unpredictability of unit startup described by the Discharger, it is infeasible to require that sampling of low volume wastes be performed immediately after unit startup. Therefore, Footnote 14 was removed from Table E-3 and Footnote 13 was removed from Table E-5.</p>	<p>Removed Footnote 14 from Table E-3 and Footnote 13 from Table E-5.</p>

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>not in our best interest or favor to hold off on sampling until a unit is requested to startup, because there are months we do not have units operating at all.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Remove this footnote.</p>		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A21	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section V.B – Page E-12, Chronic Toxicity</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Per the Fact Sheet, insufficient data was available to determine the appropriate IWC for Discharge 002 under the enclosed bay discharge classification. Therefore, no dilution credit was granted. This raised the IWC from nominally 9% calculated from Order 00-085 to 100%.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Prior testing has determined effluent from Discharge 002 does not represent a toxic risk, evidenced by consistently passing toxicity testing. For that reason, there is limited reasoning for increasing the IWC 91%. AES requests the existing IWC of 9% be retained.</p>	<p>The prior in-stream waste concentration (IWC) was developed assuming the discharge was an ocean discharge and that the specified dilution credit was applicable. The reclassification of the discharge at Discharge Point 002 to an inland surface water discharge means the discharge is regulated using the State Implementation Policy (SIP) and any dilution must be developed using that guidance. Since AES Redondo Beach has not provided a dilution study, the discharge is evaluated assuming no dilution. Hence, the new IWC is 100% for Discharge Point 002.</p>	None.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A22	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section V.D,1. - Page E-12, Chronic Toxicity</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> This section addresses the testing requirements for chronic toxicity and one of the requirements indicates a static renewal toxicity test needs to be completed with topsmelt. This requirement is infeasible for AES Redondo Beach due to the unpredictability of and infrequent run times. Coordination of the testing is infeasible if the units are</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board generally requires storm water dischargers within this region to implement the static renewal protocol for topsmelt. That is done by collecting sufficient effluent when the facility is operating to complete the test and any TIE studies. Section V.D.1 of Attachment E was modified to include the requirement to collect sufficient effluent and receiving water to complete the tests.</p>	Section V.D.1 of Attachment E modified.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>not online and circulators therefore are not running. As written in our OTC implementation plan, circulators are not permitted to be turned on solely for sampling purposes.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Provide caveat to static renewal toxicity test for topsmelt if it is infeasible to collect samples.</p>		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A23	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section V.D, and V.F.4 - Pages E-12 and E-13, Chronic Toxicity</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Text indicates the sample's salinity should be artificially altered by the addition of artificial sea salts or brine controls.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Only seawater collected at site should be used with a minimum salinity in accordance with the test method. If ambient salinity is less than the test acceptability threshold, a new sample should be collected when the freshwater source affecting the sample salinity has dried up. The sentence stating "<i>artificial sea salts shall be used to increase sample salinity</i>" should be removed. Additionally, the text stating "<i>Dilution water and control water, including brine controls</i>" should be revised accordingly. Any other reference to use of artificial sea salts/brine controls should also be removed.</p>	<p>Regional Water Board staff find that the request to use uncontaminated seawater is reasonable. The west coast methods state that "The dilution water used in the toxicity tests may be natural seawater, hypersaline brine (100%) prepared from natural seawater, or artificial seawater prepared from commercial sea salts." Therefore Section V.D. of Attachment E has been edited to include the west coast methods language.</p>	<p>Section V.D. of Attachment E modified.</p>
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A24	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section V.E - Page E-12, Chronic Toxicity</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The new Order indicates that chronic toxicity is required once per quarter; but prior to implementing the quarterly sampling, a species</p>	<p>The prior permit required quarterly chronic toxicity monitoring and annual species sensitivity rescreening. The Discharger indicates that rescreening will take place in May 2016. This Order requires species sensitivity rescreening every 24 months. If a recent screening has been conducted</p>	<p>Section V.E of Attachment E modified.</p>

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>sensitivity screening shall be conducted monthly for a period of three months.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Due to multiple non-forecasted expenses resulting from the adoption of this Order, it is recommended the species sensitivity screening shall begin at the beginning of 2017. AES will resume testing for the remainder of 2016 using the most sensitive species identified during the previous screening (to be completed in May 2016).</p>	<p>prior to the adoption of this Order, the most sensitive species determined during that screening event may be used for routine quarterly monitoring until 24 months after the date of that event.</p> <p>Section V.E of Attachment E was modified to reflect that recent species sensitivity screening results may be used for routine quarterly monitoring.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A25	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section V.H- Page E-114, Chronic Toxicity</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The new Order requires that accelerated sampling begin immediately for any summary result of “Fail” for the chronic toxicity testing. The accelerated sampling requires AES to implement a monitoring schedule consisting of four, five consecutive toxicity tests, conducted at approximately two week intervals. As mentioned previously, as a result of the unpredictability of our unit run time, this frequency of testing could be infeasible.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> A caveat shall be in place to allow more time to complete accelerated sampling if the units are not running or less samples shall be accepted if five consecutive tests are infeasible.</p>	<p>The AES Redondo Beach Generating Station facility does not run continuously. Hence, discharges may not be consistently available. Accelerated monitoring should end after three months if discharges have not occurred, such that five consecutive toxicity tests have been completed at approximately two week periods. Section V.H of Attachment E was modified to address intermittent discharges.</p>	Section V.H of Attachment E modified.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A26	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1. - Table E-6, Receiving Water Monitoring</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Salinity units are commonly ppt (parts</p>	<p>The salinity units were changed to ppt in Table E-6 of Attachment E.</p>	Changed salinity units to “ppt” in Table E-6 of

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		<p>per thousand) or psu (practical salinity units) rather than ppm (parts per million). Reporting in ppm will result in large numbers not easily comparable to measurements from other programs.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Require units in ppt or psu rather than ppm.</p>		Attachment E.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A27	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section VIII.A.1. - Table E-6, Receiving Water Monitoring</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> What is the rationale for collecting water samples for chronic toxicity testing at Station RSW-004? As noted, AES Redondo Beach plans to comply with the State’s OTC policy by ceasing use of once-through-cooling by 31 December 2020, or seven months prior to this permit’s expiration. If this addition is to provide data for a future RPA, it is not necessary, as the next NPDES permit, if needed, will govern an entirely different effluent, once cooling water is removed. Furthermore, Station RSW-004 is located at the mouth of King Harbor, well away from Discharge 002. Toxicity in waters from this station arguably cannot be traced to Discharge 002, especially if waters are collected on a flooding tide. Any TST fails at this location cannot be ascribed to Redondo Beach Generating Station.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> If this sampling effort is an effort to inform the RPA to refine the IWC, it should be noted as such and the permit clearly state that Redondo Beach Generating Station is not liable for TST fails at this station. Otherwise, AES requests the removal of the</p>	<p>Due to the reclassification of the discharge from Discharge Point 002 from an ocean discharge to an inland surface water discharge, the receiving water limitations for Discharge Point 002 are based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan contains narrative WQOs for toxicity and references the use of toxicity tests in evaluating the toxicity of receiving waters. Therefore, a narrative receiving water toxicity limitation is established in this Order, and annual monitoring for chronic toxicity at Station RSW-004 (the station closest to Discharge Point 002) is established to determine compliance with the narrative toxicity limitation.</p>	None.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		chronic toxicity testing requirement at monitoring location RSW-4 from the Receiving Water Monitoring program.		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A28	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section VIII.C - Page E-19, Bioaccumulation Monitoring</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Native California mussels (<i>Mytilus Californianus</i>) are not frequently available in the area. Available sources of native California mussels are not reliably available either. Transplanting native California mussels harvested out of the area may be unproductive if the transplant shocks the mussels due to changes in water quality conditions, especially temperature. This shock could result in mortality.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Naturally occurring mussels (<i>Mytilus</i> spp.) found in the area should be listed rather than California mussels. This will represent those organisms common to the area that have demonstrated survival in the ambient conditions.</p>	Regional Water Board staff agree. Section VIII.C of Attachment E was modified to replace California mussels ( <i>Mytilus Californianus</i> ) with naturally occurring mussels ( <i>Mytilus</i> spp.) as the species for bioaccumulation monitoring.	Section VIII.C modified.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A29	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment E, Section IX.A.2 - Page E-21, Visual Monitoring Requirements</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Item k is infeasible for routine visual monitoring of the receiving water sampling point and would only apply to those points near an outfall or intake. Observations such as k require divers, while the receiving water monitoring is completed from the surface using instrumentation deployed through the water column.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Remove item k from the visual observation</p>	The impingement and entrainment assessments required in Section III of Attachment E satisfy the requirement to evaluate the amount of calcareous material removed from the intake structure. Hence, Item k was removed from the visual monitoring requirements in Section IX.A.2 of Attachment E.	Item k was removed.

<b>Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)</b>				
<b>Commenter</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
		requirements, or in the alternative, adjust Item K to indicate that this information will be reported if maintenance on the intake tunnel is completed. For example, "If maintenance is done on the intake, a visual report of calcareous material and removal will be included with the quarterly report."		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A30	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment F, Section I - Table F-1, Facility Information</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The facility contact and authorized person to sign and submit reports should be revised.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Revise contact to Jose Perez, Site Leader, (310)-318-7575.</p>	The correction in Facility contact information is noted. The facility contact and authorized person to sign are changed to Jose Perez, Site Leader, (310)-318-7575 in Table F-1.	Facility contact and authorized person to sign updated.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A31	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment F, Section II. A.2.a - Page F-5, Internal Process Wastewater</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The low volume wastes as mentioned, includes waste from boiler blowdown, boiler condensate overboard, reverse osmosis reject water and in-plant drains. These waste streams have variable flows and enter into the South Retention Basin in order to be held and treated until discharged. The flow from the retention basin is at a constant rate of 600 gpm and the maximum possible flow is 864,000 gpd. The flow rates and volumes of the internal waste streams are inconsequential since the waste streams commingle in the retention basin and the discharge rate is managed through the basin. This maximum possible flow should be used for mass calculations.</p>	Regional Water Board staff agree. In addition to the information in this comment, the Discharger has provided the Regional Water Board with flow information for the retention basin and updated descriptions of the individual waste streams included in the low volume wastes. Section II.A.2.a of Attachment F was modified to include these corrections.	Section II.A.2.a of Attachment F modified.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<b>Solution:</b> Remove ambiguous flow volumes (e.g. the definition of in-plant floor drains indicates approximately 500 gpd of equipment wash water, residual oil, and detergent in total for the Facility) and use the total maximum potential flow for the retention basin. AES Redondo Beach will continue to work with the permitting staff to reconcile the flow concerns.		
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A32	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment F, Section II. A.2.b - Page F-6 &amp; F-7, Stormwater Runoff</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> The description of stormwater flow is inaccurate. The stormwater collection for Units 7 and 8 and D1 are reversed.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> D1 collects stormwater from the northern portion of the plant and Units 7 and 8 collects from the southern portion.</p>	The correct description of storm water flow is noted. The word “northern” is changed to “southern” and the word “southeastern” is changed to “northern” in Section II.A.2.b of Attachment F.	Corrected storm water flow descriptions in Section II.A.2.b of Attachment F.
AES Redondo Beach LLC	A33	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment F, Section VII.B.1.d and VII.B.2.d - Analytical Methods for PCBs</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> For the purpose of assessing compliance with the discharge prohibition for PCBs in the Tentative Order, the RWQCB requires the use of USEPA approved Test Method 608. The RWQCB is also requiring supplemental analysis of PCBs using an analytical method that is not a USEPA approved method in accordance with 40 CFR 136. While the RWQCB explains that the additional testing using proposed method 1668c is to gather data to verify assumptions in the TMDL, this request is not appropriate as a condition of AES’s NPDES Permit. The testing is expensive, does not provide relevant</p>	<p>The requirement to monitor and report using both USEPA method 608 and USEPA proposed method 1668c is recommended based on the Santa Monica Bay TMDL for DDTs and PCBs which states:</p> <p><i>“For all discharges with WLAs in Table 6-2, in addition to NPDES monitoring for DDT and PCBs conducted using currently approved 40 CFR 136 methods, to ensure that useable DDT and PCBs data are acquired for effluent characterization under the TMDL, USEPA recommends that the Regional Board (and USEPA) require monitoring and reporting using sufficiently sensitive test methods (e.g., USEPA</i></p>	None.

Comments from Appendix A to Letter dated May 6, 2016 from AES Redondo Beach LLC (Discharger)				
Commenter	No.	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>NPDES Permit compliance information, and has not been approved by USEPA.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> AES recommends eliminating the requirement to conduct supplemental analysis PCBs using proposed method 1668c from the Tentative Order. The request to gather additional information using method 1668c is more appropriate for a RWQCB sponsored study or regional/ watershed monitoring program, where the data can be gathered in uniform manner for use in confirming the assumptions in the TMDL.</p>	<p><i>proposed method 1668 for PCBs).</i>"</p> <p>Redondo Beach Generating Station is identified as a industrial permittee subject to WLAs in Table 6-2 of the TMDL. Therefore, the requirement to monitor and report using both methods is recommended in order to demonstrate compliance and to provide the data necessary to assess changes in the concentrations of the PCBs and DDTs in the discharge and/or receiving water.</p>	
AES Redondo Beach LLC	34	<p><b>Order Location:</b> Attachment F, Section IV.B.2- Table F-6 Waste Streams Subject to ELGs</p> <p><b>General Issue:</b> Table F-6 includes several discrepancies. The Unit 7/8 Boiler Drains and Polisher Regeneration go to the Retention Basin and not Discharge Point 002. The condensate is a low volume waste that should not require monitoring; the condensate is pure steam distilled water at the beginning of the steam cycle. Lastly, as previously explained, the low volume waste streams all commingle into the retention basin and are managed by one compliance point. The individual waste streams and flow volumes are inconsequential.</p> <p><b>Solution:</b> Revise the table accordingly.</p>	<p>As previously discussed in response to Comment No. 31 above, the Discharger has provided the Regional Water Board with updated information regarding low volume wastes. Table F-6 of Attachment F was updated based on this updated information for low volume wastes provided by the Discharger.</p>	Table F-6 of Attachment F updated.