

AES Alamitos Comments to Draft NPDES Permit Renewal and Draft TSO

1. **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.

2. **Order Location:** Global Comment

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 Alamitos presumes the annual Receiving Water Monitoring report submittal would be due February 1st for the preceding calendar year.

Solution: A clear statement clarifying the annual Receiving Water Monitoring report submittal would benefit all users and remove ambiguity.

3. **Order Location:** Page 1, Table 1

General Issue: The zip code is inaccurate and needs to be revised to 90803.

4. **Order Location:** Page 1, Table 2

General Issue: Table 2 includes 0-76 (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 (ie. peaker unit) in January 2004. Some equipment remains in place, but is indoors and covered. Since the decommissioning of Unit 7, discharge point 0-76 discharges stormwater from non-industrial activity areas, including a large parking lot.

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 into the final Order.

5. **Order Location:** Page 3, Section III.A and Page E-5, Table E-1

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.

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.

6. **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.
7. **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, ~~003~~, 002, and 003.”
8. **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.
9. **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.
10. **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.
11. **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. 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.

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 E-3 or, in the alternative Table 4 should reference Attachment E/Table E-3.

12. **Order Location:** Page 5, Table 4

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 *existing* dischargers to coastal waters.

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, *with some exception in which limitations may be relaxed*. 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.

13. **Order Location:** Page 5, Table 4

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 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.

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.

14. **Order Location:** Page 5, Table 4

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 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.

Solution: AES Alamos requests that the pH limits of the new Order be applied after AES Alamos commingles its discharge or, in the alternative, that the pH limits for the low volume waste be included in the TSO, allowing AES Alamos until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.

15. **Order Location:** Page 7, Section V.A.2

General Issue: The surface water limitations indicate the discharge from AES Alamos 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 Alamos. Because of the location of the facility and the amount of dischargers located upriver and in the vicinity of AES Alamos 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.

Solution: This surface water limitation should be omitted or added to the TSO, allowing AES Alamos until December 31, 2020 to comply with the limits.

16. **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 Alamos’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.

17. **Order Location:** Page 11, Section C.1.b

General Issue: RPA is not defined.

Solution: Clearly define RPA.

18. **Order Location:** Page 11, Section C.2.a

General Issue: The new Order states that the TRE Workplan shall describe steps AES Alamos 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.

19. **Order Location:** Page 12, Section C.3.b

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.

Solution: Remove all reference to an updated BMPP to avoid uncertainty of SWPPP requirements or reference the Summary Table on page G-6 instead.

20. **Order Location:** Page 12, Section C.3.c

General Issue: The requirements for the Pollutant Minimization Program have been removed from Appendix F; however, remain in this section.

Solution: Remove all reference to the PMP.

21. **Order Location:** Page 13, Section C.4.b

General Issue: The new Order requires AES Alamitos to develop and maintain a record of *all* spills, overflows, or bypasses from the facility and requires us to submit a quarterly report of *all* 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 *all* spills that occur anywhere on the property require 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.”

22. **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.

23. **Order Location:** Page 16, Section VII.J

General Issue: IWC is not defined.

Solution: Clearly define IWC.

24. **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.

25. **Permit Location:** Page E-6, Table E-2 and Page E-15, Section VIII.B.1.a

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.

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.

26. **Permit Location:** Page E-7, Table E-3

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 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.

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.

Solution: AES Alamitos requests the new sample procedures be consistent with the existing permit to avoid the challenges described above.

27. **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 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 *annual monitoring for chronic toxicity*.

28. **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.

29. **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 that provides the source.

30. **Order Location:** Page E-7, Table E-3

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.

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.

31. **Order Location:** Page E-8, Table E-3

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 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.

32. **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 collection volume restrictions.

33. **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.

34. **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 be revised to "Grab" instead of "24-hour composite."

35. **Order Location:** Page E-18, Section VIII.D.2

General Issue: The next Bight Regional Monitoring 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 Alamos 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 Alamos has been reduced in the new Order in comparison to the existing Order. As specified in the new Order, AES Alamos 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 Alamos is the elimination of its discharge, AES Alamos 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 Alamos.

Solution: Revise the text so it states Bight’1618 is expected to take place during 20162018. Additionally, AES Alamos 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.

36. **Order Location:** Page E-18, Section IX.A

General Issue: The visual monitoring of the receiving water sampling points is a new requirement and 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 Alamos 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 Alamos 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 Alamos property and it’s difficult to observe the discharge from the facility.

Solution: As discussed during our August 19th meeting, AES Alamos 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 Alamos’s control, so it’s possible that receiving water monitoring is completed on a day there are no units running.

37. **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 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.

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.

38. **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 submitting paper DMRs.

Solution: Please revise accordingly.

39. **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.

40. **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.

41. **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, whereas Units 3 and 4 are directed to the receiving water.

Solution: Please revise accordingly.

42. **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.

43. **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 Alamitos requests the LARWQCB grant intake credits because AES Alamitos has already been exposed to instances when pollutants at the discharge are directly attributed to the intake and AES Alamitos should not continue to be held accountable and penalized for pollutants that are directly out of its control.
44. **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?
Solution: Please clarify.
45. **Order Location:** Page F-40, Section VI. B3.a
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.
Solution: Please revise accordingly.
46. **Order Location:** Page F-43, Section VII.A
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.
Solution: The intake monitoring requirement should be clarified and revised as necessary to avoid later discussions and debates.
47. **Order Location:** Page F-43, Section VII.B.1
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 *new discharge* 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 *new*.
Solution: Please revise accordingly.

48. **Order Location:** Page F-43, Section VII.D.2
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.
Solution: See item 36 above.
49. **Order Location:** General Comment for Attachment G
General Issue: The attachment does not discuss the monitoring and reporting requirements for storm water.
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 and more clear direction should be provided or Table E-3 and Table E-8 should be referenced.

Comments to Proposed Time Schedule Order

1. **Order Location:** TSO, Page 7, Order Provision No. 1
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.
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.
2. **Order Location:** TSO, Page 7, Order Provision No. 2
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).
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.