

Appendix 5.15B
RWQCB Meeting Summary

AES - Redondo Beach Licensing Project

ATTENDEES: Cassandra Owens/RWQCB
David Hung/RWQCB
Danielle Siebal/RWQCB
Stephen O’Kane/AES Southland

Mary Vorissis/CH2M HILL
Sarah Madams/CH2M HILL
Jerry Salamy/CH2M HILL
Matt Franck/CH2M HILL

PREPARED BY: Matthew Franck

DATE: May 23, 2012

PROJECT NUMBER: 424103

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss AES Redondo Beach Energy Project (RBEP) licensing process and seek endorsement of timing and approach to NPDES/Waste Discharge process. The pending application to the California Energy Commission (CEC) will trigger interest in understanding the permit and compliance approach, and AES wanted to inform the RWQCB staff of the pending application.

General Approach to Policy Compliance

Stephen O’Kane provided the general background on the overall repowering effort for the power generating station. The existing Redondo Beach Generating Station is subject to the SWRCB policy for once-through cooling, and has submitted implementation plans to develop new onsite facilities that do not use once-through cooling. AES is following the Track 1 approach to moving “off” ocean cooling by 2020. Because of the 2020 deadline (later than several other facilities), the implementation plans (and NPDES permit renewal processes) have not been advanced by the SWRCB.

Project Description and Concepts for Planned Discharges

Redondo Beach Energy Project

AES is in the process of developing a licensing application for the RBEP, which would be a dry-cooled facility. Stephen O’Kane reported that AES intends to submit its application to the CEC in 2012. Following the completion of the licensing process, AES would construct RBEP (estimated late 2015/early 2016) but would need to continue operating the existing plant (with once-through cooling) until RBEP was online. RBEP commercial operations are expected by late 2018 – ocean cooling would cease and the existing power generating facilities would be decommissioned.

AES proposes to continue discharging RBEP industrial process water and stormwater similar to the current facility. Discharges would be to the existing ocean outfall, and not to King Harbor. Stephen O’Kane stated that the source water for industrial processes would continue to be the local potable water purveyor (California Water Service Company [CalWater]). Industrial process discharges would originate primarily from boiler blowdown and the reverse osmosis reject stream, but discharge volumes would be less than current levels due to reduced water supply use. Industrial process discharges would no longer be diluted by the much larger ocean cooling flows.

David Hung stated that discharges would need to meet the Ocean Plan objectives – the more stringent California Toxics Rule (CTR) would apply to any discharges to King Harbor. Dilution credits may be available – studies would be required and the RWQCB can help inform the study processes and tools (e.g., models).

Approach to Permit

Cassandra Owen and David Hung talked about approaches to permitting the RBEP discharge, including the potential role of the SWRCB. Stephen O’Kane stated that AES’s preference is to work with RWQCB staff toward obtaining a new permit for the project. David Hung stated that the RWQCB staff would need to confirm the

process with the SWRCB staff, and requested a packet of information with the topics discussed during the meeting (e.g., implementation schedule, proposed discharges).

Stephen O’Kane said that AES intends to move forward with the NPDES permit process and will prepare the necessary information (e.g., applications, ROWD) and seek approval for new NPDES permit for RBEP concurrently with the CEC licensing process.

Action Items/Next Steps

- AES/CH2M HILL will prepare a care package of materials for RWQCB staff – this will help them field inquiries from CEC staff as well as discuss the permit approach with the SWRCB.
- Following receipt of the care package, RWQCB staff will contact the SWRCB to discuss the permit approach (e.g., are there any reasons why the RWQCB cannot pursue a new permit in parallel with the SWRCB once-through cooling policy compliance process).