

Response to Comments – Combined for Items 8 and 9
 Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District (SCVSD)
 Item 8 – Valencia Water Reclamation Plant (Valencia WRP) &
 Item 9 -Saugus WRP
 Tentative Amended Time Schedule Orders (TSOs)

This table describes all significant comments received regarding the tentative TSOs identified above. Each comment has a corresponding response and action taken.

Written comments received from SCVSD on June 8, 2021 – Cover Letter

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
1	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 4 SCVSD requests revisions to the finding regarding prior TSO deadline extensions.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Regional Water Control Board (Los Angeles Water Board) declines to make the change because Finding 4 specifies that details concerning the reasons for the extensions are set forth in the Background/History section of the TSO.</p>	<p>No revisions have been made to the TSO amendment.</p>
2	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 9 SCVSD requests revisions to Table 1 and the corresponding footnote a, by replacing the 100 mg/L 3-month rolling average chloride effluent limitation with the 150 mg/L 3-month rolling average limitation.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board declines to make the change because the 100 mg/L 3-month rolling average is the final effluent limitation that is currently in effect, consistent with Footnote 5 of the NPDES permit (Order No. R4-2015-0072), which reads:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The 100 mg/L may also go into effect, as a three-month rolling average, replacing the final effluent limitations with Footnote 6 below, if the flow-weighted conditions specified in Resolution No. R4-2014-010, or in Section II of Attachment J are not met by July 1, 2019.”</p>	<p>No revisions have been made to the TSO amendment.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>The 150 mg/L 3-month rolling average would only go into effect after the TSO expires and after the flow-weighted projects are operational, i.e., only after the ultraviolet (UV) light disinfection process at both the Saugus and Valencia WRP, and the reverse osmosis (RO) process at the Valencia WRP are all operational.</p>	
3	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 12 & Valencia WRP TSO Finding 13 - Background/History Section</p> <p>SCVSD requests revisions to the section for both TSOs to indicate that SCVSD has been providing progress reports on a quarterly basis, as required by Saugus WRP TSO Nos. R4-2019-0056 and R4-2019-0056-A01 and Valencia WRP TSO Nos. R4-2019-0055 and R4-2019-0055-A01.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees.</p> <p>The language was added to Findings 12 and 13 of the Saugus and Valencia WRP TSOs, respectively.</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>
4	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 15 & Valencia WRP TSO Finding 16 - Background/History Section</p> <p>SCVSD requests revisions to the section for both TSOs to clarify language regarding the Facilities Plan and the EIR.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees.</p> <p>The findings in the TSOs were revised to make the requested clarifications.</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>
5	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 17 &</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees.</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>Valencia WRP TSO Finding 18 - Background/History Section</p> <p>SCVSD requests revisions to the section for both TSOs to clarify language regarding the decertified EIR.</p>	<p>The findings in the TSOs were revised to make the requested clarifications.</p>	<p>the TSO amendments.</p>
6	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 18 & Valencia WRP TSO Finding 19 - Background/History Section</p> <p>SCVSD requests deletion of the term “injunctive relief” in these findings, when discussing the order issued by the Los Angeles County Superior Court.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees.</p> <p>The findings in the TSOs were revised to make the requested clarification.</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>
7	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 19 & Valencia WRP TSO Finding 20 - Background/History Section</p> <p>SCVSD requests insertion of language regarding the Recirculated EIR public review and comment period.</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees.</p> <p>The findings in the TSOs were revised to make the requested clarification.</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>
8	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Finding 20 & Valencia WRP TSO Finding 21 - Background/History Section</p> <p>SCVSD requests revisions to the language describing the lawsuits filed by Affordable Clean Water Alliance (ACWA) as follows:</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees.</p> <p>The findings in the TSOs were revised in the following manner, similar to, but not exactly as requested:</p> <p>“Following a hearing on September 25, 2017, the court dismissed the lawsuit over the 2016 Concentrated Brine Trucking SEIR because its decertification rendered the action moot. On</p>	<p>Revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>"Following a hearing on September 25, 2017, the court dismissed the lawsuit over the 2016 Concentrated Brine Trucking SEIR because its decertification rendered the action moot. On October 24, 2017, the Court partially discharged the lawsuit writ over the 2013 EIR and ruled that the Sanitation District could move forward with the Chloride Compliance Project. On November 16, 2017, SCVSD resumed work on the chloride compliance project in accordance with the recirculated EIR. In May 2019, the Court discharged the remaining portion of the writ on the 2013 EIR, after the Sanitation District's Board adopted a resolution that ceased planning efforts on the Recycled Water Project. In November 2019, the court denied <u>entered judgment denying</u> ACWA's challenge to the Recirculated EIR in its entirety; ACWA appealed this judgement, <u>which appeal is currently working its way through the appeal process.</u> and ACWA also filed a petition against the Sanitation District's resolution to cease efforts on the Recycled Water Project. However, the Sanitation District can continue work on the chloride compliance project throughout these processes."</p>	<p>October 24, 2017, the Court partially discharged the lawsuit writ over the 2013 EIR and ruled that the Sanitation District could move forward with the Chloride Compliance Project. On November 16, 2017, SCVSD resumed work on the chloride compliance project in accordance with the Recirculated EIR. In May 2019, the Court discharged the remaining portion of the writ on the 2013 EIR, after the Sanitation District's Board adopted a resolution that ceased planning efforts on the Recycled Water Project. In November 2019, the court denied <u>entered judgment denying</u> ACWA's challenge to the Recirculated EIR in its entirety; ACWA appealed this judgement and filed a petition against the Sanitation District's resolution to cease efforts on the Recycled Water Project. <u>ACWA's appeal to the judgment is still undergoing the appeal process.</u> However, the Sanitation District can continue work on the chloride compliance project throughout these processes."</p>	
9	<p>Saugus WRP TSO Resolve No. 3 SCVSD requests insertion of the date November 3, 2020 among the list of dates on which</p>	<p>The Los Angeles Water Board agrees. The date was added in Resolve No. 3 of the Saugus WRP TSO.</p>	<p>A revision has been made to the TSO amendment.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	SCVSD submitted correspondence to the Los Angeles Water Board.		
10	Valencia WRP TSO Resolve No. 3 SCVSD requests rearrangement of the first and second row in the table, so that the Items appear in chronological order.	The Los Angeles Water Board agrees. The ordering of the two rows was switched in Resolve No. 3 of the Valencia WRP TSO.	A revision has been made to the TSO amendment.

Written comments received from the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE) on June 7, 2021 – Cover Letters

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
11	SCOPE comments that they are disturbed that the Los Angeles Water Board is being asked to grant another extension for compliance with waste discharge limits for this treatment plant and they want to know when the Los Angeles Water Board will stop granting extensions and enforce the limits as required.	The Los Angeles Water Board considers all the information presented at the time of each request for an extension. Unfortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in unforeseen delays associated with the completion of the UV and RO plant upgrades. The prior 2020 TSO Amendment was related to the UV plant upgrades while the proposed 2021 TSO Amendment is related to the RO plant upgrade.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.
12	Saugus WRP TSO Finding 13 & Valencia Finding 14 SCOPE comments on the history of prior delays associated with the CEQA process and the resulting litigation. SCOPE opines that most of those actions were brought on by SCVSD's	Comment noted. However, the past EIR/ CEQA issues are outside the scope of the TSO Amendment action by the Los Angeles Water Board, which is addressing delays associated with the COVID-19 pandemic and wildfires.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	refusal to address issues that should have been resolved in the EIR and that much of the litigation could have been avoided had SCVSD moved forward with diligence.		
13	<p>Saugus WRO TSO Finding 32 & Valencia Finding 32</p> <p>SCOPE requests that the public be provided with the substantiation of the claims made by SCVSD regarding the cause of the delays in completing the plant upgrades provided by SCVSD.</p>	<p>On June 7, 2021, the Los Angeles Water Board emailed Ms. Lynne Plambeck, President of SCOPE, a copy of the SCVSD letter dated February 10, 2021, which provides SCVSD's rationale for requesting a time extension. Should any other members of the public request a copy of the February 10, 2021 letter, it will be provided to them pursuant to the Public Records Act.</p>	<p>No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>
14	<p>Saugus WRO TSO Finding 32.d & Valencia Finding 32.d</p> <p>SCOPE comments that the public health advisories for smoke in the Santa Clarita Valley in August and September 2020 do not warrant the year's delay that SCVSD is requesting.</p>	<p>Comment noted. However, SCVSD does not attribute the delays solely to the wildfires. Instead, SCVSD lists wildfires as one of many contributing factors, as discussed in detail in the letter dated February 10, 2021, which was subsequently emailed to SCOPE on June 7, 2021.</p>	<p>No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>
15	<p>SCOPE requests that the Los Angeles Water Board not grant the time extension because SCVSD continues to add new service connections that will make the exceedances worse. SCOPE opines that it is time to be more forceful in obtaining compliance and resolving this festering water quality issue.</p>	<p>The time extension is needed based on the information provided by SCVSD for the discharge from the Saugus and Valencia WRPs to comply with the final effluent chloride limitations.</p>	<p>No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.</p>

Written comments received from Friends of the Santa Clara River (FOSCR) on June 8, 2021 – Cover Letter

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
16	FOSCR comments that this is the third request for an extension by the Sanitation District. It is now been two decades since the Santa Clara River was declared an impaired water body because of chloride pollution. It is time to start enforcing this order.	Comment noted. SCVSD has complied with the interim chloride effluent limitations in the NPDES permits and in the Time Schedule Orders for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs. SCVSD has also submitted progress reports in a timely manner.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.
17	FOSCR express concern that without some enforcement action by the Board, delays for one reason or another will continue to occur. We therefore urge the Regional Board to take some enforcement action to ensure there is an incentive to reduce further delays and encourage timely compliance.	Comment noted. The Time Schedule Orders are considered enforcement actions. However, escalating enforcement has not occurred because SCVSD has been able to comply with the terms of the current TSOs.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.
18	FOSCR notes that according to the public notice, previous reasons that the District was not able to complete this chloride removal facility and comply with the Chloride TMDL included legal actions as stated in the notice, “However, the July 2019 deadline was not met because SCVSD encountered a 6-year delay associated with the CEQA process and CEQA approval of the EIR for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs.” FOSCR opines that most of these actions were brought on by the District’s own failure to address and resolve EIR issues that were timely	See response to comment #12 above from SCOPE.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	brought to their attention. Had they moved forward to rectify these problems instead of refusing to address them, much of this litigation would have been avoided.		
19	<p>FOSCR comments that the reasons cited by SCVSD's as causes for the delay do not warrant another year's delay.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the public safety shut offs did not affect the areas where the Saugus and Valencia treatment plants are located • health advisories for smoke in the Santa Clarita Valley did occur in 2020 for around a week in August and another advisory for several days in September, the time lost amounted at most to around two weeks. 	See response to comment #14 above from SCOPE.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.
20	FOSCR requests that the Los Angeles Water Board provides substantiation of SCVSD's claims of materials delays and the amount of time lost by such delays. FOSCR asked if it really warrants another whole year of delay.	The SCVSD letter dated February 10, 2021, which provides details justifying the request for a time extension, was emailed to FOSCR on June 15, 2021.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.
21	FOSCR urges the Los Angeles Water Board not to grant this extension while the District continues to add new connections that will only make the exceedances worse. FOSCR states this is especially egregious in the case of the Mission Village tract, Newhall Ranch, now	The Newhall Ranch WRP NPDES permit is outside the scope of the proposed revised tentative TSO Amendments for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs. However, the Newhall Ranch WRP, which has not been built, holds a current NPDES permit which contains a 100 mg/L final effluent limitation for chloride. Once built, the Newhall Ranch WRP will have to comply with	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	coming on line considering the Regional Board's permit limit of 100 mg/l for chlorides.	all the requirements contained in the NPDES permit, including the chloride final effluent limitation.	
22	FOSCR comments that it is time to be more forceful in obtaining compliance and resolving this continuing water quality issue.	See response to comment #15 above from SCOPE.	No revisions have been made to the TSO amendments.