

Response to Comments – Combined for Items 13 and 14

Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District (SCVSD)

Item 13 – Valencia Water Reclamation Plant (Valencia WRP)
 &
 Item 14 - Saugus Water Reclamation Plant (Saugus WRP)

Tentative Time Schedule Orders (TSOs) (dated March 6, 2019)
 Comments Due: April 10, 2019

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

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
Comments received from Mr. Alan “Flo” Lawrence Cover letter dated April 8, 2019			
1.1	<p>“The Water Board's only appropriate decision is to continue both of these items to a future, uncertain date, with no action taken at the hearing now, other than to approve the continuance, OR, take these items "off calendar" all together, so as to save the board and the public time and effort. Given the numerous defects there is no appropriate way that a public hearing can be conducted, and a decision reached until the defects are corrected.</p> <p>There are numerous compelling reasons as to why no action on these items is the best possible decision. Following, please see 22 listed sections of comments on these "TSO's".”</p>	<p>The Board disagrees. Consideration of the tentative Time Schedule Orders (TSOs) for the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District’s (SCVSD’s) Saugus Water Reclamation Plant (WRP) and the Valencia WRP should not be delayed. It is important that the tentative TSOs remain on schedule to be considered at the May 9, 2019 Board meeting because on July 1, 2019, the interim effluent limitations for chloride, contained in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for both of these publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) will expire. The proposed TSOs would provide SCVSD with the additional time necessary to complete capital improvement projects that are designed to bring the Saugus and Valencia WRPs into compliance with the final effluent limitations for chloride, which are based on the waste load allocations (WLAs) specified in the Santa Clara</p>	None necessary.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>River Chloride Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL).</p> <p>Issues that are outside the scope of the tentative TSOs, including ongoing litigation and debate over the Recycled Water Project, are not a just cause for delay. Nor is it appropriate to speculate on the future outcome of pending litigation to which the Regional Water Board is not a party.</p>	
1.2	<p>“The effect of this decision on the Santa Clarita Valley is extremely significant. ... Please, therefor, when this item is rescheduled, set it for a Santa Clarita Valley location, or, if necessary, at your usual hearing location in Los Angeles. ... The items are critical for Santa Clarita. Holding them as currently contemplated is not responsive government.”</p>	<p>Note that the Los Angeles Water Board's jurisdiction covers most of both Ventura and Los Angeles counties. During its monthly meetings, the Board typically considers items that affect stakeholders in many different parts of the region. As a result, the meeting location cannot be selected based on one or two agenda items.</p> <p>Nonetheless, for various reasons, the location of the May 2019 Board meeting has been changed from the City of Malibu to the City of Agoura Hills at: Agoura Hills City Hall - Council Chambers 30001 Ladyface Court Agoura Hills, California 91301</p> <p>For the reasons given in response to Comment #1.1 above and here, the TSOs will remain on the May 9, 2019 Board meeting agenda for consideration.</p>	None necessary.
1.3	<p>“Stunning facts that have significant effect on how these agenda items should be decided have not been provided to this Water Board, nor the public, by the applicant. These are listed herein...”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comment #1.1 above and Comments #1.4 to 1.23 below.</p>	None necessary.
1.4	<p>“The Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board, that a California Superior Court Trial on this entire project's conformance with the California Environmental Quality Act</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board is aware that there is pending litigation related to the SCVSD's Final Recirculated Chloride Compliance Project EIR –</p>	None necessary.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>(CEQA) is currently on calendar for early September 2019. This same Court stopped this entire project before. It may well do so again. Such a court ruling would render any action taken by the Water Board now to be wasteful.”</p>	<p>Separation of Recycled Water Project (Final Recirculated EIR), which was certified by the SCVSD Board of Directors on August 30, 2017. The Regional Water Board is not a party to this litigation and; therefore, is not bound by any of the rulings to date. However, notably, the Superior Court found that, “[t]he Final Recirculated EIR complies with the February 23, 2016 preemptory writ of mandate by resolving the particular issues identified by the court.” The Court granted the SCVSD permission to resume work on the Chloride Compliance Project in accordance with the Final Recirculated EIR and project approvals. According to the Superior Court’s decision, the court only retains jurisdiction over the remaining issue in the environmental review of impacts to the stickleback caused by the Recycled Water Project, if that project goes forward. (<i>Affordable Clean Water Alliance v. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County</i> (Oct. 24, 2017) BS 145869, Decision on (1) motion to partially discharge writ: granted; (2) motion for orders re: enforcement of the writ: denied.) The TSOs are consistent with the Court’s statement that the District may resume work on the Chloride Compliance Project.</p> <p>Judge Chalfant gave SCVSD a choice on whether or not it could separate the two components into two projects or not. The Judge said, “...the District is free to pursue whichever course it wants.” (Reporter’s transcript (June 2, 2016), p. 16:13.) Judge Chalfant further acknowledged that SCVSD has another duty, “trying to comply with a Regional Board order.” (<i>Id.</i> at p. 16:21)</p>	

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>We have considered the question of whether the Chloride Compliance Project and Recycled Water Project are different projects with independent purposes which can be implemented independently. Here, the Chloride Compliance Project has independent utility from the Recycled Water Project. The Chloride Compliance Project does not presume completion of nor is its operation dependent upon the Recycled Water Project.</p> <p>Given the importance of chloride reduction in the receiving waters to protect beneficial uses and the potential for already protracted CEQA litigation to be prolonged, the Regional Water Board cannot wait for the conclusion of litigation before acting on any matter related to these TSOs and the NPDES permits for the SCVSD's two WRPs generally.</p> <p>To the extent there is a future need to revise the TSOs in response to future rulings in any litigation, the Regional Water Board can reopen the TSOs and make any pertinent changes, in accordance with requirement #8 in each TSO, which reads as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">The Regional Water Board may reopen this TSO at its discretion or at the request of the Permittee, if warranted. Lack of progress towards compliance with this TSO may be cause for the Regional Water Board to modify the conditions of this TSO.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response to Comment #1.1 above.</p>	

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
1.5	<p>“The possible effect of this pending trial, and its September date has not been disclosed to this Water Board, nor to the public, in any material the board has received. A full disclosure of the possible effects of various trial results must be presented to the Water Board, as part of a staff presentation, and in a staff report made available to the public, well in advance of the strongly suggested future hearing date. This future hearing date would be a substitute for the currently scheduled May 9 hearing.”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4 above.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>
1.6	<p>“The Sanitation District has submitted "compliance dates" as part of these TSO's, that take effect prior to the September 2019 Trial, where the entire project may again be stopped. Other dates within these "TSO"s, where in the 'Sanitation District" commits to their adherence, would also potentially be stopped dead in their tracks, as has happened once before, from the same court holding the September trial.”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4 above.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>
1.7	<p>“The Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board, nor to the public the fact that the Superior Court still holds jurisdiction over this Sanitation District as a result of an earlier ruling against this District, by the same Superior Court holding the September trial.”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4 above.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
1.8	<p>“The Sanitation District had not disclosed to this Water Board, nor to the public the fact that the Sanitation District, at its public hearing held Monday, February 25th, acted in violation of the court order against it, and in violation of the binding pledge this Sanitation District gave to the Superior Court.”</p>	<p>SCVSD has provided a copy of the resolution that its Board of Directors adopted on February 25, 2019, as an attachment to their comment letter on the tentative TSOs. That comment letter, together with all of the other written comments received by the April 10, 2019 comment deadline, for the Saugus and Valencia WRP TSOs, are posted on the Regional Water Board website at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/losangeles/board_decisions/tentative_orders/index.html</p> <p>Should the Court find the District has failed to comply with any order or pledge, the Regional</p>	<p>None necessary</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>Water Board may review any such ruling and modify the TSOs, if necessary.</p> <p>Please also refer to the responses to Comment #1.1 and 1.4 above.</p>	
1.9	<p>“The Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board, nor to the public that its nearly eight year old commitment to provide recycled water to its ratepayers as an integral project benefit of its so called "Chloride Compliance Project", was reneged by the District at this February 25 hearing, as seen in its agenda item number 8. The key deception here, is that full integration throughout its entire history, of recycled water provision has always been part of the single, so called "Chloride Compliance" project, and its EIR. There always has been only a single project. Never two.”</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board is aware of the SCVSD’s February 25, 2019 resolution. While the SCVSD did resolve to cease its planning efforts on the Recycled Water Project, including withdrawing its Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental EIR for Study of Impacts to the UTS Fish under Reduced Discharge Conditions from the SCVSD’s WRPs, it also resolved in the February 25, 2019 resolution that it would continue to assist the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency (SCV Water) in its assessment of recycled water opportunities within the SCR watershed, including working with SCV Water as it updates its Recycled Water Master Plan.</p> <p>The issuance of water recycling requirements is outside the scope of the TSO items. Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8 above.</p>	None necessary
1.10	<p>“The Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board, nor to the public, that it has not received (nor has it even sought) Court permission to abandon or modify the contents of the court order and writ that still are in effect against the District. This binding court order was that the Sanitation District (no one else) had the legal obligation to provide both actual recycled water, as well as a complete California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) about all the specifics as to how this commitment was to be made and kept.”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8 above.</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
1.11	<p>“The Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board, not to its ratepayers, nor to the public, that this District's one or two sentence attempted "transfer" of all its legal, procedural, jurisdictional and financial obligations, to another public agency (the newly created monopolistic Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency) has not been accepted BY this other agency.”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.8 and 1.9 above. The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items, but we note that SCV Water states on its website that, “[a]mong our efforts to conserve water, recycled water plays a pivotal role. Unlike groundwater which can be depleted or SWP which can be subject to drought, recycled water is a renewable resource which will be available as long as we generate wastewater. In the next few years, SCV Water is proposing to expand the use of recycled water to additional users throughout the Santa Clarita Valley.”</p>	None necessary
1.12	<p>“Court orders and Court writs are not like "Greeting Cards". They cannot just be "mailed" to someone. Simple stated, the Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board that they do not have, have not sought, and have not obtained either Court or other Agency permission or acceptance of their highly illegal "give away" of THEIR obligations.”</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.8 and 1.9 above.</p>	None necessary
1.13	<p>“This Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board nor to the public just how radically changed the project now has before this Water Board is, compared to the project last seen before the Water Board in October 2014. All the changes remain hidden.</p> <p>Among these changes are:</p> <p>a) Unlike other areas of California, the Santa Clarita Valley continues to suffer the effects of prolonged drought.</p> <p>b) Beginning in 2013, at least five (5) ground water wells in the North Eastern Santa Clarita Valley that were the prime source of drinking water and plant irrigation for about 40,000 people went completely dry. They remain dry as of April 2019.</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.8 and 1.9 above.</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>c) Personnel with the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency have determined that at least three to perhaps five successive years of rain fall of more than 30 inches per year would have to occur for these dry ground water wells to be recharged sufficiently to be pumped again.</p> <p>d) This year, Santa Clarita has only received about 19 inches of rain, for less than is needed to even begin the recharge of the depleted wells that serve 40,000 people.</p> <p>e) These facts reveal just how radically changed the project now before the Water Board is, compared to its previous form. The project always presented (until illegal action taken by this Sanitation District on February 25), always contained within it the benefit of providing more recycled water to Santa Clarita.</p> <p>f) All the water now supplied to the areas where the ground water wells went dry, is water obtained from the Sacramento Bay Delta 450 miles away. Seventy percent (70) of this water is used to irrigate landscaping. All during the many years this so called "Chloride Compliance Project" has been before the public, (there has always been just a single project, never two), the provision of recycled water has always been an integral part OF this project.</p> <p>The environmental effects of using Sacramento Bay Delta water to irrigate artificial slopes, parks, school playgrounds, landscaped center road medians and more was not an issue when the now obsolete "Chloride Compliance EIR" was compiled eight years ago. At that time, ground water from wells in the area was in adequate supply. Recycled water could fully replace much of the plant irrigation needs in Santa Clarita.</p> <p>It is that commitment that the Sanitation District is attempting to abandon, in violation of a Court order. The far more drastic reliance upon State Water Project Water from Sacramento, because of continued Santa Clarita Valley Drought is one of the</p>		

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>more important environmental condition changes that must be addressed in a current EIR, which must replace the now obsolete 2013 EIR></p> <p>g) The Sanitation District has not disclosed to the Water Board that is HAS NOT obtained (nor has it even sought) court permission to DELETE the major benefit of recycled water provision that was an integral part of the project this Water Board evaluated previously.”</p>		
1.14	<p>“The Sanitation District miss informs this Water Board about the single project that is before it. It is not now, nor has it ever been more than one, single project. It has never been "two projects". The District clearly hopes that the Water Board will not question and reject this deception. If the Water Board does not "fall" for this trick, then the attempt by the Sanitation District to delete a primary project objective and present a vastly different project as if it were the same as seen before, would be rejected by this Water Board.</p> <p>The proof that there has always been just a single project (never two) and that recycled water provision was always a central part of that single project is blatantly before the Water Board now. It is contained, visibly, in the very reports presented to the Board at this time.”</p>	Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8 above.	None necessary
1.15	<p>“Please note that the Sanitation District, in its attempt to evade the court order requiring the District to provide a full environmental study of providing recycled water, attempts to hide all that it has done to date to conform to the court order.</p> <p>The District actually issued a CEQA "Notice of Preparation" for a "Supplemental EIR" for the recycled water project section of its "Chloride Compliance Project" EIR.</p>	Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4 above. While not exhaustive, the tentative TSOs also include findings regarding the history of the SCVSD's environmental analysis. See Findings #8-14 in each tentative TSO.	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>However, please note the exact nature OF that fully "noticed" CEQA NOP.</p> <p>It was for a "Supplemental EIR" not at all an EIR on a fully separate project. Just what project EIR was this "Recycled Water Supplemental EIR" proposed to "supplement"??</p> <p>Of course, it was the same old 2013 "Chloride Compliance Project EIR (set aside by the courts)" that had the provision of recycled water listed as a project benefit and actual EIR objective.</p> <p>"Separate projects" under CEQA never are, somehow, "supplements" to other projects. If there were EVER "two projects", as asserted now by the Sanitation District (with no foundation), then the "Recycled Water" requirement would have been ALWAYS presented for review and analysis as an independent, standalone CEQA EIR, NOT a "supplement" to an existing EIR. Especially an EIR that has been successfully sued and overturned in Court.</p> <p>Again, there have never been "two projects" but always just one. Please reject this blatantly false "two projects" assertion from the Sanitation District.</p> <p>The Superior Court surely will in the near future."</p>		
1.16	<p>"The over two hundred million dollars in public funding from both State and Federal sources has yet to be approved, nor has it overcome all the available appeals and formal objections to such funding. Approval of that funding appears to be on hold until after the trial that affects the fate of this project is concluded, and a ruling issued.</p> <p>Without funding that is secured beyond appeal, it is not possible that the "new" "benchmarks" project "deadlines" shown in the "TSO's" can be met. The Water Board should not issue any "new" deadlines, based upon funding that has not been secured. Such</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4 above. Finding #17 in both TSOs discusses that State Water Board and USEPA are recommending that the state revolving fund application, submitted by SCVSD for the chloride compliance project, be approved. Final approval is pending, awaiting a response from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to USEPA's letter dated February 5, 2019, in which USEPA requested that USFWS provide written concurrence under Section 7 of the Endangered</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	funding must be fully secured and beyond challenge. That is not the case now.”	Species Act (ESA) with the USEPA's determination that the Project is not likely to adversely affect listed species or critical habitat.	
1.17	“Possible expired Basin Plan. Brief mention is made in the text of these two draft "TSO's" that the Basin Plan for the Santa Clara River is set to expire at the end of April. Public hearings on a new basin plan should be noticed and held, prior to what amounts to an amendment that is unclear as to its legal status. Is this action amending a plan that has expired? Is it amending a plan that has just been adopted? These profound questions are not answered in any documents at this time. A project that has undergone such major changes cannot just be "extended". It should be presented as part of a new basin plan.”	<p>The Regional Water Board Basin Plan does not “expire”. The Basin Plan is a regulatory document for the region that contains water quality standards and programs of implementation for those standards for the Los Angeles Region, including TMDLs. The Basin Plan is implemented through permits and other actions of the Board.</p> <p>Finding #2 in both TSOs discusses the expiration date of the NPDES permits, not of the Basin Plan. The Valencia NPDES permit (Order No. R4-2015-0071) and the Saugus NPDES permit (Order No. R4-2015-0071) are both set to expire on April 30, 2020.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response to Comment #1.1 above.</p>	None necessary
1.18	<p>“As of this date, this project has no court approved CEQA document. The Sanitation District itself, as the result of a formal "CEQA Initial Study" years ago, determined that a full CEQA EIR was mandatory if this single project was to obtain public dollar funding and proceed to actual construction.</p> <p>How can the Water Board treat these "TSO's" as if they were contemplated as part of a "real project", when the so-called project still has not fulfilled the most basic of environmental requirements under California Law? Namely, a fully certified CEQA Document free of legal challenge and Court jurisdictions? The Water Board cannot and should not act without these.”</p>	<p>The Court’s decision dated October 24, 2017, indicates that the “District will be permitted to resume work on the Chloride Compliance Project in accordance with the Final Recirculated EIR and Project approvals.” (<i>Affordable Clean Water Alliance v. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County</i> (Oct. 24, 2017) BS 145869.) Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8 above.</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
1.19	<p>“The project that is asking for "more time" not only does not have a certified CEQA Document, free of legal challenge, the document it is attempting to "use", is legally stale.</p> <p>All of the technical studies in the single master EIR (one project, one EIR, not two of either) were conducted in 2011, 2012, and in early 2013. These were compiled prior to the onset of the record California Drought, which has yet to "break" in the SCV.</p> <p>Also, for the last several years, real estate development in the Santa Clarita Valley has "boomed". Large areas of development that used to be vacant land now are developed. The nineteen square mile Newhall Ranch project is being actively graded, as is the 2000-acre Skyline Ranch Project, the 15,000 job "Needham Ranch at Santa Clarita", and many more "smaller" projects.</p> <p>Still others not contemplated when the single EIR for the Sanitation District Project was prepared are in the "pipeline". These new uses of land radically alter most of the "cumulative Impact analysis" contained in the legally "stale", obsolete EIR on the "Chloride Compliance Project".</p> <p>In addition, many projects with zoning that was in effect when the 2013 EIR was being compiled have had their General Plan Designations and zoning changed. In many cases, land has gone from intense development uses, to "open space". These changes render a "we used the General Plan and zoning code for cumulative impact analysis" concept utterly invalid. Only a cumulative impact analysis based upon current conditions will conform to CEQA requirements, and an active court review.</p> <p>This Water Board cannot "extend" the time for a project that has no EIR that is "legal", and "current".”</p>	<p>The Court’s decision dated October 24, 2017, indicates that the “District will be permitted to resume work on the Chloride Compliance Project in accordance with the Final Recirculated EIR and Project approvals.” (<i>Affordable Clean Water Alliance v. Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District of Los Angeles County</i> (Oct. 24, 2017) BS 145869.) To the extent this comment challenges the propriety of allowing the facilities to continue to operate with the same effluent limitations, Water Code 13389 exempts adoption of effluent limits under the Clean Water Act from CEQA, and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, section 13301 contains a CEQA exemption for existing facilities.</p> <p>The Court’s October 24, 2017, Decision on (1) motion to partially discharge writ: granted; (2) motion for orders re: enforcement of the writ: denied, also discusses that, “The Recirculated Draft EIR updates the environmental baseline and the environmental impact analysis of the Chloride Compliance Project within the 2013 EIR and 2016 Brine SEIR to the extent there was any new information or changed circumstances. R W 790-91, 800-01.” and that ... “[b]ased on the analysis of the potential environmental impacts of the Chloride Compliance Project, including the potential impacts of the separation of the Recycled Water Project, the Recirculated Draft EIR found that the Chloride Compliance Project would result in no significant impacts. RW 791.”</p> <p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8 above.</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
1.20	<p>“The Sanitation District has not disclosed to this Water Board that the provision of recycled water to the Santa Clarita Valley community was featured heavily as a benefit of the so called "Chloride Compliance Project" that would need to have a huge mega hundred-million-dollar rate increase to fund it. This "recycled water benefit" again, ALWAYS, touted as an integral part of the Chloride Compliance Project, WAS funded by a huge mega hundred-million-dollar rate increase.</p> <p>This rate increase was placed before the property owners of Santa Clarita Valley, in a formal, legally required "proposition 218" rate increase election. Recycled water provision was fully a part of that rate increase, and the election it required.</p> <p>Among the many mysteries presently not answered in the radically changed project in these "TSO's", is WHAT HAPPENS NOW TO ALL THAT RATE INCREASE MONEY, NOW THAT IT IS NOT GOING TO BE SPENT, SINCE RECYCLED WATER HAS BEEN "DELETED" FROM THE PROJECT?</p> <p>Of course, no such "deletion" has really taken place yet, despite the illegal, ineffective actions so briefly alluded to by the Sanitation District.”</p>	<p>The commenter's questions about the SCVSD's use of its revenues are outside the scope of the TSOs. Please refer to the response to Comment #1.1 above.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
1.21	<p>“Absolutely no damage to "beneficial users" downstream will happen as a result of these agenda items being taken "off calendar", so that the many defects noted herein can be corrected.</p> <p>These is undeniable evidence, in the public record, that downstream users have suffered no damage at all from the water discharged into the Santa Clara River from the two Santa Clarita Valley Waste Water Reclamation Plants. This has been the truth for over fifty years.</p>	<p>This comment first debates the impacts of chloride and then states that no beneficial users will be harmed by a delay in considering the TSOs. The impact of chloride on crop production and the protective threshold for chloride have already been documented in the administrative record for the original Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL (Resolution No. 02-018), adopted on October 24, 2002, as well as in the 2006 and 2008 revisions to the TMDL, including the Literature Review and Evaluation. On the basis of those records and during those proceedings, the</p>	<p>None necessary</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>The purpose of submitting this assertion into this public record, IS NOT to discuss the current 100 milligrams per liter of Chloride TMDL in some reaches of the Santa Clara River.</p> <p>That discussion will happen in another agenda item, basin plan renewal hearing, or court action.</p> <p>This is being submitted to prove that no beneficial users will be harmed if this item is taken off calendar.</p> <p>Here is the first bit of proof that no damage to downstream users will result..." [See comment letter for remainder of comment, essentially stating that there is no damage to farmers as a result of chloride in the Santa Clara River.]</p>	<p>Board determined the protective threshold for salt-sensitive agriculture. This issue had been well addressed in the past and therefore was not re-addressed during the October 9, 2014 adoption of a revision to the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL (Resolution No. R14-010).</p> <p>Please also refer to the response to Comment #1.1 above, concerning the request to postpone the hearing.</p>	
1.22	<p>"The Sanitation District DID NOT place its Chloride Compliance hardware in a location where the Distribution of Recycled Water could be sent to a majority of the customers of the District." [See comment letter for remainder of comment essentially stating concerns regarding the locations of the Chloride Compliance and Recycled Water Projects.]</p>	<p>The Regional Water Board assumes that by "chloride compliance hardware" the commenter is referring to the new reverse osmosis and ultra violet equipment that will be installed at the Saugus and Valencia WRPs to comply with the chloride final effluent limitations contained in their respective NPDES permits.</p> <p>The Regional Water Board reviewed the initial Wastewater Facilities Plan that was submitted by SCVSD on May 2, 2011 and found it to be inadequate because it lacked a plan for actions to meet the 100 mg/L WLA. Following the issuance of a Notice of Violation and Administrative Civil Liability Complaint No. R4-2012-0160, on October 28, 2013, SCVSD submitted a revised chloride compliance facility plan which included reverse osmosis facilities for the removal of chloride. Regional Water Board staff reviewed the proposed location for the additional treatment facilities, including reverse osmosis facilities for</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>the removal of chloride and determined it did not impair any beneficial uses protected by the Regional Water Board Construction techniques, operational methods and mitigation measures have been proposed to ensure protection of all applicable beneficial uses.</p> <p>Division 7, Chapter 5, Article 6, Section 13360 of the California Water Code prohibits a Regional Board Order from specifying the design, location, type of construction, or particular manner in which compliance may be had with that requirement, order.</p> <p>Please also refer to the response to Comment #1.1 above.</p>	
1.23	<p>No fines to be levied against the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District are necessary for non compliance by the District with the previous set of "Strict Deadlines" it agreed to meet in October of 2014, as imposed by this Water Board.</p> <p>This is because the missed deadlines were unavoidable, because of another "strict order" imposed upon the District by the Superior Court of California.</p> <p>The Water Board and staff clearly understand this.</p> <p>Since the Superior Court issued its writ against the Chloride Compliance Project in 2016, many of the deadlines the District agreed to meet, have been missed. The July 2019 deadline for the Chloride Compliance Project to be actually be operational is about to be missed.</p> <p>The Water Board wisely did not attempt the fine the District for complying with a court order. No such "fine questions" were even</p>	<p>Noncompliance with deadlines specified in an NPDES permit are subject to discretionary enforcement action by the Board. However, exceedances of numeric final effluent limitations are subject to mandatory minimum penalties (MMPs) of \$3,000 for each violation, under CWC Section 13385(h). Details on how to apply MMPs on serious vs. non-serious violations can be found at the State Water Resources Control Board's Water Quality Enforcement Policy (Enforcement Policy, 2017). The Enforcement Policy is available at https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/resolutions/2017/040417_9_final%20adopted%20policy.pdf. If the TSOs are not issued, SCVSD would need to comply with the final effluent limitations for chloride by July 1, 2019. SCVSD would be subject to MMPs after July 1, 2019 for violations of the chloride final effluent limitations for both the Saugus WRP and</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>placed upon a Water Board Agenda for discussion or consideration, much less action.</p> <p>This was the correct course.</p> <p>Taking these items off calendar now, until all the defects identified herein are resolved, will avoid a repeat of deadlines adopted, only to repeatedly be missed because of a Court Order, or other unresolved defects.”</p>	<p>the Valencia WRP. Adoption of the TSOs is consistent with the commenter’s sentiment that “fines” should not be “levied” (administrative civil liability should not issue) against the District here, where it had no control over the delay caused by litigation.</p>	
1.24	<p>“Please distribute copies of this testimony to all of the Water Board members, Ms. Renee Purdy, Michael Lauffer, the three superb attorneys from Sacramento who advise the Board so capably, and to Eileen Sobeck.”</p>	<p>All comment letters that are received by the specified deadline are provided to the Regional Water Board members for their review prior to their consideration of an agenda item. Likewise, the executive management team, including the Executive Officer and the Regional Water Board’s legal counsel, is integrally involved in the review of comment letters and the Board’s responses.</p> <p>However, administrative procedures associated with the Regional Board’s permitting actions require that the State Water Board remain impartial because, under Section 13320 of the Water Code, the State Water Board is the entity which receives petitions to review a Regional Water Board’s action, or failure to act. Because the State Water Board may ultimately review a decision of the Regional Water Board on the Saugus/Valencia TSOs, the State Water Board, including its Executive Director, Ms. Sobeck, and its Chief Counsel, Mr. Lauffer, cannot engage in communication or discourse on the merits of these TSOs leading up to the Regional Water Board’s action.</p>	<p>Forwarded comment letter with the exception of Mr. Lauffer and Ms. Sobeck.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		Should any party petition the State Water Board on these matters, all comments will be part of the record and parties can reiterate any outstanding concerns or make additional comments to the State Water Board through the water quality petition process.	
Comments received from Mr. Allan Cameron – Comprehensive Development Consulting Cover letter dated April 10, 2019			
2.1	"Because of procedural, administrative, financial and legal requirements that are not met which must be remedied, these items must be taken "off calendar", and not heard on May 9, 2019."	Please refer to response to Comment # 1.1.	None necessary
2.2	ONE: NEW BASIN PLAN?? There is information in the Public Record, contained in these draft "TSOs" that says the Santa Clara River Basin Plan is set to expire at the end of April. If this is indeed the case, these items should be considered as part of the adoption of a new Basin Plan, during the hearings on that plan. This would permit considering these important items in the proper context of how a new plan would be affected. Such context would be missing if these items were evaluated outside the parameters of the larger plan.	Please refer to response to Comment # 1.17.	
2.3	TWO: PENDING COURT TRIAL CHALLENGING THIS PROJECT NOT DISCLOSED. Nothing in the notices or reports made available to this Water Board, or to the public reveals that a court trial against the projects cited in these draft "TSO's" will take place in September of 2019. The trial will take place in a court that has ruled against the project previously. If a court ruling is issued again against this project, the dates for compliance listed in these "TSO's" will be rendered impossible to meet yet again. These items must be taken off calendar until after the September trial, so that the lack of disclosure about this pending court trial is given the proper consideration by this Water Board and the public that respects and depends upon it.	Please refer to responses to Comments # 1.4.	

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	One wonders what a staff report on this issue would say, if the significant issue of the pending trial had been revealed and analyzed, prior to the hearing.		
2.4	<p>THREE: NO PUBLIC OR PRIVATE FINANCING FOR THIS PROJECT ISSUED YET.</p> <p>Only financing that has been approved would allow this project to meet the various new dates for "compliance" contained in these draft "TSO's". This project has no approved financing. Because of this, the dates for "Compliance" listed, are wholly speculative. There is no certainty that financing will issue, for reasons cited elsewhere. There is no public purpose served by approving anything that cannot proceed. Again, removing this item from the calendar, until financing may survive all the procedural and legal challenges against it, is the only appropriate option.</p>	Please refer to response to Comment #1.16.	None necessary.
2.5	<p>FOUR: EVEN SHORT OF THE NEW TRIAL, COURT JURISDICTION OVER THIS EXISTS NOW</p> <p>The information presented to the Water Board does not appear to clearly state this fact. The Superior Court still holds jurisdiction over whether or not this project may legally proceed. When the Superior Court issued its Writ and Judgement that halted this project in 2016, clear requirements were set forth that the project was mandated to fulfill. The Court retains full authority to halt the project again if these requirements are ignored.</p>	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.4 and 1.5.	None necessary
2.6	<p>FIVE: THE DISTRICT IS IN VIOLATION OF EXISTING COURT REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>Among these, was a requirement that the District prepare and submit a full CEQA Supplemental EIR that would address the specifics of a stated objective contained in all of its project descriptions. This objective committed the District to study all aspects of the recycled water the District pledged to supply as part of its "Chloride Compliance" project. Instead of honoring this actual court requirement, the District, at its February 25 meeting this year, actually acted to violate them. As a result of this flagrant act, court action against the District to halt the project again is highly likely.</p>	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9 and 1.10.	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>This fact was not disclosed to the Water Board. Had it been, the framework for the May 9 hearing would likely be quite different. This is yet another reason justifying the removal of this item from the present hearing calendar.</p>		
2.7	<p>SIX: THE DISTRICT ITSELF SAYS IT NEEDS A FULLY APPROVED EIR, WHICH IS MISSING The Sanitation District itself, after considerable study eight years ago, announced that its proposed "Chloride Compliance Project" would need to have a fully approved California Environmental Quality ACT (CEQA) EIR approved beyond challenge in order for the project to seek and obtain all its financing and discretionary permits from multiple agencies, allowing the project to proceed to construction.</p> <p>No such fully approved EIR exists, and never has.</p> <p>Whatever construction activity may have happened on this site is now proceeding "at its own risk", which is considerable. It can be stopped easily at any time.</p> <p>The Water Board must not condone this flagrant gambling with public funds, by acting as if the project is somehow able to proceed, when the evidence in the public record does not support such a conclusion.</p>	<p>Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, and 1.10.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>
2.8	<p>SEVEN: PROJECT RADICALLY DIFFERENT FROM WHAT BOARD SAW BEFORE The project now asking for more time to be built is much different from what the Board considered in the past.</p> <p>a) The environmental impact report is now fully "stale" and out of date. b) This same EIR is now legally invalid per existing court judgement and writ still in effect. c) The project before the Water Board is radically different than the one placed before the ratepayers in a legally mandated "proposition 218" rate increase election. The ratepayers have never seen, nor agreed to pay for this different project.</p>	<p>Please refer to response to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.13 and 1.19.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>d) The provision of recycled water, always an integral part of this "Chloride Compliance" project has been illegally reneged and abandoned by the District</p> <p>e) No Court permission for this project objective of recycled water to be taken out has been asked of, or granted by the Court, which still has jurisdiction over this project, a fact not revealed to the Water Board.</p> <p>All of these changes require that the Water Board take this item "off calendar", until and unless these defects are addressed and corrected.</p> <p>(f) The final evidence that verifies that only one project exists, is the applications presented to the Water Board years ago. Only a single project was submitted, and only a single EIR for that project has ever been proposed or issued.</p>		
2.9	<p>EIGHT: NO OTHER PUBLIC AGENCY HAS AGREED TO ASSUME THE DELETED PROJECT</p> <p>If the Water Board allows action on these agenda items now, it will be acting as if the critical project objective of providing additional supplies of recycled water is somehow still being provided. It is not. This Sanitation District, with no Court Permission, has reneged and renounced any intention to fulfill its obligations TO the Court, the public, and its non-resident ratepayers. These non-resident ratepayers are major industrial, commercial and retail giants. Their operations span the globe. They have only recently been made aware of the damage to their long-term business plans, caused by the renegeing of increased supplies of recycled water. This water source, if supplied would decrease costs and increase revenue for these enterprises, both directly and indirectly. They now wish to protect their interests.</p> <p>No other public agency has agreed to assume this recycled water responsibility.</p> <p>No other agency could. Only the Sanitation District has voter/ratepayer/court permission and the requirement for providing this recycled water project benefit.</p>	<p>Please refer to the responses to Comments #1.8, 1.9 and 1.11. The Recycled Water Project, including funding mechanisms and agency responsibility, is not the focus of the TSOs.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
2.10	<p>NINE: ONLY ONE PROJECT EXISTS, NOT TWO, CONTRARY TO DISTRICT ASSERTIONS.</p> <p>Recently, the District has begun to assert a non-fact. This "non fact", is that there are, somehow, now "two projects", not just the historic single project. The District now attempts to claim that the so called "Chloride Compliance Project" is one project, and that, somehow there is a second, separate project the District now calls "the recycled water project". This has never been true.</p> <p>This false assertion is easily dis proven.</p> <p>(A) Only a single, full, "stand alone" CEQA EIR had ever been proposed or issued by the District.</p> <p>(B) This single EIR has always had the provision of recycled water contained in it. As a matter of fact, recycled water provision has always been listed as a PROJECT OBJECTIVE of the "Chloride Compliance Project".</p> <p>(C) In addition to the first full EIR (invalidated by the Court) five additional "supplemental" EIR's have been proposed for this same, single project. No second, separate, stand-alone EIR for "Recycled Water" had ever been proposed, much less issued. All five additional "supplemental" EIR's also listed recycled water provision as a component part, and project objective of each of these "supplements".</p> <p>(D) When the "proposition 218" ratepayer/parcel election was held, only one project was presented to receive funding from the ratepayers. This was the so called "Chloride Compliance" project, which has always had the provision of recycled water contained within it as a "project objective". No "second project" has ever been offered to the ratepayers for approval.</p> <p>(E) The District did NOT ask the Court to permit it to consider the provision of recycled water as a project wholly separate from the "Chloride Compliance" project. The District only asked to be able to study the recycled water component of the "Chloride Compliance" project in a CEQA "Supplemental EIR". The EIR to which the District proposed a "Supplement" was still the 2013 full</p>	<p>Please see responses to Comments #1.4, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.19.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>EIR on the whole Chloride Compliance Project. This EIR was set aside by the Superior Court, and still has that status.</p> <p>(F) If there indeed had ever been a legitimate "separate" second project for recycled water, it could only have had its own separate, stand-alone CEQA EIR, not just a supplement. The District fully understands that. It has never proposed ANY "second full EIR" for recycled water. If only the Districts public pronouncements were consistent their actions, credibility might result.</p>		
2.11	<p>TEN: THE WATER BOARD NEEDS A VALID CEQA DOCUMENT. THIS PROJECT HAS NONE.</p> <p>The Water Board has still another compelling reason to remove this item from its agenda, with no action being taken at this time. The project before it in this agenda item, in addition to being radically different from the project seen before by the Water Board, has no approved CEQA document. Until it does, the Water Board cannot act.</p>	<p>Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.19.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
2.12	<p>ELEVEN: THE WATER BOARD MUST AWAIT THE RESULTS OF THE SEPTEMBER TRIAL</p> <p>All the actions contained within these two "TSO's" could be completely rescinded, depending upon the results of the September trial. This is what happened before. Taking this item off the agenda without action is the only sure way to prevent this from happening again.</p>	<p>Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
2.13	<p>TWELVE. "TSO'S" CONTAIN STARTLING INFORMATION THAT REQUIRES INVESTIGATION</p> <p>The Sanitation District, in these two "TSO" drafts list information never disclosed about levels of Chloride in the Santa Clara River. The last publicly disclosed information about chloride levels in the Santa Clara indicated that the average levels were usually about 130 milligrams per liter of water. Information in these "TSOs" indicates that, based upon chloride levels only sketchily cited, that levels may be as high as 230 milligrams of chloride per liter of water.</p>	<p>The conditions in the Santa Clara River watershed have not changed because the waterbody is still impaired with respect to chloride. The 130 mg/L chloride concentration mentioned by the commenter corresponded to a conditional site-specific objective for Reach 4B of the Santa Clara River, which was included in Attachment B to Resolution No. R4-2008-012, Revision of the TMDL for Chloride in the Upper Santa Clara River. However, the 130mg/L conditional WLA did not apply to the Saugus WRP or to the</p>	<p>None necessary</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>Most of that is listed as coming from sources outside the control of Santa Clarita Valley ratepayers.</p> <p>This points to a structural and scientific defect that has persisted surrounding this issue for years.</p> <p>There has never been a watershed wide Chloride Background Level Survey (CBLs) conducted over all the reaches of the river, and at least during two different times of the year. It should be the responsibility of the Water Board to take the lead, and convene Santa Clarita Valley stake holders to participate in a Water Board supervised CBLs study. This long overdue study would result in much needed, now absent precision about the truth of the Chloride situation in the Santa Clara. Such a study could also offer economies of scale for the identification of other chemicals known to be in the river, such as ammonia, VOC's, lead, arsenic, and others that are overdue also for understanding, given the changed circumstances in the Santa Clara due to climate change and large, ongoing population growth.</p>	<p>Valencia WRPs because they discharge to Reach 6 and Reach 5 of the Santa Clara River, respectively, and the TMDL specifies distinct WLAs for those reaches. Moreover, the WLAs established in Resolution No. R4-2008-012 were revised in 2014, with the adoption of Resolution R14-010. Prior to the Regional Board adoption of R14-010, a draft of the proposed revision to the chloride water quality objectives, conditional site-specific objectives, and Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL was released for public comment on August 4, 2014. A Notice of Hearing was published and circulated for forty-five days preceding Regional Board action on the TMDL, at the October 9, 2014 public hearing.</p> <p>Watershed-wide water quality monitoring is already being conducted in the Santa Clara River watershed as part of NPDES permitting requirements and other monitoring programs. NPDES compliance monitoring data is available to the public through the California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) database on our website. A query of the publicly-available information stored on CIWQs, for the time period between January 2015 through January 2019 database, indicate that the average chloride concentration in the receiving water station located downstream of the Saugus WRP and Valencia WRP is 132 mg/L and 134 mg/L.</p> <p>The ongoing collection of data is not a reason to delay issuing the TSOs. Please also refer to responses to Comments #5.1.</p>	
2.14	THIRTEEN: AS HAS BEEN TRUE NOW FOR YEARS, NO FINES ARE APPROPRIATE	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.21 and 1.23.	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>Since no claims or tort actions have ever been filed in court by downstream "beneficial users" asking that monetary damages be awarded to them, from losses caused by water from Santa Clarita, it is safe to assume that no such damage has ever occurred, and will not in the future, while the defects and issues identified herein are remedied. Therefore, the wise and appreciated restraint shown by the Water Board for years now, as far as "fines" are concerned, is clearly the best practice in the future. The District, unlike in the past, now has fully informed stake holders who stand ready to defend against any action that may be contemplated. However. Constructive, positive action is called for now, which will result in significant benefits for all concerned good will oriented interests.</p>		
2.15	<p>CONCLUSION For legal, scientific, procedural, administrative, financial, and issues of credibility, the only acceptable choice at this time is for this item to be taken off the hearing schedule until the issues cited herein are addressed.</p> <p>The earliest possible date for this item to be brought back for consideration must be after the ruling of the court in the September trial has been issued.</p> <p>The staff and management of CDC appreciates this opportunity to comment on this ongoing issue so critical to the water future of the Santa Clarita Valley.</p>	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.7 and 1.8.	None necessary
<p>Comments received from the Silverstein Law Firm – Affordable Clean Water Alliance (ACWA) Cover letter dated April 10, 2019</p>			
3.1	<p>ACWA believes that the Tentative Orders lack a solid factual and legal foundation in that they reflect a historical narrative so incomplete as to be misleading and even false.</p> <p>Paragraphs 9-14 and 17 of the Valencia TSO minimizes the extent to which the District has acted inconsistently and irresponsibly,</p>	The Regional Water Board prepared the findings in the Tentative Time Schedule Orders based upon information in semiannual progress reports submitted to the Regional Water Board pertaining to achieving compliance with the final effluent limitations for chloride. When it became evident	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	and its disregard for CEQA requirements, Court orders and the importance of the Santa Clara River as habitat for special-status species. Exhibit 1 (March 9, 2016 Judgment) and Exhibit 2 (Peremptory Writ of Mandate) were referenced.	that, due to ongoing litigation, SCVSD would not be able to meet the deadlines in its NPDES permits, SCVSD staff approached the Regional Water Board and requested TSOs for both the Saugus and Valencia WRPs. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	
3.2	ACWA believes that SCVSD has failed to fully comply with the writ of mandate issued against it three years ago regarding the chloride project and that it has consistently violated CEQA. Exhibit 3 (February 23, 2016 Decision) is referenced.	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.8 and 1.19.	None necessary.
3.3	ACWA commented that Finding 9 of the Valencia TSO is only partially correct. ACWA refers to Exhibit 4, Transcript of the June 2, 2016 court proceedings, and mentions that SCVSD could not pursue the chloride removal portion of its Project separate from the recycled water portion without performing a proper CEQA analysis of separating the two Project components.	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.4, 1.8, 1.9 and 1.19. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary.
3.4	ACWA presents a narrative of the October 24, 2017 ruling, in which the Judge conditionally allowed the District to go forward with the chloride removal portion of the Project in a ruling on, but with the caveat that he was not ruling on the validity of separating out the water recycling portion of the Project (referencing Exhibit 5 - 10/24/17 transcript, p. 5), which would still require the adjudication of ACWA's challenge to the EIR supporting the separation of the two portions of the Project (id. at pp. 16-17), and without the court ruling on the adequacy of the District's current effort to obtain CEQA approval of the Chloride Project, denominated the "Recirculated EIR."	<p>Comment noted. Finding 14 of the TSO was revised as follows to mention the October 24, 2017 court ruling which allowed SCVSD to resume work:</p> <p>On November 16, 2017, a court decision allowed SCVSD to resume work, following an October 24, 2017 court ruling in which the judge: <u>1) granted SCVSD's motion to partially discharge the writ; 2) concluded that the final recirculated EIR complies with the writ by resolving the particular issues identified by the court; and, 3) permitted SCVSD to resume work on the chloride compliance project in accordance with the final recirculated EIR and project approvals. However, the court retained jurisdiction over the remaining</u></p>	Inserted language in Finding 14 of the Saugus WRP and Valencia WRP TSOs.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>issue in the writ: <u>an environmental review of impacts to the stickleback caused by the Recycled Water project, if that project goes forward. On September 25, 2017, ACWA filed a challenge to the recirculated EIR. A trial date has been set for September 26, 2019.</u> The mandated work stoppage had already resulted in SCVSD's failure to meet various TMDL-established deadlines that had been incorporated into the Saugus and Valencia WRPs' NPDES Permits.</p>	
3.5	<p>ACWA commented that the trial for the pending petition/complaint against SCVSD's Recirculated EIR is set for September 26, 2019. Exhibit 6, the Case Access and Future Hearings Information for the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Los Angeles (Case No. BS170983), is referenced.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please refer to response to Comment 3.4.</p>	<p>Inserted language in Finding 14 of the Saugus WRP and Valencia WRP TSOs.</p>
3.6	<p>ACWA commented that on April 14, 2016, SCVSD attempted to persuade Judge Chalfant to discharge the Writ by filing a return to the Writ on, which consisted solely of a Supplemental EIR on disposal of brine waste from the chloride removal component of the Project. (Page 3 of Exhibit 7, the Decision on Motion to Dismiss, was referenced.)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1 and 1.4. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>
3.7	<p>ACWA commented that Judge Chalfant ruled that the District could take no further action in performance of the Chloride Compliance Project until it completed further studies regarding the potential impacts to the unarmored threespine stickleback. ACWA further describes that, in August of 2016, the District issued a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Supplemental EIR (SEIR) on the impacts on the Stickleback of reducing its effluent discharge to the Santa Clara River. ACWA highlighted sections of the SEIR that would evaluate the project's hydrologic impacts on unarmored</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 3.4. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.</p>	<p>None necessary.</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	threespine stickleback. Exhibit 8, the Notice of Preparation of the SEIR was referenced.		
3.8	ACWA commented that on September 26, 2017, the District's counsel stated in open court that, although it had learned from the Department of Fish and Wildlife that the analysis would be longer than SCVSD had originally thought, SCVSD would be doing a full analysis of the impacts of reducing its discharge to the Santa Clara River. (Exhibit 9, the 9/26/17 hearing transcript, p. 19, was referenced.)	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.16. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary.
3.9	ACWA commented that no actual, written document embodying the "Augmented/Modified 2013 EIR" was circulated for public review and comment, and indeed, none existed, as was shown when no such document was produced at the Board hearing where the Board certified it. Pages 3 – 4 of the 6/2/16 Tentative Decision on Motion for Order, Exhibit 10, were referenced.	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comment #1.1, 1.8 and 1.19. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary.
3.10	ACWA commented that on June 2, 2016, the court granted ACWA's Motion and ruling that SCVSD's "certification of the Modified EIR and SEIR did not comply with CEQA." (Exhibit 10, p. 8, was referenced.)	Comment noted. Refer to response to Comment #1.1, 1.4, 1.7, 1.8 and 1.19. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary.
3.11	ACWA comments that Finding 12 of the Tentative Order groups events thematically, not chronologically, and that it omits significant events. ACWA reiterates that on August 6, 2016, SCVSD issued a Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental EIR that would analyze the environmental impacts, including on the Stickleback, of separating the recycled water component of the Project from the chloride removal component of the Project, but that no Scoping Meeting was held, and no Draft SEIR was ever issued.	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary.
3.12	ACWA commented that recently, on February 25, 2019, the District formally withdrew the NOP, and "reject[ed] the Recycled Water Project," some two and one-half years after issuing the	Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8.	None necessary.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	NOP, referencing Exhibit 11, Resolution of the Board of Directors of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District Regarding Withdrawing Notice of Preparation of Supplemental Environmental Impact Report For Recycled Water Project In Santa Clarita Valley.		
3.13	ACWA believes that the recycled water component, which was listed as a Project objective in the 2013 EIR, remains in the Recirculated EIR under challenge because SCVSD incorporated by reference the 2013 EIR into the Recirculated EIR. Pages Exhibit 12, pages 2-2, 7-2 and 7-3 of the Recirculated EIR, are referenced.	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4 and 1.8.	None necessary.
3.14	ACWA comments that Finding 13 of the Tentative Order mentions that the SCV District Board certified the Recirculated EIR on August 30, 2017.	Comment noted. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary.
3.15	ACWA commented that they filed a challenge to the Recirculated EIR on September 25, 2017 and that a trial date has been set for September 26, 2019.	Although the court proceedings are outside the scope of the TSOs for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs, information regarding the challenge to the recirculated EIR and the pending court date were added to Finding 14, to complete the narrative.	None necessary.
3.16	ACWA believes that the full story with respect to SCVSD not pursuing recycled water was not reflected in the TSOs.	The Regional Water Board did not include information regarding recycled water in the TSO findings because recycled water development is outside the scope of the proposed TSOs. Water Recycling Requirements (WRRs) for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs are regulated under separate WRR Orders, No. 87-49 and 87-48, each amended by Order 97-072. However, before SCVSD attempts to increase the amount of tertiary effluent that it currently recycles, it must comply with section 1211 of the California Water Code and submit a 1211 application to the State Water Board's Division of Water Rights.	None necessary.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
3.17	ACWA commented that the recycled water component cannot legally be piecemealed from the whole, much less reneged upon and jettisoned outright, as SCVSD now seeks to convince the Regional Water Board that it can be allowed. ACWA believes that the Board's proposed actions and approvals regarding the above-referenced TSO's are premature because the legality of SCVSD's actions will be tested again, later this year, in the Superior Court.	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.7 1.8 and 1.19.	None necessary.
3.18	ACWA commented that in ruling to invalidate the Original EIR, Judge Chalfant found that the District had not properly analyzed the impact on the Stickleback of reducing recycled water discharge to the Santa Clara River. (2/23/26 [sic 2/23/2016] Decision, pp. 20-21 24, at Exhibit 3)	Comment noted. The Regional Water Board believes that the ACWA comment contains a typographical error with respect to the year of the February 23 court decision. We believe it should be 2016 not 2026. Nonetheless, the February 23, 2016 court decision is part of the Administrative Record for these two TSOs, since it was submitted as an exhibit of the comment letter received by the Regional Water Board by the April 10, 2019 comment deadline. Please also refer to response to Comment #1.4. The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items.	None necessary.
3.19	ACWA commented that there is still no analysis showing whether any level of diversion of recycled water away from its current discharge to the Santa Clara River will or will not harm the various species, including the fully-protected Unarmored Threespine Stickleback, a species for which no take whatsoever is legally permissible. (Fish and Game Code § 5515.)	The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.4 and 3.16.	None necessary.
3.20	ACWA commented that the community is still confidently expecting that SCVSD will not only continue to provide the 475 acre-feet per year of recycled water that it is currently contracted to provide, but that it will provide even more such water.	The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items. Please refer to responses to Comments 1.8, 1.9 and 3.16.	None necessary.
3.21	ACWA commented that the Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency's (SCV Water) website further reflects the confidence that more recycled water will be produced by the District. The website says:	Comment noted. The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items. From the information posted on SCV Water's website it	None necessary.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	(1) SCV Water is currently providing recycled water to the Valley community at the rate of approximately 475 acre-feet/year, which recycled water it obtains from LACSD, i.e., the District; (2) “[i]n the next few years, SCV Water is proposing to expand the use of recycled water to additional users throughout the Santa Clarita Valley. Large landscape irrigation and industrial users will be targeted for recycled water use”; and (3) the benefits of this expansion include “less need to release recycled water to the Santa Clara River[.]” (https://yourscvwater.com/recycled-water , accessed 4/2/19,	appears as though SCV Water will be assuming the role of recycled water distributor. See also response to Comments 1.8, 1.9 and 1.11.	
3.22	ACWA commented that the local water agency is depending on an expanded supply of recycled water, which it states will come from recycled water that will not be released to the Santa Clara River. Indeed, for fiscal years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, the District contractually agreed to vast increases in recycled water allotments, well above the 475 acre-feet/year, to 2,200 acre-feet/year in both years.	The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items.	None necessary
3.23	ACWA commented that diverting more effluent away from discharge to the Santa Clara River has the potential to reduce River flows, which in turn may disrupt and damage the habitat of the Stickleback and other species, and should only be authorized after the most careful consideration by this Board, the other relevant agencies and referenced Exhibit 14, a letter from Dept. of Fish & Wildlife letter, dated 7/9/2016.	The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items. Please refer to response to Comment #3.16.	None necessary
3.24	ACWA urges this Board to condition any grant of additional time to the District on the strictest compliance with the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, and to ensure adequate analysis of impacts to, and full protection for, the Stickleback, the arroyo toad, and other species that live in the Santa Clara River and depend upon the River for their food and reproduction.	Please refer to responses to Comments 1.1 and 3.16. The Chloride Compliance Project already has concurrence from USEPA and must obtain concurrence from USFWS before proceeding. SCVSD has an independent duty to comply with the federal and State Endangered Species Acts. There is no need to add additional requirements to protect endangered species in the tentative TSOs.	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
3.25	The Tentative Orders are incomplete in their factual and legal narrative, and premature in their proposed actions. This Board should withdraw them, or reject them, and require the District to present proof of full compliance with the Judgment and Writ, and with CEQA, before issuing any orders.	Please refer to response to Comment 1.4. Language has been added to the Saugus WRP and Valencia WRP tentative TSOs in findings 13 and 14 to provide more of a narrative description of the court proceedings, for information purposes. The findings adequately support the need for the TSOs; there is no need to add more detail concerning the parties' litigation claims.	None necessary
3.26	ACWA commented that the Board should not intervene to enable the District to continue ignoring the law.	The Regional Water Board proposes to issue the TSOs to assist SCVSD in achieving compliance with the final effluent limitations for chloride in its NPDES permits. The Regional Water Board is authorized to issue time schedules in situations where a discharge is taking place that violates or will violate requirements prescribed by the regional water board pursuant to Water Code section 13300.	None necessary
Comments received from Ms. Sandra Cattell – Sierra Club Cover letter dated April 10, 2019			
4.1	The Sierra Club would like to comment on the actions of the Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District's Water Reclamation plants. The Sanitation District raised its rates based partly upon its pledge to its ratepayers that it would provide recycled water. With the District's claim that they can no longer carry out their promise, it is important to remind them that their project EIR lists the recycled water program as a formal "CEQA" project objective. Additionally, the District has not completed the EIR that Judge Chalfant has ordered regarding how the District will provide recycled water.	The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items. Please refer to responses to Comments #1.1, 1.4, 1.8, 1.9, and 1.20.	None necessary
4.2	The Sierra Club commented that Fish and Wildlife has asked the Sanitation District to perform an SEIR to do the following: LA County (SCH #2012011010) 1. Provide comments of the impacts to unarmored three spine stickleback under reduced discharge conditions 2. Research the impacts to Least Bell's Vireo	US Fish and Wildlife made those comments as a result of the 3.5 million gallon per day (MGD) proposed reduction in discharge that from the WRPs annual average flows (8.5 MGD for Valencia and 4.5 MGD for Saugus) that would occur if the recycled water component of the	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	3. Provide an environmental baseline 4. Provide a biological baseline assessment 5. Assess an Instream Flow analysis 6. Obtain a CESA 2081(a) permit 7. Obtain an LSA agreement through impact identification and management commitments 8. Refine the vegetation survey 9. Broaden the scope of the adaptive management plan The Sierra Club asks that the Sanitation District complete its obligation to provide an SEIR.	project operated. The water recycling efforts are outside the scope of the TSO items. Refer also to response to Comments 1.1 and 1.8.	
4.3	We also request that the May 9th hearing be held in the Santa Clarita Valley, which is the community most affected by your decisions.	Refer to response to Comment 1.2.	None necessary
4.4	Please forward this testimony to all of the Water Board members, Ms. Renee Purdy, Michael Lauffer, and to Eileen Sobeck.	Refer to response to Comment 1.24.	None necessary
Comments received from Ms. Lynne Plambeck – Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment (SCOPE) Cover letter dated April 10, 2019			
5.1	We note that the baseline chloride level of the Santa Clara River is 100 mg/l. After an extensive non-degradation process in 2008, a level of 117 mg/l was found to be protective of downstream agricultural resources. The TSO states that 230 mg/l is protective of fish and other amphibians. We would like to assert here that we believe that level is overstated and inaccurate. No evaluation of an increase in the chloride level that amounts to over 100% of baseline levels was ever conducted on the effects to the reproductive cycles of the many downstream endangered or threatened amphibians and fish. We did not pursue the effects to the reproductive cycle further because of lack of funding and because we felt that the agricultural limit of 117 mg/l would hopefully be sufficient to address species protection.	The Tentative TSOs for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs contain interim effluent limitations and final effluent limitations. Each of these sets of effluent limitations includes two parts, consistent with the assumptions and requirements of wasteload allocations in the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL. For the interim effluent limitations, there is, first, a 12-month rolling average, expressed as a formula, which takes into consideration the fluctuations in chloride concentrations in the imported water supply from the State Water Project. Second, a 230 mg/L Daily Maximum interim effluent limitation establishes a cap on chloride concentrations, while the discharger is implementing measures to achieve the part of the final effluent limitation to	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
		<p>protect the agricultural beneficial use. This 230 mg/L interim effluent limitation is the same as one part of the final WLA established in the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL, adopted by the Regional Water Board on October 9, 2014.</p> <p>In developing the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL, the Board considered the beneficial uses of the river, particularly salt-sensitive agriculture and aquatic life uses and the water quality objectives to protect those uses. For salt-sensitive agriculture, the Board considered the Literature Evaluation and Recommendations prepared as part of the Upper Santa Clara River Chloride TMDL Collaborative Process to determine the protective threshold. For aquatic life, the Board relied upon the Basin Plan. Chapter 3 of the Basin Plan contains the region's water quality objectives, including objectives for mineral quality in inland surface water (Table 3-10). Footnote f. to Table 3-10 establishes 230 mg/L as the concentration that is protective of freshwater aquatic life. This is based on USEPA's recommended water quality criteria for chloride developed pursuant to the Clean Water Act section 304(a). See USEPA's National Recommended Aquatic Life Criteria table. The Daily Maximum interim and final effluent limitation of 230 mg/L chloride is based on this Basin Plan water quality objective.</p>	
5.2	We are discouraged that after two decades of trying to address this problem, the Sanitation District has still not met the effluent limits required by the Clean Water Act and by your Board. While we understand that the court orders resulting from the EIR litigation may not be subverted by your Board, we also have	As explained in Finding 11 of the TSOs, a June 2, 2016 court order required SCVSD to cease work, which resulted in a delay. The proposed schedule is intended to provide SCVSD the time necessary to complete capital improvement projects that are	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>observed that the Sanitation District has sometimes appeared not to proceed in good faith. For instance, instead of working with the community to resolve obvious problems surrounding their earlier proposals, the community was forced to litigate to ensure that their homes were protected and conservation easements honored. Now, they want yet another extension. This continued delay is unacceptable. We request that your Board 1) shorten that extension to two years for the Valencia Plant, since the contract for the AWTF has already been awarded; and 2) to one year for the Saugus Plant, since the Saugus plant is only going to add UV treatment to reduce the need to chlorinate.</p>	<p>designed to bring the Saugus and Valencia WRPs into compliance with the final effluent limitations for chloride.</p> <p>For the Valencia WRP, while the proposed extension is 2½ years, the Discharger must start commissioning of AWTF within 2 years (by July 31, 2021). This represents the start of operation and entails testing equipment, instrumentation; sub-systems, and the overall process; adjusting settings; and optimizing the new treatment process, to ensure that equipment specifications as well as final effluent limitations are met.</p>	
5.3	<p>We further encourage you to create interim measures for failure to meet the any TSO that you may establish.</p>	<p>The TSOs already include Requirements 2, 4 and 6. Requirement 2 of each TSO establishes interim milestones and deadlines at a minimum every six months until the final deadline, while Requirement 4 of each TSO requires quarterly reporting of efforts taken by the Permittee towards achieving compliance with the final effluent limitations for chloride. Requirement 6 of each TSO states that:</p> <p>6. If the Permittee fails to comply with any provision of this TSO, the Regional Water Board may take any further action authorized by law. The Executive Officer, or his/her delegee, is authorized to take appropriate enforcement action pursuant, but not limited to, California Water Code sections 13350 and 13385. The Regional Water Board may also refer any violations to the Attorney General for judicial enforcement, including injunction and civil monetary remedies.</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
5.4	<p>We do not understand how the agency that would produce, contract for, and be responsible for any required mitigation for recycled water issuing from its facility, could be relieved of the duty to provide an EIR for those actions. Your Board should further be aware that this concept has not appeared on any Santa Clarita Valley Water Agency agenda, nor is it incorporated in their budget or other water planning documents. This resolution is, in our opinion, just one more example of an agency that would use means, that they are fully aware would not be legally acceptable, as a way to avoid conducting required environmental review. Since the recycled water project was originally part of the environmental review for this proposal, it is unclear whether the court will allow its abandonment, since it did not previously do so.</p>	<p>Refer to the responses to Comments 1.4, 1.8, 1.9, 1.19, 2.10, 3.4, 3.12, 3.16, and 3.22.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
<p>Comments received from Ms. Ann Heil – Santa Clarita valley Sanitation Districts (formerly Los Angeles County Sanitation District) Cover letter dated April 10, 2019</p>			
6.1	<p>SCVSD is grateful for the work done by staff at the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Board) to develop the subject TSOs, and appreciates the opportunity to provide comments</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
6.2	<p>The Sanitation District supports adoption of the TSOs, with the requested revisions listed in Attachment 1, as the TSOs will allow additional time to comply with chloride effluent limitations and deadlines required by the NPDES permits for the Saugus and Valencia Water Reclamation Plants (WRPs). The additional time is necessary due to delays in completion of the Chloride Compliance Project caused by repeated litigation that has impeded progress, and a summary of that litigation is provided below. As the Regional Board is no doubt aware, the Sanitation District remains committed to both chloride compliance and water recycling.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
6.3	<p>SCVSD provides a brief synopsis of the process they underwent to prepare an EIR and make subsequent revisions in response to</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	multiple lawsuits. Lawsuit #1 was regarding the October 2013 EIR. Lawsuit #2 pertained to the March 2016 Supplemental EIR (SEIR), which was subsequently de-certified. Lawsuit #3 will be regarding the August 2017 recirculated EIR.		
6.4	SCVSD commented that it is committed to providing recycled water where possible, but recognizes its limited authority in developing recycled water projects. The Service Duplication Act (California Public Utilities Code, Div. 1, Part 1, Chapter 8.5) generally prevents the Sanitation District from directly serving recycled water in a water purveyor's certificated service area. Delivery of both potable and recycled water to customers is the responsibility of the local retail and/or wholesale water purveyors, and decisions on the timing and scope of recycled water projects are made by those entities. In rare cases, the Sanitation District can deliver recycled water directly to end users; however, given the ongoing litigation, permitting challenges, and uncertainties associated with the Recycled Water Project, the Sanitation District's Board adopted a resolution on February 25, 2019 (Attachment 2) to cease and not proceed with any further planning efforts for the Recycled Water Project, to withdraw the proposed Recycled Water Project from the CEQA process, and to instead support local planning efforts of water agencies if and when those agencies seek to develop recycled water projects	Comment noted.	None necessary
6.5	This resolution and an earlier resolution adopted on July 7, 2015 (Attachment 3) are consistent with each other and with the Service Duplication Act in stating that the provision of recycled water in the Valley is a regional endeavor led by the water agencies that plan and carry out specific projects, rather than the Sanitation District. In addition, neither resolution indicates dependency of the Chloride Compliance Project on the provision of recycled water. The Chloride Compliance Project is a mandatory project that is designed to meet water quality standards for the Santa Clara River for the protection of agriculturally-related beneficial uses; it must move forward regardless of future plans for reuse of the recycled water produced by the Sanitation District.	Comment noted.	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
6.6	In summary, the Sanitation District remains committed to completing the Chloride Compliance Project, and to ensuring that recycled water is available to those entities in the best position to facilitate its use.	Comment noted.	None necessary
Comments received from Ms. Ann Heil – Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation Districts (formerly Los Angeles County Sanitation District) Attachment 1			
6.7	<p>SCVSD requests that the language in Requirement 1 be modified because they believe that the tentative TSOs establish new interim effluent limitations that supersede those in the NPDES permits for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs. Therefore, they request the addition of the following specific language that relieves the WRPs from the obligation to meet the final effluent limitations in the existing NPDES permits, since it appears that it is the intent of the Regional Board to provide such relief:</p> <p>For the Saugus WRP TSO: "<u>In lieu of the chloride final effluent limitations in Table 4 of Order No. R4-2015-0072, cComply immediately with the following interim effluent limitations which will apply all year round, and which shall be deemed effective from May 9, 2019 to January 31, 2021...</u>"</p> <p>For the Valencia WRP TSO: "<u>In lieu of the chloride final effluent limitations in Table 4 of Order No. R4-2015-0071, cComply immediately with the following interim effluent limitations which will apply all year round, and which shall be deemed effective from May 9, 2019 to January 31, 2022...</u>"</p>	<p>The proposed language does not correctly state the effect of the tentative TSOs. The tentative TSOs do not supersede the final effluent limitations in the NPDES permits for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs. Rather, the TSOs simply provide additional time to construct facilities necessary to comply with the final effluent limitations in the NPDES permit. Water Code 13385 subdivision (j)(3)(c)(iii) requires that the TSO contain interim requirements, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (I) Effluent limitations for the pollutant or pollutants of concern and (II) Actions and milestones leading to compliance with the effluent limitation. <p>For these reasons, the TSOs continue the interim effluent limitations in the NPDES permits and impose deadlines for completing tasks associated with construction of the additional treatment facilities, including reverse osmosis facilities for the removal of chloride. If SCVSD complies with the TSOs, Water Code section 13385 provides an exception to the imposition of mandatory minimum penalties for violations of effluent limitations in the NPDES permits.</p>	None necessary

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
6.8	<p>Similarly, SCVSD requests that the language in Requirement 7 be modified as follows, because they believe that the tentative TSOs also establish new milestones and deadlines that supersede those in Provision VI.C.7.B of Order Nos. R4-2015-0072 and R4-2015-0071:</p> <p>For the Saugus WRP: "All other provisions of Order No. R4-2015-0072 not in conflict with this TSO are in full force and effect, <u>with the exception of Requirement No. VI.C.7.B.</u>"</p> <p>For the Valencia WRP: "All other provisions of Order No. R4-2015-0071 not in conflict with this TSO are in full force and effect, <u>with the exception of Requirement No. VI.C.7.B.</u>"</p>	<p>The tentative TSOs do not modify the NPDES permits for the Saugus and Valencia WRPs. In addition, several of the tasks in Requirement VI.C.7.B, including monitoring and reporting, remain operative requirements, so the proposed language is inappropriate. As described above, the effect of the tentative TSOs is limited to providing relief from mandatory minimum penalties associated with discharges of chloride at levels that exceed final effluent limitations established in the NPDES permits.</p>	None necessary
6.9	<p>SCVSD requests that the language in Finding 14 be modified as follows, "On October 24, 2017, a court decision allowed SCVSD to resume work....The UV technology is designed to disinfect the treated effluent, but will also lower the amounts of disinfection byproducts produced, as well as reduce chloride concentrations by <u>approximately</u> 7 mg/L."</p>	<p>Finding 14 was already modified in response to Comment 3.4 to clarify that, "On November 16, 2017, SCVSD resumed work, following an October 24, 2017 court ruling..." The word "approximately" was added in the last sentence of that paragraph.</p>	Language similar to what was requested was inserted into Finding 14.
6.10	<p>SCVSD requests that the language in Finding 12 be modified, for completeness, as follows, to include the date that the SCVSD Board of Directors approved a resolution to cease environmental studies related to the Recycled Water Project:</p> <p>"On August 4, 2016, SCVSD issued a Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report.... <u>On February 25, 2019</u>, the SCVSD Board of Directors approved a resolution to cease environmental studies related to the Recycled Water Project."</p>	<p>Finding 12 was modified as requested.</p>	Language was inserted into Finding 12.
6.11	<p>SCVSD requests that the language in Finding 18 of the Valencia WRP TSO be modified as follows:</p>	<p>Finding 18 was modified as requested in the Valencia WRP TSO.</p>	Language was inserted into Finding 18.

#	Comment	Response	Action Taken
	<p>“On February 8, 2019, SCVSD notified the Regional Water Board that on January 31, 2019, the SCVSD Board of Directors awarded a \$87 million contract to Obrascon Huarte Lain (OHL), U.S.A. to construct the advanced water treatment facility (AWTF) at the Valencia WRP.”</p>		
6.12	<p>SCVSD requests that the language in Finding 18 of the Saugus WRP TSO be modified to add another task that has initiated, as follows:</p> <p>Add a row to the table and insert the interim milestone task “Start Onsite Construction”, with a completion date of “November 28, 2018.”</p>	<p>Finding 18 was modified as requested in the Saugus WRP TSO.</p>	<p>Language was inserted into Finding 18.</p>
6.13	<p>SCVSD provided a copy of the Resolution that the Board of Directors of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District adopted on February 25, 2019, Regarding Withdrawing Notice of Preparation of Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for Recycled Water Project in Santa Clarita Valley, as Attachment 2.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>
6.14	<p>SCVSD provided a copy of the Resolution that the of the Board of Directors of Santa Clarita Valley Sanitation District adopted on July 7, 2014, Regarding the Sustainability of Water Resources and Development of Opportunities to Use Recycled Water In the Santa Clarita Valley.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>None necessary</p>