

5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED AT THE PUBLIC HEARING AND RESPONSES

The following persons, organizations, or public agencies provided oral comments on the adequacy of the Draft Additional Analysis during the May 2, 2006 public hearing:

1. Diane Trautman, Planning Commissioner, City of Santa Clarita
2. Sandra Cattell
3. Lynn Plambeck, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment

5.1 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

5.1.1 Comments of Diane Trautman, Planning Commissioner, City of Santa Clarita

Comment 1

Table 3.0-18 is confusing and appears to be mistaken.

Response 1

Table 3.0-18 has been revised. Please see Final Additional Analysis **Section 6.0, Revised Draft Additional Analysis Pages**, to view the revised table.

Comment 2

What is the timing of litigation currently pending in the Santa Clarita Valley and state regarding water supply?

Response 2

Several lawsuits are pending that relate to water supply in the Santa Clarita Valley and state. See **Topical Response 2: Litigation Concerning Water Supplies** for a discussion regarding each of the known cases. Given the unique nature regarding each of the cases, it is not possible to predict when they may be resolved.

Comment 3

When will the new EIR on the Monterey Agreement being prepared by the Department of Water Resources (DWR) be prepared?

Response 3

DWR prepared the Notice of Preparation for the new Monterey Agreement EIR and circulated it to the public in February 2003. The Draft EIR is currently being prepared by DWR. The circulation date of the new EIR has not yet been established by DWR.

5.1.2 Comments of Sandra Cattell

Comment 4

The topics of global warming, levee stability, and water accounting are best addressed at the state level.

Response 4

For additional information regarding the effects of climate change, please see **Topical Response 3: Climate Change and its Effects**. Each of the topics indicated are addressed by DWR in a variety of documents including the *SWP Delivery Reliability Report* and the *California Water Plan*. Both of these documents were used as reference information during the preparation of the Additional Analysis.

Comment 5

The commenter provided comments favorable to the project and its applicant.

Response 5

The comments indicated are acknowledged and have been considered by the City as part of its review of this document. Because the comments do not address the content of the Draft Additional Analysis, no further response is provided.

5.1.3 Comments of Lynn Plambeck, Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment

After the public hearing, this commenter provided more detailed written comments that address the topics raised during public testimony. Please see the responses to the comments provided by the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment, dated May 4, 2006.

Comment 6

The commenter is opposed to the project.

Response 6

The comments indicated are acknowledged and have been considered by the City as part of its review of this document. Because the comments do not address the content of the Draft Additional Analysis, no further response is provided.

Comment 7

Planning projects cannot rely on Castaic Lake Water Agency's (CLWA's) 41,000 acre-feet per year (afy) water transfer it purchased in 1999. It can only be relied on for current projects.

Response 7

The City disagrees with this comment. Please see **Topical Response 1: CLWA's 41,000 AFY Water Transfer** for addition information on this topic.

Comment 8

CLWA should not be the agency preparing the EIR for the 41,000 afy transfer. DWR should prepare the document.

Response 8

The City does not agree with this comment. CLWA is free to prepare its own EIR and has done so. The Final EIR for the transfer was certified by CLWA in December 2004. That document is presently the subject of litigation. Please see **Topical Response 1: CLWA's 41,000 AFY Water Transfer** and **Topical Response 2: Litigation Concerning Water Supplies** for additional information.

Comment 9

The 41,000 afy water transfer is not permanent.

Response 9

The City does not agree. Available information presented in this Additional Analysis indicates that the transfer is permanent. Please see **Topical Response 1: CLWA's 41,000 AFY Water Transfer** for additional information.

Comment 10

Chloride pollution is an issue for the City to understand and address.

Response 10

The comments indicated are acknowledged and have been considered by the City as part of its review of this document. Please see the response to the letter presented by Friends of the Santa Clara River, dated May 4, 2006.

Comment 11

The Saugus Formation is still polluted with perchlorate and the clean up efforts are not funded.

Response 11

Please see **Response 18** to the comments provided in the letter provided by the Santa Clarita Organization for Planning and the Environment, dated May 4, 2006.