



PUBLIC HEARING REQUEST TO SPEAK/WRITTEN COMMENT FORM



20

NAME (Please print):

MARY COURTNEY

DO YOU WISH TO SPEAK AT THIS MEETING?

☒ YES☐ NO

ADDRESS (Street and Number):

23741 Alta Madera Dr.

CITY:

Valencia

STATE:

CA

ZIP CODE:

91355-2222

TELEPHONE NO.:

EMAIL ADDRESS:

mary@courtney.org

REGARDLESS OF WHETHER YOU PROVIDE VERBAL COMMENTS TODAY, IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO PROVIDE WRITTEN COMMENTS ON THIS PROJECT, YOU MAY RESPOND BELOW AND SUBMIT THIS SHEET TO A CORPS OR CDFG REPRESENTATIVE OR WRITE TO THE CORPS OR CDFG BY JUNE 26, 2009 AT: U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, LOS ANGELES DISTRICT; REGULATORY BRANCH - VENTURA FIELD OFFICE; ATTN: CESPL-RG-N-2003-01264-AOA; 2151 ALESSANDRO DRIVE, SUITE 110; VENTURA, CA 93001 OR CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME - NEWHALL RANCH EIS/EIR PROJECT COMMENTS; 4949 VIEWRIDGE AVENUE; SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
ALTERNATIVELY, YOU MAY EMAIL COMMENTS TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESSES: Aaron.O.Allen@usace.army.mil or newhallranch@dfg.ca.gov by June 26, 2009.

COMMENTS

I think I understand correctly that well water will be used for residential use. In agricultural ~~areas~~ ^{uses}, well water helps replenish the aquifer, but if it is used in residential and commercial areas, the water does not return to the source.

I am also concerned with the many mitigations that will need to be enforced. The amount of sprinkler run-off just along Valencia's streets is an indication of how ill-prepared

DATA REQUIRED BY THE PRIVACY ACT

AUTHORITY: 33 CFR 327

PRINCIPAL PURPOSE: Distributed at Public Meetings and Workshops to provide a record of attendees, and to develop a mailing list for future public meetings in keeping with the policy of OCE to conduct Civil Works Program in an atmosphere of public understanding, trust and mutual cooperation. All interested individuals and agencies are to be informed and afforded an opportunity to be heard and their views considered in arriving at conclusions, decisions, and recommendations in the formulation of civil works proposals, plans, projects, and on the proposed uses of navigable waters.

ROUTINE USES: Utilized for determining attendance at Public Meetings; determining who desires to speak at Corps Public Meetings and developing mailing lists for various Corps studies.

DISCLOSURE: Voluntary. Failure to provide information may result in not being contacted for future public meetings, etc.

— especially when human behavior is part of the necessary compliance.

137. Public Hearing Comment Card from Mary Courtney

Response 1

This comment expresses general concerns about water supply and the Project's effects related to groundwater recharge. These topics received extensive analysis in **Section 4.3**, Water Resources, of the Draft EIS/EIR. For example, the evaluation of the Project's impacts on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge, which is provided on page 4.3-86 of the Draft EIS/EIR states, in part:

"Groundwater recharge would not be substantially impacted by the water demands based on the best available information. This information shows that no adverse impacts on Basin recharge have occurred or would occur due to the existing or projected use of local groundwater supplies. Based on a memorandum prepared by CH2MHill (Effect of Urbanization on Aquifer Recharge in the Santa Clarita Valley, February 22, 2004; see **Appendix 4.3**), no significant impacts would occur to the groundwater basin with respect to aquifer recharge. Urbanization in the Santa Clarita Valley has been accompanied by long-term stability in pumping and groundwater levels and the addition of imported SWP water to the Valley; together, these actions have not reduced recharge to groundwater, nor depleted the amount or level of groundwater in storage within the local groundwater basin. These findings are also consistent with the CLWA/purveyor groundwater operating plan for the Basin (see EIS/EIR, **Appendix 4.3**, 2005 Basin Yield Report)."

Additional analysis of potential groundwater recharge impacts also is provided, including the following text from page 4.3-87 of the Draft EIS/EIR:

"Currently, portions of the Specific Plan area are irrigated agricultural land. Some of these areas would be developed for the proposed Project, introducing impervious surface over approximately 30 percent of the Project area. The reduction in irrigated agriculture and the increase in paved area would reduce overall recharge; however, several factors would serve to counter the impact of urbanization on groundwater recharge within the Specific Plan area:

- Development within the Specific Plan area would increase runoff volume discharged after treatment (*e.g.*, in water quality control facilities) to the Santa Clara River, whose channel is predominantly natural and consists of vegetation and coarse-grained sediments. The porous nature of the sands and gravels forming the streambed allows for significant infiltration to occur to the Alluvial aquifer underlying the Santa Clara River;
- Development of the Specific Plan area would significantly increase the area of irrigated landscaping on currently undeveloped land, which would serve to increase the amount of recharge to the area; and
- The groundwater supply for the Specific Plan post-development would not require an increase in groundwater pumping beyond the applicant's existing agricultural allocation (7,038 afy).

In addition, irrigation used in the Project area would increase the amount of recharge available to the Santa Clara River. Based on the above information, the Specific Plan impacts on groundwater recharge and levels would be less than significant relative to Significance Criterion 1."

Based on the analysis of potential groundwater recharge impacts summarized above and other analysis provided in **Section 4.3** of the Draft EIS/EIR, the proposed Project and the alternatives would not result in significant impacts to groundwater levels in the Project area. In addition, for further responsive information, please see revised **Section 4.3** of the Final EIS/EIR, and **Topical Response 8: Groundwater Supplies and Overdraft Claims**.

Response 2

This comment addresses general concerns regarding the enforcement of mitigation measures recommended by the Draft EIS/EIR. Upon project approval, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) would adopt a mitigation monitoring or reporting program, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081.6, to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions it has adopted to mitigate or avoid significant impacts of the project are implemented, consistent with CDFG's regulatory jurisdiction under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) and California Fish & Game Code section 1600, *et seq.* The U.S. Army Corps and Engineers (Corps) and CDFG appreciate the commentor's concerns, which will be included as part of the record and made available to decision makers prior to a final decision on the proposed Project.