

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

Please submit by 17 January 2014 to AraceliCazarez@KennedyJenks.com

Project Template

Please provide information in the tables below:

I. Project Proponent Information

| | |
|--|--|
| Agency/ Organization | Squaw Valley Public Service District |
| Name of Primary Contact | Mike Geary |
| Name of Secondary Contact | Cindy Herbert |
| Mailing Address | P.O. Box 2026, Olympic Valley, CA 96146 |
| E-mail | cherbert@svpsd.org |
| Phone (###)###-#### | 530-583-4692 |
| Other Cooperating Agencies/Organizations/Stakeholders | TDPUD, NCSD, Placer County Water Agency, Placer County, Alpine Springs CWD, SV Mutual Water Co., SW Gas, SuddenLink, Liberty Energy, ATT |
| Is your agency/organization committed to the project through completion? If not, please explain | Yes |

II. General Project Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Title | Redundant Water Supply |
| Project Category | <input type="checkbox"/> Restoration <input type="checkbox"/> Storm Water/Flood Control <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Waste Water/ Water Supply |
| Project Description (Briefly describe the project, in 300 words or less) | <p>The Squaw Valley Public Service District (District) is actively pursuing a project to procure redundant and supplemental water supplies for future reliability and beneficial uses of our constituents. In September 2009, the District completed the Alternative/Supplemental Water Supply and Enhanced Utilities Feasibility Study. The purpose of the study was to determine potential project "fatal flaws" and it investigated the feasibility of importing water supplies from outside District boundaries. The Study concluded that the feasibility of the project was apparent based on the available water supply from the Martis Valley; desire of local water purveyors to work with the District on the project; potential transmission main corridors within the Highway 89 corridor and USFS rights of way; there being no major environmental fatal flaws; and interest from natural gas and communications providers in the area partnering with the District to create a utility corridor to provide these services to the Valley and others along the alignment. Phase II of the project titled the Preferred Alternative Analysis is currently moving forward in concert with Placer County's Truckee River Access and Bike Trail Project. Phase II will consist of an alternatives analysis, preliminary design, and updated feasibility study to include cost estimates and a public outreach program. Phase III of the project, the subject of this project description, is the environmental compliance and permitting stage of the project with construction of the terminal tank. The terminal tank will, in the short term, provide system balancing to mitigate the 3 mile distance from the West Tank and enhance fire flows in eastern Olympic Valley. The installation of a utility corridor along the Truckee</p> |

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | River would require compliance with CEQA, Clean Water Act Section 401 and 404, Federal and California Endangered Species Act and California Fish and Game Code Section 1600A. | |
| Project Prioritization: | Total number of projects submitted by your Agency: | 6 |
| | Agency Prioritization of this project (e.g., 3 of 5) | 1 |
| Does this project contribute to a larger Project (e.g., TMDL, EIP, Phase 2 of 3) ? If so provide description. | Yes, feasibility phase completed, preferred alternative study and preliminary design funded and underway. This is the environmental and 1st construction phase of a large regional project that may include another project for public access to an aquatic resource (Truckee River Access and Bikeway Project) | |
| Political Support – List related MOUs, agreements or TACs currently in place. | Olympic Valley Groundwater Management Plan | |
| Project Location: | | |
| Latitude: | 39.20511 | |
| Longitude: | -120.20595 | |
| Project Location Description (e.g., along the south bank of stream/river between river miles or miles from Towns/intersection and/or address): | The project consists of up to 8.5 miles of utility corridor to be installed in concert with the Truckee River Access and Bike Path Project adjacent to the Truckee River between Truckee and Olympic Valley, a supply source, booster station, and terminal tank | |

III. Plan Objectives Addressed

For each of the objectives addressed by the project, provide a one to two sentence description of how the project contributes to attaining the objective and how the project will be quantified. If the project does not address any of the draft IRWM plan objectives, provide a one to two sentence description of how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity of the Region (see the bottom of page 4).

| Objectives: | Will the project address the objective? | Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective | Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced) |
|--|---|---|--|
| WQ1 - Meet approved TMDL standards in accordance with the attainment date, and participate in the development of future TMDLs. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | A redundant water supply will result in reduced pumping of the Squaw Valley aquifer thus increasing surface flows in Squaw Creek, a direct impact on TMDL's | Presently unknown |

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

| Objectives: | Will the project address the objective? | Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective | Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced) |
|---|---|---|--|
| WQ2 – Reduce pollutant loads by implementing measures such as stormwater LID retrofits, erosion control/restoration to meet Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) for receiving water bodies established in the Basin Plan within the planning horizon. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| WQ3 - Implement water quality monitoring programs through planning horizon, and coordinate annually throughout the Region. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| WQ4 - Ensure that drinking water supplied by public water systems continues to meet Federal and State standards. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | A redundant water supply will help to ensure the continued quality of the Squaw Valley aquifer by reducing reliance on the already limited resource | Presently unknown |
| WQ5 - Restore degraded streams, wetlands, riparian and upland areas to re-establish natural water filtering processes. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Reduced pumping on the Squaw Valley aquifer will help to increase in stream flows and restore riparian habitat | Presently unknown |
| WQ6 -Operate and maintain, build, or replace infrastructure for reliable collection, treatment and disposal of wastewater. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| WS1 - Provide water supply to meet projected demands for a 20-year planning horizon. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | A redundant and supplemental water supply will provide water for build out demand for 20 years and beyond | A WSA is being prepared to update quantity necessary. Assume 1,210 Acre Feet |
| WS2 - Operate and maintain, build, or replace infrastructure to reliably supply water. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project builds infrastructure for long term redundancy and reliability of water supply | 1,210 Acre-Feet |

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

| Objectives: | Will the project address the objective? | Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective | Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced) |
|---|---|--|--|
| WS3 - Implement and promote water conservation measures and practices to meet state goals. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| GWM1 - Maintain and monitor groundwater supply to assure future reliability. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project maintains redundancy and supplements water supply | 1,210 Acre-Feet |
| GWM2 - Promote groundwater protection activities for high quality groundwater, and advocate for improvements to impacted groundwater quality through public education. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project includes public education and outreach program | Unknown |
| GWM3 - Manage groundwater for multiple uses (e.g. municipal/industrial/agricultural supply and environmental use). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project provides supplemental supply for future users. Positive environment impact by reduced pumping of Squaw Valley aquifer | Increase existing supply by 1,210 Acre Feet |
| ER1 - Enhance and restore water bodies, wetlands, riparian areas and associated uplands to support healthy watersheds, viable native fish, wildlife and plant habitats. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project promotes reduced pumping on existing aquifer which in turn increases surface flows improving habitat during low flow periods | Unknown |
| ER2 - Develop and implement programs to prevent the spread of existing invasive species and colonization of potential future invasive species. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| ER3 - Implement, in coordination with public and private landowners, activities to manage forest health and wildfire risks. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project provides fire protection to private landowners along 8 mile corridor adjacent to Truckee River where none presently exists | Unknown |

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

| Objectives: | Will the project address the objective? | Brief explanation of project linkage to selected Objective | Quantification (e.g. acres of streams/wetlands restored or enhanced) |
|--|---|---|--|
| ER4 - Minimize ecosystem impacts caused by existing and new development. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| IWM1 - Conduct local and regional water-related planning activities within the planning horizon as supported by current and future watershed science. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| IWM2 - Ensure collaboration among multiple jurisdictions within the Region for information exchange. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project will be a coordinated effort between water purveyors, county parks department, communications, and gas company | Presently Unknown |
| IWM3 - Increase public education and awareness of watershed functions, protection and restoration needs to encourage stewardship by the public. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Projects promotes goals of the Squaw Valley Groundwater Management Plan, includes public outreach and education program | Unknown |
| IWM4 - Promote activities that reduce flood risk. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |
| IWM5 - Address climate change (e.g. water quality, water supply, groundwater recharge, flood management) in local and regional planning efforts and support efforts to continue improving the science. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | A long term reliable water supply is needed to offset impacts of global warming, may become critical infrastructure in future supply scenario. Meets Groundwater Management Plan Goals. | Unknown |
| IWM6 - Monitor water storage, release and exchange activities in order to improve coordination with regional planning. | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- |

If no objectives are addressed; describe how the project relates to a challenge or opportunity of the Region:

| |
|----|
| -- |
|----|

Project Impacts and Benefits

Please provide a summary of the expected project benefits and impacts in the table below or check N/A if not applicable; **do not leave a blank cell.**

| If applicable describe benefits or impacts of the project with respect to: | | |
|--|---|---|
| a. Native American Tribal Community considerations. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- |
| b. Disadvantaged Community considerations¹. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- |
| c. Environmental Justice² considerations. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- |
| d. Assist the Region in adapting to effects of climate change³. | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project mitigates long term impacts of climate change through drought supply planning |
| e. Generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. green technology). | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Bringing natural gas to the region will replace heating oil and propane as the energy source thus reducing green house gases |
| f. Other expected impacts or benefits that are not already mentioned elsewhere. | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Project provides fire protection facilities to residents along Truckee River urban wild-land interface. Bringing natural gas to region will allow the elimination of thousands of propane tanks lowering human risks and reducing fire dangers. |

1. A Disadvantaged Community is defined as a community with an annual median household (MHI) income that is less than 80 percent of the Statewide annual MHI. A map has been provided with the Project Template Instruction for reference.

2. Environmental Justice is defined as the fair treatment of people of all races, cultures, and incomes with respect to the development, adoption, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies. An example of environmental justice benefit would be to improve conditions (e.g. water supply, flooding, sanitation) in an area of racial minorities

3. Climate change effects are likely to include increased flooding, extended drought, and associated secondary effects such as increased wildfire risk, erosion, and sedimentation.

IV. Resource Management Strategies (RMS)

For each resource management strategy employed by the project, provide a one to two sentence description in the table below of how the project incorporates the strategy. A description of the Resource Management Strategies can be found in Volume 2 of the 2009 California Water Plan here:

<http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/cwpu2009/index.cfm>

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

| Resource Management Strategy | Will the Project incorporate RMS? | Description, of how RMS to be employed if applicable |
|--|---|--|
| Reduce Water Demand | | |
| Agricultural Water Use Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Urban Water Use Efficiency | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Improve Operational Efficiency and Transfers | | |
| Conveyance - Regional / local | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project reduces reliance on existing supply, provides regional conveyance of resources |
| System Reoperation | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Water Transfers | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Increase Water Supply | | |
| Conjunctive Management & Groundwater | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project promotes regional solution to long term water supply |
| Desalination | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Precipitation Enhancement | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Recycled Municipal Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Surface Storage -- Regional / Local | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project adds 2 million gallon water storage tank to local water system |
| Improve Water Quality | | |
| Drinking Water Treatment and Distribution | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project reduces or eliminates need to treat future groundwater supply |
| Groundwater and Aquifer Remediation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project reduces demand on Squaw Valley aquifer |
| Matching Water Quality to Use | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Pollution Prevention | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Reduced groundwater pumping minimizes pollutant transport |
| Salt and Salinity Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Urban Runoff Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Practice Resources Stewardship | | |
| Agricultural Lands Stewardship | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Economic Incentives (Loans, Grants, and Water Pricing) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Ecosystem Restoration | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Reduced groundwater pumping will increase in stream flow and help restore riparian habitat |
| Forest Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Land Use Planning and Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Recharge Areas Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |
| Water-dependent Recreation | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |

Tahoe Sierra IRWM

| | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Watershed Management | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | Project implements goals of groundwater management plan |
| Improve Flood Management | | |
| Flood Risk Management | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | -- |

Note: The following RMS have been omitted from the list: Conveyance-Delta and Surface Storage – CALFED.

Other RMS addressed and explanation:

| |
|--|
| Project provides for redundant and/ or supplemental water supply as mandated by the State of California Water Code section 10610.2 (3) and the Safe Drinking Water Act amendment, the Bio-terrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 300i-4 (b |
|--|

V. Project Cost and Financing - Please provide any estimates of project cost, sources of funding, and operation and maintenance costs, as well as, the source of the project cost in the table below.

| a. Project Costs | Requested Grant Amount | Cost Share: Non-State Fund Source (Local/Federal Funding Match) | Cost Share: Other State Fund Source | Total Cost |
|--|---|---|---|------------|
| 1. Capital (2013 Dollars) | 2765000 | \$920,000 OR <input type="checkbox"/> DAC | 0 | 3685000 |
| 2. Annual Operations and Maintenance (O&M) | | \$10,000 | 0 | 10000 |
| b. Can the Project be phased? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | | | |
| 1. If so provide cost breakdown by phase(s) | Project Cost | O&M Cost | Description of Phase | |
| Phase 1 | 323000 | 0 | Feasibility Study, Alternative Analysis, Preliminary Design, Cost Estimates | |
| Phase 2 | 3685000 | 10000 | CEQA, Permitting, Terminal Tank | |
| Phase 3 | 4140000 | 50000 | Well Construction/ Booster Station | |
| Phase 4 | 18630000 | 50000 | 20" Transmission Main | |
| c. List secured source(s) of funding for Project cost | Source(s) | | Amount | |
| | Undetermined | | \$-No secured funds are presently available | |
| d. List proposed source(s) of unsecured funding and certainty of the sources for Project cost. | PCWAPlacer CountyCDPH-SRF | | \$-Presently Unknown | |
| e. Explain how operation and maintenance costs will be financed for the 25-year planning period for project implementation (not grant funded). | O & M will be provided by District when constructed through operating revenues. | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>f. Basis for project cost¹ (e.g. conceptual, planning, bid, etc.)</p> | <p>Previous study: Alternative Supplemental Water Supply and Enhanced Utilities Feasibility Study 2009 Farr West Engineering.</p> |
| <p>g. Has a Cost/Benefit analysis been completed?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> |
| <p>h. Please describe what impact there may be if the project is not funded. (300 words or less)</p> | <p>The subject of this application is the construction of a terminal tank and the environmental and permitting phase of a larger regional water supply project to import water from the Martis Valley aquifer to the Truckee River, Olympic Valley, and potentially Alpine Springs CWD, and Squaw Valley Mutual Water Company. Should importing water from Martis Valley, a technically feasible project, become the preferred alternative the total cost of the project may be 26 million dollars or more. The District is actively pursuing funding partnerships with other agencies including Placer County Water Agency, Placer County Parks and Recreation (Truckee River Access and Bike Trail Project), Southwest Gas, Suddenlink Cable, Alpine Springs CWD, developers, and other beneficiaries. It is imperative at this stage the District assume a leadership role in establishing the environmental feasibility, obtain permits, and construct the terminal tank. With the Placer County Truckee River Access and Bike Trail project moving forward the opportunity for a joint project is now. If the project is not funded the future redundancy and reliability of the District water source remains uncertain. The eastern subdivisions in Squaw Valley will continue to suffer from pressure fluctuations and water hammer without the terminal tank to balance water demand. The Squaw Valley aquifer may be further depleted by long term impacts of global warming. Regional growth as projected in the Squaw Valley General Plan will not be possible due to lack of water supply resulting in long term economic impact. The opportunity cost of partnering with Placer County and developers who are considering a natural gas pipeline would be lost. Funding for the EIR stage of the project at this time will put the project on track with other stakeholders and pave the way for forming the funding mechanisms for a project of this magnitude.</p> |

1. For the grant application a detailed project cost estimate will need to be provided with the following cost categories; per the IRWM PSP for Round 2, Implementation Grants: Direct Project Administration, Land Purchase/Easement, Planning/Design/Engineering/Environmental Documentation, Construction/Implementation, Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement, Construction Administration, Other Costs, and Construction/Implementation Contingency.

VI. Project Status and Schedule -Please provide a status of the project, level of completion as well as a description of the activities planned for each project stage. If unknown enter **TBD**.

| Project Stage | Check the Current Project Stage | Completed? | Description of Activities in Each Project Stage | Planned/Actual Start Date (mm/yr) | Planned/Actual Completion Date (mm/yr) |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| a. Assessment and Evaluation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Feasibility study completed. Alternative analysis and further evaluation of pipeline alignment is currently funded and progressing | 11/1/2013 | 12/1/2014 |
| b. Final Design | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | -- | -- |
| c. Environmental Documentation (CEQA/NEPA) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | CEQA/ NEPA & project permitting is subject of this application | 12/1/2014 | 12/1/2015 |
| d. Permitting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | CEQA/ NEPA & project permitting is subject of this application | 7/1/2014 | 12/1/2015 |
| e. Construction Contracting | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | -- | 1/1/2016 | 5/1/2016 |
| f. Construction Implementation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A | Construction of Terminal Tank is subject of this application | 5/1/2016 | 11/1/2016 |

| | |
|--|---|
| Provide explanation if more than one project stage is checked as current status | The District completed a fatal flaw feasibility study in 2009. Currently funded is a project to select the proffered alternative and alignment, select pumping facilities and terminal tank locations, and preliminary design with engineers estimates; to be |
|--|---|

VIII. Project Technical Feasibility

Please provide any related documents (date, title, author, and page numbers) that describe and confirm the technical feasibility of the project.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>a. List the adopted planning documents the proposed project is consistent with or supported by (e.g. General Plans, UWMPs, GWMPs, Water Master Plans, Habitat Conservation Plans, TMDLs, Basin Plans, etc.)</p> | <p>Olympic Valley Groundwater Management Plan, May 2007 HydroMetrics LLC, Page 53</p> |
| <p>b. List technical reports and studies supporting the feasibility of this project</p> | <p>Alternative/Supplemental Water Supply and Enhanced Utilities Feasibility Study. Eco-Logic 2009</p> |
| <p>c. Concisely describe the scientific basis (e.g. how much research has been conducted) of the proposed project in 300 words or less.</p> | <p>The Squaw Valley Aquifer and future redundant or supplemental water supply has been the source of exhaustive research over the past two decades or more. The following reports and studies are a summary of past efforts: Squaw Valley Public Service District 2002 Capacity & Reliability Study March 2003, ECO:LOGIC Squaw Valley Groundwater Development & Utilization Feasibility Study Update August 14, 2003, West Yost Associates Squaw Valley 2004 Model Update/Updated Sustainable Yield Analysis August 30, 2004, HydroMetrics Groundwater Management Support Activities Groundwater Characterization Report May 12, 2005, West Yost Hydrogeological Information Review and Assessment of ASR Potential March 28, 2005, ASR Systems Olympic Valley Ground Water Management Plan 2007, HydroMetrics Age Dating Squaw Valley Water November 20, 2008, Lawrence Livermore Labs Alternative/Supplemental Water Supply and Enhanced Utilities Feasibility Study September 2009, ECO:LOGIC Olympic Valley Creek Aquifer Study Final Report (Draft) November 2013,</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>HydroMetrics Groundwater Resource Evaluation (Martis Valley)November 2000, Nimbus Engineers Independent Appraisal of Martis Valley Groundwater Availability May 2002, Kennedy Jenks Consultants Martis Valley Groundwater Management PlanApril 2013, Balance Hydrologies Martis Valley Surface/ Groundwater Interaction Study2012 Interflow Hydrology The District is currently studying alternatives to importing water from Martis Valley and feasibility of a joint utility corridor to serve residences from Truckee to Alpine Springs; the culmination of years of effort paving the way for the environmental phase of the project.</p> |
| <p>d. Does the project implement green technology (e.g. alternate forms of energy, recycled materials, LID techniques, etc.)</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> |
| <p>1. If so please describe</p> | <p>The joint utility corridor will bring</p> |
| <p>e. If you are an Urban Water Supplier¹:</p> | <p style="background-color: black; color: black;"> </p> |
| <p>1. Have you completed an Urban Water Management Plan and submitted to DWR?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> |
| <p>2. Are you in compliance with AB1420?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> |
| <p>3. Do you comply with the water meter requirements (CWC §525)</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> |
| <p>4. If the answer to any of the questions above is “no”, do you intend to comply prior to receiving project funding</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Provide Explanation if necessary: District currently serves less than 3,000 customers</p> |
| <p>f. If you are an Agricultural Water Supplier²:</p> | <p style="background-color: black; color: black;"> </p> |
| <p>1. Have you completed and submitted an AWMP (due 12/31/12)?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> |
| <p>2. If not, will you complete and submit an AWMP prior to receiving project funding?</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A</p> <p>Provide Explanation if necessary:--</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| g. If the project is related to groundwater: | |
| 1. Has a GWMP been completed and submitted for the subject basin? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| 2. If not will a GWMP be completed within 1 year of the grant submittal date? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A |

1. Urban Water Supplier is defined as a supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water for municipal purposes either directly or indirectly to more than 3,000 customers or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually.

2. Agricultural Water Supplier is defined as a water supplier, either publicly or privately owned, providing water to 10,000 or more irrigated acres, excluding the acreage that receives recycled water.