

Discussion of the WSA and the Village at Squaw Project at PSD meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2014

=====

New dates for WSA (these supersede whatever is in these meeting notes:

The schedule for delivery and presentations of the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for the Village at Squaw Valley Project has changed and is currently as follows:

- \* June 24, 2014 - Board Meeting - Receive presentation of the Draft WSA.
- \* July 15, 2014 - The Final WSA is delivered to Placer County (the County Board of Supervisors will consider its approval with the project's EIR).
- \* July 29, 2014 - Board Meeting - Receive presentation of the Final WSA.

=====

The discussion started with a question by PSD Board President Dale Cox about the 25-year development projection considered in the WSA. There have been two projections of future development and Dale requested an explanation of the specific difference between the two.

- 1) One projection was estimated by the PSD, and involved analysis of the maximum development as allowed by the specific land use classifications (zonings) under the Squaw Valley General Plan. A parcel by parcel review was performed within their service boundary, to estimate the maximum General Plan buildout. This included Resort Phase II, KSL Village, Plumpjack redevelopment, Poulsen property, Olympic Estates, and the Sena property.
- 2) The County's projections use both a list and forecast approach to determine cumulative development within Squaw Valley.

The list approach considers approved projects currently under construction, projects that are approved that have not been constructed, and projects that are expected to be approved and constructed for which the County is currently processing an application(s) or has direct knowledge of the project and reasonably expects it to be carried out. This part of the County's projections include the Resort at Squaw Creek - Phase II, KSL Village, Plumpjack redevelopment, Olympic Estates, Squaw Valley Ranch Estates, Mancuso property and the Olympic Valley Museum.

The forecast approach does not assign development to any specific properties but considers historical rates of development (looking back 25 years); development could occur anywhere where it is authorized within Squaw. It is intended solely to provide a reasonable basis for predicting cumulative conditions within the 25-year time frame so that an appropriate cumulative impact analysis can be performed. This portion of the projection is not intended to serve as a precise prediction regarding the amount of development that will occur on a particular parcel; rather, the analysis is a forecast of the cumulative, aggregate level of development that will exist in 25 years.

The County's development projection is a lower number than the PSD's General Plan buildout projection and considers only the next 25-years.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>The explanation of the County's development projections described in #2 above was reviewed and edited by Mike Geary. Not all of the information was specifically discussed during the meeting and includes information from a Technical Memo that will be included in the WSA.

The County raised concern that the PSD was not a Public Water System, as defined by statute and that the PSD did not have the authority to approve the WSA. However, both the County and Developer desired the PSD to prepare the WSA for submission to the County, as the approving agency, utilizing their projections to a 25 year horizon.

Mike Geary did not have the difference in the two estimates with him at the meeting, but promised to provide it to the Board. However, he compared it to “apples and oranges”. The PSD was determining demand projections based on the 1983 SV General Plan and zoning/parcels listed (“maximal build out”). The County (and the developer) used growth rate numbers looking back 25 years, then projecting forward 25 years. The PSD BOD has requested these numbers.

Mike Geary then went to make sure everyone understood that the WSA is an assessment of aquifer capacity and does not commit the PSD to supply water to all the forecasted customers. Rather, each new large development must provide its water supply on its own, which in many cases will involve negotiating with private property owners (e.g., KSL, Squaw Valley Lodge, Plumpjack, other property owners on Squaw Peak Rd.) overlying the aquifer in the western end of the valley, since the best quality water in the aquifer lies principally under their property.

The WSA purpose is to inform the County about the general availability of water in the 25 year horizon, it is not a commitment to supply water. It will be a Yes/No determination based on the projected demands and the existing supply as determined by hydrologic modeling, including normal and multiple drought year scenarios.

John Wilcox then made sure everyone understood that the statement in the recent Powder Magazine article (and other news articles/comments) about there being only enough water for “100 homes” is based on the capacity of the existing PSD wells. It does not refer to the capacity of the aquifer.

Carl Gustafson asked if the creek well interaction study, the technical memorandum on the pumping effects on the creek, and other studies will be part of the dEIR. Mike Geary confirmed that this data was used to update the numerical groundwater model used to assess the sufficiency of water supply in the WSA.

Peter VanZant of Sierra Watch asked for confirmation on 3 items

- (1) Confirm PSD NOP comments stating that the PSD’s existing water supply system cannot meet the demand of the project (Geary confirmed yes to this).
- (2) Supply sufficiency analysis will use hydraulic groundwater modeling
- (3) New wells will need future verification to supply the project and any impacts from pumping the new wells will be analyzed.

Ed Heneveld questioned if the PSD ever considered drilling a well on their own property at the old fire station. Mike Geary said, and Jesse agreed, that it is not likely a good site given proximity to the toe of the north slope and shallow depth to alluvial fan.

In response to questions about board mission and need to support new development, PSD attorney, Tom Archer clarified that the district has a duty to explore for new water and a duty to serve existing customers, that new development needs to supply its own water, that the overlying property owner has rights to pump what they want but cannot harm existing users, and, finally, that cumulative effects of pumping needs analysis.

<sup>1</sup>The explanation of the County’s development projections described in #2 above was reviewed and edited by Mike Geary. Not all of the information was specifically discussed during the meeting and includes information from a Technical Memo that will be included in the WSA.

Ed Heneveld also questioned if we are only to get a yes/no supply answer from the WSA, would it be possible to fund an additional study to determine the “sustainable (or safe) yield” of the aquifer. Others confirmed interest and need for this analysis (probably after the WSA is completed).

<sup>1</sup>The explanation of the County’s development projections described in #2 above was reviewed and edited by Mike Geary. Not all of the information was specifically discussed during the meeting and includes information from a Technical Memo that will be included in the WSA.