

WATERSHED WHISPERERS



Exploring Potential for Water Use, Infrastructure, and Environmental Justice in the Owens Valley and Mono Basin



California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
Department of Landscape Architecture
Sponsor: Metabolic Studio
Principal Investigator: Professor Barry Lehrman

606 Studio Team: Tiernan Doyle, Eric Haley, James Powell, and Devon Santy
Spring 2013



WATERSHED WHISPERERS

*Exploring Potential for Water Use, Infrastructure, and
Environmental Justice in the Owens Valley and Mono Basin*

Aqueduct Futures: The Cal Poly Pomona Los Angeles Aqueduct Centennial Project
With financial support from the Metabolic Studio

606 Studio Graduate Student Team

Tiernan Doyle | Eric Haley | James Powell | Devon Santy

606 Studio Graduate Faculty

Principal Investigator: Barry Lehrman, MLA/MArch, ASLA, PLA

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Lee-Anne S. Milburn, MLA, Ph.D., PLA

Faculty Advisor: Karen C. Hanna, MA, FASLA, FCELA, PLA

Faculty Advisor: Dr. Weimin Li, MS, Ph.D., ASLA

Faculty Advisor: Doug Delgado, MLA

606 Studio | Department of Landscape Architecture | College of Environmental Design

California State Polytechnic University, Pomona | 2013

3801 West Temple Ave, Pomona, California 91768

(909) 869-2673 | lsmilburn@csupomona.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures	A	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP).	25
Acronyms Used in this Document.	C	U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM).	27
Acknowledgements	D	U.S. Forest Service (USFS).	27
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I	Secondary Decision Makers	28
Aqueduct Futures.	i	Stakeholders	28
606 Studio	ii	ACT I: MAJOR PROCESSES OF THE EASTERN SIERRA	31
Setting the Stage	ii	Hydrology	31
Characters.	iii	Topography and Geology	31
Processes	iii	Precipitation	38
Community	iii	Surface Water	41
Analysis and Program	iii	Groundwater	43
Guidelines	iv	Hydrogeology	43
Implementation	iv	Historical Water Diversions.	44
INTRODUCTION	1	Aqueduct Infrastructure	45
Goal	4	Sources of Water for the City of Los Angeles.	49
Objectives	4	Costs to Bring Water from the Owens Valley.	49
Project Timeline and Process	5	Uses of LADWP Water	49
HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT	7	Habitat and Plant Communities	50
Overview	7	Recreation Opportunities.	57
Using the Toolkit	8	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP)	57
SETTING THE STAGE: SPATIAL AND GEOGRAPHIC SITUATION.	11	U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM).	57
Statewide Context.	13	U.S. Forest Service (USFS)	57
Regional Context.	15	Tourism Economy.	58
Study Area Context.	17	Economic Context.	60
Current Planning Context	17	Demographic Diversity.	63
Mono Lake Legal Battles and Decisions	17	Native American Populations	63
Owens Valley Legal Issues and Plans	19	Minority Populations	63
U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Planning	21	Land Ownership Patterns	64
U.S. Forest Service (USFS) Planning	21	Hazards and Future Planning Context	67
Stakeholder Issues and Claims	21	Earthquakes and Volcanism	67
606 Vision Planning	23	Fire Hazard	68
CHARACTERS: KEY DECISION MAKERS WITHIN THE EASTERN SIERRA	25	Climate Change Projections	71
Primary Decision Makers	25	ACT II: COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	73
		Introduction.	73
		Workshops.	74
		Focus Group Results	74
		Discussion	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Survey	78	GUIDELINES	105
Description	78	Introduction	105
Results	78	Category Guidelines	106
Discussion	80	Overlap Guidelines	106
Interviews	81	Agriculture	108
One-on-One Meetings	81	Development	111
Meeting Themes	81	Habitat Rehabilitation	114
Community Outreach Conclusion	81	Hydrologic Regeneration	118
Program Development	82	Recreation	121
Agriculture	83	SAMPLE	
Development	83	IMPLEMENTATIONS	125
Habitat Rehabilitation	83		
Hydrologic Regeneration	83	THE FUTURE	143
Recreation	83	Recommended Planning Areas	143
		Recommendations for	
		Future Actions	145
		Possibilities for Implementation	147
		Future of the Eastern Sierra	148
ACT III: LANDSCAPE		REFERENCES	150
ANALYSIS AND		APPENDIX A:	
PROGRAM SUITABILITY	85	COMMUNITY MEETING	
Landscape Units	85	SURVEY AND RESULTS	163
Theoretical Basis	85	Survey Questions	164
Inventory	85	Survey Responses	170
Creation Process	86		
Rasters to Polygons	86	APPENDIX B: GIS DATA	
Reclassification	86	USED IN MODEL	185
Conversion	87		
Polygon Layers	87	APPENDIX C:	
Data Union	87	THE 606 STUDIO	189
Processing	87	The 606 Studio	190
Program Feasibility Categories	89	Faculty Profiles	190
Introduction	89	606 Studio Team	192
Method	89		
Agriculture	91		
Development	92		
Habitat Rehabilitation	92		
Hydrologic Regeneration	93		
Recreation	93		
Program Conflict	94		
Introduction	94		
Areas without Conflict	94		
Areas of Conflict	94		
Program Compatibility	95		
Program Conflict Intensity	95		
Change Models	97		
Agriculture	98		
Development	99		
Habitat	100		
Hydrology	101		
Recreation	102		

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Grant Lake from the Dam	i	Figure 37. Habitat Fragmentation	51
Figure 2. Independence Wellfield Erosion.	ii	Figure 38. Owens Valley Pupfish	52
Figure 3. Alabama Hills Arch	iv	Figure 39. Sierra Nevada Yellow-Legged Frog	52
Figure 4. Southern Sierra and Alabama Hills	1	Figure 40. Least Bittern.	52
Figure 5. Aqueduct Map.	2	Figure 41. Willow Flycatcher	53
Figure 6. Project Timeline and Process Diagram	5	Figure 42. Vole	53
Figure 7. Mono Lake Evening	6	Figure 43. Tule Elk	54
Figure 8. Owens Lake Dust Bowl	10	Figure 44. Sage Grouse	54
Figure 9. Project State Context.	12	Figure 45. Pronghorn Antelope	55
Figure 10. Project Area Adjacencies	14	Figure 46. Bighorn Sheep	55
Figure 11. Los Angeles Water Sources, 20-Year Ranges 1984-2004.	15	Figure 47. Mountain Lion	55
Figure 12. Study Area.	16	Figure 48. Recreation Management.	56
Figure 13. Walker Creek Diversion Impoundment.	18	Figure 49. Mono County Recreation Seasonality.	58
Figure 14. Owens Lake.	20	Figure 50. Mono County Visitor Activities	58
Figure 15. Aqueduct Intake with Chris Plakos, LADWP	24	Figure 51. Mono County Visitor Outdoor Recreation	59
Figure 16. Decision Makers.	26	Figure 52. Economic Comparisons	60
Figure 17. Additional Decision Makers.	28	Figure 53. Income and Age	61
Figure 18. Erosion in Independence Wellfield.	30	Figure 54. Income by Age Group.	61
Figure 19. Topography	32	Figure 55. Housing Seasonality	61
Figure 20. Eastern California Shear Zone.	33	Figure 56. Mammoth Mountain Opening Day	62
Figure 21. Valley Sections at Different Latitudes	34	Figure 57. Largest Employers.	62
Figure 22. Long Valley Volcanic Hazards and Faults	35	Figure 58. Employment Sectors.	62
Figure 23. Project Area Geology and Faults	36	Figure 59. Native American Reservations.	63
Figure 24. Olancha Snowline	37	Figure 60. Ethnicity	63
Figure 25. Climate/Hydrology Block Diagram	38	Figure 61. Project Area Land Ownership.	64
Figure 26. Streams.	40	Figure 62. Land Ownership Proportions.	64
Figure 27. Mono Diversions.	41	Figure 63. Possible Private Land Map.	65
Figure 28. Groundwater Resources.	42	Figure 64. Land Use, Non-Open Space	65
Figure 29. Historical Diversions.	44	Figure 65. Fault Surface Rupture Risk Zones.	66
Figure 30. Aqueduct Cross-Sections.	45	Figure 66. Aqueduct Fault Crossings [Aberdeen to Owens Lake]	67
Figure 31. Water Infrastructure	46	Figure 67. Fire Management Hazard	68
Figure 32. LADWP Water Source Proportions	48	Figure 68. Fire Management Responsibility.	69
Figure 33. Water Use and Population	48	Figure 69. Streamflow Change	70
Figure 34. LADWP Projected Demand.	49	Figure 70. Bishop, California	72
Figure 35. Water Use by Sector	49	Figure 71. Land Ownership Opinion	78
Figure 36. Design Species.	50	Figure 72. Tourism Opinion.	78
		Figure 73. Public Land Management Opinion	78

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 74. Recreation Activities Opinion	78
Figure 75. Development Opinion	79
Figure 76. Jobs Opinion	79
Figure 77. Business Opinion	79
Figure 78. Ethnic Representation.	79
Figure 79. Outdoor Recreation Activities.	80
Figure 80. Program Development	82
Figure 81. View from Walker Creek	84
Figure 82. Landscape Unit Inventory.	86
Figure 83. Landscape Unit Detail.	88
Figure 84. Program Category Process	89
Figure 85. Program Category Criteria.	90
Figure 86. Land Use Categories Overview	91
Figure 87. Non-Conflict Program Feasibility	94
Figure 88. Program Compatibility Matrix	95
Figure 89. Conflict Intensity	96
Figure 90. Change Model Matrix.	97
Figure 91. Agriculture Change Model	98
Figure 92. Development Change Model.	99
Figure 93. Habitat Change Model.	100
Figure 94. Hydrology Change Model	101
Figure 95. Recreation Change Model.	102
Figure 96. Mono Lake Tufa	104
Figure 97. Dry Field and Fence at Lone Pine Paiute Reservation	106
Figure 98. Agriculture and Hydrology Integration Strategies.	109
Figure 99. Development, Agriculture, and Recreation Strategies	112
Figure 100. Habitat Rehabilitation and Hydrologic Regeneration.	116
Figure 101. Habitat, Hydrology, and Recreation Integration	120
Figure 102. Habitat, Hydrology, and Recreation Integration Strategies	123
Figure 103. Lone Pine Streetscape	124
Figure 104. Sample Implementations Legend	124
Figure 105. Dawn Near Rush Creek	142
Figure 106. Areas with High Potential for Land Use Conflict.	144
Figure 107. Trail Camp Lake	148

All images not otherwise credited prepared
by 606 Studio Graduate Student Team

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act	OHV	Off Highway Vehicle
AF	Acre-Feet	OVC	Owens Valley Committee
AGR	Agriculture Program Category	PM-10	Particulate Matter of 10 microns or less in diameter
AIM	Assessment Inventory and Monitoring	PoO	Plan of Operations
BLM	Bureau of Land Management	REA	Rapid Ecoregional Assessment
CDWR	California Department of Water Resources	REC	Recreation Program Category
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	RV	Recreational Vehicle
CFS	Cubic Feet per Second	SSURGO	Soil Survey Geographic Database
CSA	Community Supported Agriculture	SWRCB	State Water Resource Control Board
DCR	Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation	TTF	Technical Trail Feature
DEM	Digital Elevation Model	USFS	United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service
DEV	Development Program Category	USFWS	United States Department of Fish and Wildlife
DFIRM	Digital Flood Insurance Rate Maps	USGBC	United States Green Building Council
DOD	Department of Defense	USGS	United States Geologic Survey
DWP	Department of Water and Power (shorthand for LADWP)	UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
ECSZ	Eastern California Shear Zone	WGCEP	Working Group for California Earthquake Probabilities
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	WHSRN	Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Network
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement		
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency		
ESTA	Eastern Sierra Transit Authority		
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency		
FFA	Future Farmers of America		
FIPS	Federal Information Processing Standard		
FRAP	Fire and Resource Assessment Program		
GBUAPCD	Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District		
GCM	General Circulation Model		
GIS	Geographic Information Systems		
GPCD	Gallons per capita per day		
HAB	Habitat Rehabilitation Program Category		
HAER	Historic American Engineering Record		
HYD	Hydrologic Regeneration program category		
ICWD	Inyo County Water District		
IMP	Interim Management Policy		
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change		
LADWP	Los Angeles Department of Water and Power		
LID	Low Impact Development		
LORP	Lower Owens River Project		
LQ	Location Quotient		
LTWA	Long Term Water Agreement		
MLC	Mono Lake Committee		
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding		
NCDC	National Climatic Data Center		
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act		
NHD	National Hydrology Dataset		
NLCD	National Land Cover Database		
NPS	National Park Service		
NRCS	United States Department of Agriculture National Resource Conservation Service		

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Watershed Whisperers received a great deal of assistance in the production of this document. Background research, data collection, interviews, surveys, community workshops, and classroom advice from the instructors at Cal Poly Pomona were all critical factors in the project, and the team would like to thank all of the individuals and organizations that contributed:

606 Studio Faculty

Barry Lehrman, Lee-Anne Milburn, Karen Hanna, Weimin Li, Doug Delgado

Cal Poly Pomona Staff and Student Support

Kristopher Penrose – Landscape Architecture Department
Carlos Flores – Aqueduct Futures Project Student Research Assistant
Zoe Lance – PolyCentric writer

Team Interviewees

Josh Hart and Cathreen Richards – Inyo County Planning Department
Chris Plakos – LADWP
Mark Bagley – Owens Valley Committee
Scott Burns – Mono County Planning Department
Danna Stroud – Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Holly Alpert – Inyo-Mono Regional Water Management Group
Sally Manning – Big Pine Paiute Tribe Environmental Director
Daniel Pritchett – Owens Valley Committee
Larry Freilich – Inyo County Water District
Mike Prather – Eastern Sierra Audubon Society
Alan Bacock – Big Pine Paiute Tribe / Owens Valley Committee
Tom LaBonge – Los Angeles City Councilmember
Geoff McQuilkin – Mono Lake Committee

Other Individuals and Groups

Deanne Michels and the staff at Statham Hall in Lone Pine, California.
Don Baxter and the staff at the June Lake Community Center, June Lake, California.
All of the community workshop participants from the Lone Pine workshop on February 16, 2013 and the June Lake workshop on February 17, 2013.
All of the survey respondents who provided such detailed feedback.

Financial Supporters

Metabolic Studio for their contribution to the Aqueduct Futures Project, without which, this project might not have been possible.

Other Supporters

We would like to thank our families, partners, friends, and classmates. Their support throughout the three years of the Masters of Landscape Architecture program at Cal Poly Pomona played an integral role in our success and sanity.



Figure 1. Grant Lake from the Dam
Photo: Eric Haley 2012



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Los Angeles Aqueduct has been a source of urban growth, wealth, and prosperity, as well as intense animosity, environmental degradation, and extensive legal action for over one hundred years. Since before the Aqueduct's completion in 1913, the multi-faceted relationship between the Eastern Sierra and the City of Los Angeles has perpetuated continued discussion over resource extraction and water usage that extends outward into the greater United States (Libecap 2004). While complex, the issues that demand reexamination of this subject and of the regional impacts of the Aqueduct on its watershed are not new. Groundwater pumping, stream diversions, habitat loss, and economic stasis can be seen as the side effects of large-scale urban water projects across the globe (Glennon 2002). In 1913, Los Angeles was ahead of its time in establishing one of its main water supplies over 200 miles away from the city center (Libecap 2004), but this story has become increasingly familiar as urban areas transform into megalopolises

enabled by ever increasing control and regulation over distant water sources (Birch and Wachter 2011). As the 100 year anniversary of the Aqueduct passes, Los Angeles and the Eastern Sierra have the potential to become leaders and curators of sustainable water sourcing and supply that will be an example for other cities throughout the world.

Aqueduct Futures

In response to the centennial anniversary of the Los Angeles Aqueduct's completion, Professor Barry Lehrman of the California State Polytechnic University of Pomona created the Aqueduct Futures Project to explore the next 100 years of water use and development in Southern California. This project took the form of interdisciplinary courses that included community engagement, and developed an exhibit and website aimed at the general public and K-12 schools. The overall goal of these efforts was to advance policy and practices related to the adaptability, resiliency, and

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Figure 2. Independence Wellfield Erosion
Photo: James Powell 2013

sustainability of the water infrastructure in Southern California; raise awareness about the water/energy nexus; and explore the cultural and ecological impacts of the Aqueduct.

606 Studio

As part of this larger effort, Professor Lehrman sponsored a team of graduate students from the Masters of Landscape Architecture program at the California State Polytechnic University of Pomona to develop regional strategies for sustainable land use and watershed planning along the northern half of the Aqueduct. Working as part of the program's capstone 606 Studio, this team developed a vision plan for the Owens Valley and Mono Basin watersheds that explores land planning possibilities and alternative futures of the Eastern Sierra region. Recognizing that Los Angeles and the Owens Valley now have the tremendous opportunity to become leaders in the realm of sustainable water supply, cooperative land stewardship, and resource resiliency, this vision plan examines

different ways in which these possibilities may be realized and expanded into the future.

Setting the Stage

The project area is located approximately 233 miles northeast of the City of Los Angeles. Bounded on the western side by the peaks of the Sierra Nevada and by the White and Inyo Mountains to the east, the Owens Valley is the deepest valley in the United States. Together with the creeks that drain into Mono Lake, these areas make up the watershed for the Los Angeles Aqueduct. Though the Eastern Sierra provides over half of the water supply of Los Angeles, the local population is sparse, and scattered mainly in small, unincorporated towns that are situated near Highway 395, which runs north-south through the entire area. In total, the study area comprises 4,188 square miles (10,847 sq km) with a population of 34,000 in 2013. This can be compared with the City of Los Angeles, which had a population of 3.82 million in 2011, and occupied 503 square miles (1,302 sq km).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Characters

Land ownership within the study area is concentrated within the hands of three major agencies: the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), which exports the water resources of the area to supply the City of Los Angeles; the United States Department of Interior Bureau of Land Management (BLM), a federal agency which oversees mineral resources and energy production on government land; and the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USFS), which manages timber, water, and recreation resources within the Inyo National Forest. Though they have major impacts on the lands and resources in the area, the decision making and planning processes of these agencies are often disparate and made at a scale that does not reflect the needs of the watershed as a whole.

Processes

The effects of the geography of the Eastern Sierra are not limited to striking scenery alone. Topography and terrestrial processes have created intricate patterns of weather, hydrologic resources, and geologic activity. Specialized plant communities and wildlife species developed to take advantage of the resulting landscapes. Because of the relative isolation of the area, and the specialized conditions, the Eastern Sierra is home to a multitude of rare and endangered plant and animal species that are scarce throughout the rest of California. Though much of the area is kept undeveloped because of federal ownership, a long history of resource extraction that includes mining, water withdrawals, and electricity generation has taken a toll on the land, the effects of which are especially visible in the desiccated springs in the Owens Valley. Resource extraction has affected ecologies of the area by degrading wildlife habitat and causing widespread conversion of vegetation types, but it has also taken a toll on the local communities. Because of the large amount of federal and municipal land ownership in the area, the economy has remained stagnant, privately owned land is virtually non-existent, and the employment sector is dependent on government jobs and a highly seasonal tourism base.

Community

Community outreach was a vital component that helped to shape the final goal, objectives, and deliverables of the project. Outreach was conducted through two community workshops,

12 stakeholder interviews, and an online survey, which was open to residents of the Eastern Sierra for two months. The information gained from these meetings confirmed a great deal of information that had already been obtained through background research, but it also introduced new topics that were of great importance to local communities. After analyzing the content from the community meetings, it became clear that the main areas of planning importance within the Eastern Sierra involved agriculture, town development, wildlife habitat, water resources, and recreation.

Analysis and Program

Uniting research, community workshops, and agency needs within one project required analysis of disparate approaches to and opinions of the Aqueduct. While this presented a complex challenge for the planning process, each way of thinking also brought exciting opportunities. Recognizing this as a strength of the region, the team determined that developing a toolbox of planning strategies for future work would be the most effective deliverable that could be created. The resulting material could then be used by a wide range of decision makers, from community groups to federal landowners, to increase cooperation and create projects that are beneficial for the area on a watershed scale.

After the categories of planning importance had been derived from research and community workshops, the first step in creating this toolbox was analysis of the existing landscape. Using GIS data from a variety of sources, the landscape was broken down into units based on the similarity or differences of their physical attributes. The planning categories of agriculture, town development, wildlife habitat, water resources, and recreation were each assigned generalized physical attributes that defined areas in which the activities could take place. These physical attributes were matched with the landscape units that had been created to map out where these land use types could take place on the ground.

Once the program feasibility categories had been mapped onto the landscape, it became clear that there were areas where more than one program category could take place. These sites of overlap became opportunities to create areas of nuanced design, where planning projects could increase both cooperation among agencies and ecological health throughout the area.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



Figure 3. Alabama Hills Arch
Photo: Eric Haley 2012

Guidelines

Due to the delicate nature of the environmental and social processes within the study area, the toolbox was expanded beyond programmatic mapping to include guidelines for the responsible and suitable installation of those land use types. In order to accomplish this, planning guidelines based on sustainable methods, low impact design, and environmentally conscious precedents were developed for each program category. Recognizing that the areas of programming overlap present special opportunities for unified and productive action, the project gives special attention to developing guidelines for the overlap areas. These overlap guidelines provide suggestions for how to make multiple program categories work within one area.

Implementation

In order to make the final document as useful to community and planning groups as possible, the project also developed sample implementation activities that could be undertaken within the study area.

These implementations included a variety of smaller scale programming options that would fit within the program categories and help to ameliorate any conflict within the overlap areas. Each implementation activity was coded by the program categories to which it could belong in order to make the planning process easier and more effective.

This vision plan does not provide specific designs or mandates for action. As a student project, this document has no authority to enforce any policy change, and many of the desires of the community were determined to be outside the scope of this vision plan. Instead, this document aims to be a catalyst for cooperation between agencies and communities by providing planning tools and options for the entire watershed of the Los Angeles Aqueduct within a singular project. It is hoped that the common language created by this vision plan's toolkit will help to further the sustainable water use practices already underway, and move the Eastern Sierra and the City of Los Angeles into a new era of accord and leadership in the realm of resource extraction and supply.

The Frog sisters lived at a spring. Rattlesnake, who lived about one mile or more away, planned to steal the spring away from them. He kept very close watch until he had a chance. One afternoon, when the Frog sisters were fast asleep and no one was around, Rattlesnake came down to the spring and drank as much as he could, holding the rest of the water in his mouth. He took every bit of the water in the spring and started for his home. He was about a half-mile away when the Frog sisters woke up and to their surprise found no water in their spring. They immediately investigated and guessed what had become of their water. They pursued Rattlesnake and saw him climbing up the hill. The Frog sisters followed him up the hill as fast as they could. Upon seeing the sisters in pursuit, Rattlesnake increased his speed, but as he ascended the mountain, he became tired, coughed, and spat out some of the water. He continued on his journey until the Frog sisters overtook him, stopped him, tickled him, and made him spit all the water he had in his mouth. The Frog sisters drank the water and took it back to their spring where they deposited the water in its rightful place.

– Paiute fable (as told by Susie Baker in 1935) (Bauer 2012)