

Mono Basin Watershed Plan Management Plan March-2007



Draft of Watershed Plan –draft of 1-28-2007

Context

- Watershed approach

- California's watershed programs and Mono County's involvement

Overview of issues and problems

- Problems linked to potential causes

 - Water quantity

 - Water quality

 - Vegetation change

- Potential watershed problems and risks

- Knowledge and information gaps

General principles of this watershed plan

Main issues and potential solutions

- List of issues and solutions

- Potential problems of the future

Recommended policies and programs

- List of goals, objectives, possible actions, and details

- Applicable best management practices

- Opportunities for governmental agencies and citizens groups

- Public education and outreach

- Monitoring

Summary and conclusions

Literature cited

CONTEXT

Watershed Approach

The natural unit for considering most water-related issues and problems is the watershed.

A watershed can be simply defined as the land contributing water to a stream or river above some particular point. Natural processes and human activities in a watershed influence the quantity and quality of water that flows to the point of interest. Despite the obvious connections between watersheds and their streams, water problems are typically looked at and dealt with in an isolated manner. Many water problems have been treated within the narrow confines of political jurisdictions, property boundaries, technical specialties, or small geographic areas. Many water pollution problems, flood hazards, or water supply issues have only been examined within a short portion of the stream or within the stream channel itself. What happens upstream or upslope has been commonly ignored. The so-called watershed approach merely attempts to look at the broad picture of

an entire watershed and how processes and activities within that watershed affect the water that arrives at the defining point. The watershed approach is simply a means of considering water problems in a comprehensive manner.

A companion watershed assessment describes how the 800 square mile watershed influences the quantity and quality of water that flows into Mono Lake. As stated in the assessment, this plan only deals with lands in the basin and does not pertain to the lake.

California Watershed Programs and Mono County's Involvement

Within California, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the state Regional Water Quality Control Boards are the principal agencies charged with minimizing water pollution and maintaining or improving water quality. These entities have been largely successful at reducing water pollution that starts at a known point, such as a sewer outfall from a city or a waste pipe from a factory. As these so-called point sources have been brought under control, the agencies found that pollution from broader areas of land was still degrading water quality. Sediment from dirt roads and bare construction sites, pesticide runoff from farms, nutrients and bacteria from livestock operations, chemicals and oil residues from urban streets are all examples of so-called nonpoint-source water pollution. The agencies concerned with limiting water pollution have adopted the watershed approach to studying and controlling nonpoint-source pollution.

In 1997, the Governor's office directed state agencies that deal with natural resources (e.g., State Water Resources Control Board and Regional Water Quality Control Boards, Department of Fish and Game, Department of Conservation, and Department of Forestry and Fire Protection) to coordinate activities on a watershed basis. In March 2000, California voters passed Proposition 13, the Costa-Machado Water Act, which included substantial grant funding for local watershed management activities. In early 2001, Mono County in cooperation with the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team responded to a request for proposals from the State Water Resources Control Board by submitting two proposals to develop watershed assessments and plans. Both proposals were successful, and scopes of work were developed and eventually approved in 2004. Work began on these projects in January 2005.

A watershed assessment for the Mono basin was completed in 2006. The basic concept of a watershed assessment is to describe any known problems concerning water quantity and quality and attempt to connect those problems with conditions, processes, and activities within the watershed. Such linkages between problems and potential causes can provide the basis for subsequent planning and management that attempt to address the identified problems. The watershed plan reported here follows from and was based upon the Mono basin watershed assessment.

The watershed plan for the Mono basin suggests a variety of approaches and measures for addressing some of the water-related issues and problems identified in the assessment.

The plan merely offers guidance and proposals. It has no authority itself, and all implementation of suggested policies and actions will rely on decisions of local jurisdictions, agencies, non-profit organizations, and private citizens. A primary recommendation is that the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team assumes the role of overseeing implementation and revision of this plan.

OVERVIEW OF ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

The watershed assessment found that the Mono basin has remarkably good water quality but has serious habitat problems from the legacy of excessive water diversions that are well known and currently being addressed. Besides those obvious impairments, the Mono basin watershed is in generally good shape, at least in comparison to most of California. Nevertheless, there are a variety of issues that could improved, and this plan suggests some means of dealing with those problems.

A primary challenge is to maintain the current high quality of waters in the Mono basin. The simple fact that the great majority of the watershed is relatively undisturbed accounts for the good condition of the streams and lakes in the watershed. Wherever there is increased disturbance of channels, riparian areas, and uplands, water quality and aquatic habitat suffer.

Water quality and aquatic habitat are at risk from careless development and construction of roads and structures. The capacity of the watershed to support further changes in land use without significant degradation is unknown. However, experience in other areas suggests that all reasonable measures that keep surface runoff, sediment, and pollutants contained at the site of disturbance or at least out of streams minimizes degradation of water resources and aquatic habitat.

Problems linked to potential causes

Water quantity

The “legacy” issues of water quantity in the streams diverted to the Mono Craters tunnel for export to Los Angeles have been largely addressed by State Water Resources Control Board Decision 1631. Tradeoffs between water in Mill and Wilson creeks are being addressed through the relicensing process for the Lundy hydroelectric project.

Current water supplies for Mono City and Lee Vining appear to be adequate to meet all anticipated demands (Team Engineering, Inc., 2006), but water supply for future growth in the June Lake area is uncertain and continues to be studied.

Water quality

Accelerated erosion and sedimentation appears related to road and building construction and the June Mountain Ski Area. Reversed Creek is probably the stream most affected by accelerated sedimentation in the past. The sediment containment program at the June Mountain Ski Area seems to have functioned quite effectively in recent years. Much of the local soil erosion from construction, trails, and OHV use is unlikely to impact streams because it is not transported far from the site of erosion.

Microbial contamination of streams is assumed to be caused by careless disposal of human and pet wastes.

Trace quantities of MTBE and other constituents of gasoline are suspected in lakes of the June Lake loop from boats and cars on adjacent roads. Such contamination is not known to be significant or require any action.

There is potential, but no direct evidence, for contamination from excessive use of chemical fertilizers on gardens, lawns, and parks. Nutrients from fertilizers that are not incorporated in plant tissue can be leached from soils and enter local streams.

Vegetation change

The risk of catastrophic wildfire is linked to the accumulation of dead fuels and increases in density of forests, woodlands, and shrublands in the absence of a natural fire regime.

Riparian vegetation has been lost and altered by decades of water diversion.

Riparian habitat has been locally impacted by the construction and presence of roads, trails, buildings, and recreational facilities (primarily campgrounds) within the riparian zone.

Wetlands have been drained, filled, and converted to other land uses with a continuing decline in wetland habitat and values.

Native riparian plants have been and continue to be replaced by exotic plants, such as salt cedar and bouncing bet.

Potential watershed problems and risks

Extensive clearing of vegetation and leaf litter for fire safety may lead to accelerated erosion.

Areas of wetlands remain at risk of drainage and conversion to other land uses in the June Lake area.

Much land in the Mono basin could be available for development if the City of Los Angeles sold any of its properties.

Knowledge and information gaps

There are insufficient water quality data to evaluate trends and identify most sources of contaminants. However, an adequate water quality monitoring program is unlikely to be cost-effective.

The long-term response of riparian and aquatic communities below diversion dams to both the restoration activities and the authorized levels of water diversions is unknown, but the early results are quite positive.

The hydrologic and ecologic effects of climatic variability and potential trends in climate within the Mono basin are unknown, but contingency planning seems prudent.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF THIS WATERSHED PLAN

This watershed plan for the Mono basin is largely based on the following concepts and principles:

- minimizing further disturbance of vegetation and soils, particularly near channels
- implementing “Best Management Practices” to keep surface water, sediment, and pollutants on-site during and after some change in land use, earth-moving, or construction activity
- avoiding disturbance of stream channels and associated riparian areas, and removing existing disturbances of riparian areas and channels
- guiding land-use changes away from streams and riparian areas

Most watershed management practices in the Mono basin that relate directly to some water quality characteristic will need to occur under a cloud of uncertainty. In an ideal situation, contaminants of concern would be carefully monitored, a practice to reduce the contamination would be implemented, and continued monitoring would indicate whether the practice was successful and whether it should be modified in an “adaptive management” strategy. Unfortunately, the cost of intense water-quality monitoring sufficient to reliably demonstrate trends is often prohibitive. Funds for an adequate monitoring program may be better spent on an implementation program that common sense suggests will reduce the negative effects of an activity, even if the reductions cannot be quantified. Nevertheless, there are particular situations where the effectiveness of some practice does need to be quantified. An example might be determining how much sediment is retained by sediment-collection basins below a major construction project or cleared ski run. There is also great potential for bioassessment techniques to indicate general trends in the condition of a waterway.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2005) has a draft handbook in circulation for developing watershed plans. This handbook is likely to become the standard protocol for addressing nonpoint source pollution through a watershed approach. The draft relies heavily on the “Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL)” procedure with respect to particular pollutants that impair a waterbody for certain beneficial uses. The draft handbook summarizes development of a TMDL as follows: “For each impaired waterbody, a state or tribe must develop an accounting of loads that would result in the waterbody’s meeting water quality standards. This is called a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL). A TMDL is the amount, or load, of a specific pollutant that a waterbody can assimilate and still meet the water quality standards. The “load” is allocated among the current pollutant sources (point, nonpoint, and background sources), a margin of safety, and sometimes future growth” (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005).

Although the TMDL approach to non-point source pollution appears to be an effective means of improving water quality in many parts of the nation, the author does not believe this approach has much applicability within the Mono basin. Without expenditure of considerable funds for research on the quantity and source of contaminants of concern, the ability to assign responsibility for quantifiable reductions of those contaminants would seem impractical, if not impossible. The funds necessary for the research effort

would seem better spent implementing Best Management Practices, even though the quantitative effectiveness of those practices would remain unknown.

MAIN ISSUES and POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

The following section is a brief outline of some of the major issues followed by a list of concepts and options that could address that particular problem. This initial list is intended to provoke discussion of these issues and potential solutions and is certainly not exhaustive. This list should be updated periodically with additions and amendments.

Issues

Potential Solutions

Water supply for the June Lake area

- Continue and expand water conservation efforts of the June Lake Public Utility District

Conversion of wetlands

- Emphasize importance of wetlands in Mono County General Plan
- Develop and implement a tracking system between Mono County, Lahontan RWQCB, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to ensure compliance with existing regulations
- Use the BLM-initiated land-tenure adjustment program to trade privately-owned wetland parcels for publicly-owned parcels that could be developed with minimal environmental consequences

Excessive sediment in tributaries

- Reroute roads away from riparian zones; close rarely used roads; stabilize fords, culverts, and bridges to reduce impact of road-related erosion
- Implement low impact development guidelines

Degradation of riparian habitat

- Move roads, trails, and facilities out of riparian zone
- Implement low-impact development guidelines

Fecal contamination

- Build additional outhouses and RV dump sites in high-use areas

Educate traveling public about sanitation principles similar to wilderness users

Contamination from fertilizers & pesticides

Educate public to reduce use of household & horticultural chemicals

Threat of catastrophic wildfire

Continue and greatly expand the fuels management program of the Inyo National Forest

Continue and expand the community-based fire-safe program

Adopt recommendations of current (2006-2007) wildfire hazard study project

Potential problems of the future (maintain awareness of the possibilities)

Erosion from OHV use in channels and riparian areas

Future mining

Future round of small-hydro proposals

Leaching of pollutants from Pumice Valley landfill

Failure of poorly located and/or poorly maintained septic systems

Groundwater contamination by gasoline from historic tanks and spills

RECOMMENDED POLICIES and PROGRAMS

The main recommendations of this plan are presented in the following format:

Broad goals

Desired future condition

Operational goals / objectives

Potential actions

Potential funding sources

Potential impediments to actions

Recommended implementation program

Goal: Maintain & improve aquatic habitat of all streams

Desired future condition: hydrological and ecological processes and properties of in-stream habitat are fully functional

Operational goals: increase flows impacted by diversion, restore riparian vegetation and stream channels

Potential actions: continue restoration program mandated by SWRCB Decision 1631 and Water Rights Order WR 98-05

Potential funding source: Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Potential conflicts: increasing water demand in LADWP service area

Goal: Maintain existing wetlands

Desired future condition: Extent and functions of wetlands have not declined from current status

Operational goals: avoid filling, drainage, and other degradation of wetlands

Potential actions: do not permit development of wetlands (except as provided under USACE nation-wide permit for single-family lots smaller than half acre); guide development away from wetland margins through careful review of development proposals, educate public, property owners, and real estate / building community about values of wetlands in Mono County; suggest conservation easements on wetland parcels and explore opportunities for land trades with less-sensitive property in public domain

Potential funding source: Mono County general fund, grants for conservation easements (from sources such as Wildlife Conservation Board) through Eastern Sierra Land Trust, BLM land-tenure adjustment program for land trades

Potential conflicts: developers and property owners wishing to build in wetlands

Possible program: strengthen wetland protection policies in Mono County general plan, identify privately owned parcels containing wetlands with potential for development and proactively suggest alternatives to development, create a tracking system to coordinate role of county with Lahontan RWQCB and USACE, actively pursue a conservation easement on LADWP lands

Goal: reduce fecal coliform pollution

Desired future condition: less fecal coliform in streams

Operational goals: reduce surface disposal of human waste, reduce surface dumping of RV holding tanks

Potential actions: construct and maintain more outhouses at staging areas and trailheads; move existing outhouses out of riparian zones; construct and maintain more RV dump stations, such as the one planned at Oh! Ridge, and advertise those locations

Potential funding source: dedicated portion of campground revenues
Potential conflicts: tourism boosters would protest a "Don't poop on Mono County" public education campaign; USFS and BLM would not accept costs of more outhouses
Question: is surface dumping of RV holding tanks illegal (there is a California law prohibiting dumping of tanks if they contain formaldehyde or other chemicals)?

Goal: reduce anthropogenic sediment load of streams
Desired future condition: bedload and suspended sediment load of streams approximates natural background levels
Operational goals: erosion from road surfaces and shoulders is reduced; erosion from grading, construction, and other soil disturbance is kept on site and out of channels
Potential actions: remove and rehabilitate roads in riparian areas, remove nonessential stream crossings by roads and restore former crossing sites, restore degraded riparian areas, require sediment containment BMPs for all grading and building permits
Potential funding source: USFS road engineering budget, private construction funds
Potential conflicts: inadequate funding and massive backlog of Forest Service road maintenance needs, increased costs of construction
Possible program: emphasize road impact reduction on Inyo National Forest, strengthen erosion control requirements in county and town general plans, improve erosion control BMP technology transfer within public works and building departments associated with grading and building permits, create a county position of low-impact development specialist to assist builders and property owners

Goal: maintain and improve riparian habitat
Desired future condition: intact and fully functional riparian corridors along all streams
Operational goals: remove or minimize sources of riparian disturbance and degradation
Potential actions: continue LADWP stream restoration program, remove and rehabilitate roads in riparian areas, remove nonessential stream crossings by roads and restore former crossing sites, remove campgrounds and other facilities from riparian zones, restore degraded riparian areas, add riparian conservation to Mono County general plan and MEA
Potential funding source: LADWP, USFS road engineering and recreation budgets, grants from state and federal programs for riparian restoration
Potential conflicts: inadequate funding for road and campground removal and rehabilitation, recreational users that enjoy streamside campsites, trails, and roads
Possible program: continue LADWP stream restoration program; consider riparian areas as a "right-of-way" for streams and emphasize importance of streams and riparian areas in all public planning (e.g., next revision of Inyo National Forest land and resource land

management plan, Mono County General Plan, BLM resource area plan); adopt policies to protect and restore riparian areas; move roads, trails, campgrounds out of riparian areas; maintain adequate setbacks from streams in county and town general plans; actively pursue a conservation easement on LADWP lands

Goal: reduce threat of catastrophic wildfire

Desired future condition: fuel loads approximate to pre-1850 levels, defensible fuel breaks around communities

Operational goals: remove excessive fuels from forests and shrublands, especially near communities

Potential actions: expand and accelerate recent fuel management programs of Inyo National Forest and Bureau of Land Management

Potential funding source: USFS fire management budget, BLM fuels program, new Congressional appropriations for fuel management

Potential conflicts: very high financial costs, aversion to smoke from prescribed burning, potential increase in erosion

Possible program: continue and expand fuel management programs of Inyo National Forest, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection; continue and expand the community-based fire-safe program; adopt recommendations of current (2006-2007) wildfire hazard study project

Applicable Best Management Practices

There is an extensive literature of Best Management Practices to minimize erosion and sediment delivery, retain stormwater runoff, reduce nutrient pollution, reduce pesticide pollution, conserve water, maintain aquatic and riparian habitat, restore streams, etc. Some examples directly relevant to Mono County include:

Erosion and nutrient control (Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 1988)

Erosion control (Sierra Business Council, 2006)

Road construction and maintenance (Sommarstrom, 2001; Caltrans, 2002 and 2003)

Landscaping (Cobourn, et al., 2001)

Riparian management (Santa Clara Valley Water District, 1996; Institute for Environmental Negotiation, 2002)

Construction, development, commercial (California Stormwater Quality Association, 2003)

Although BMPs tend to be very specific and detailed practices, a list of eight principles was distilled by the author of the road maintenance manual for northwestern California (Sommarstrom, 2001):

1. Prevention of erosion is better and cheaper than trying to control erosion.
2. Treat the cause – not the symptom – of erosion.
3. Disconnect the road [or other disturbance] from the stream channel.
4. Protect the riparian zone.
5. Keep existing vegetation wherever possible.
6. Direct runoff away from bare soil or disturbed areas.
7. Keep runoff velocities low.
8. Each solution should not create more problems than it is solving.

Opportunities for governmental agencies and citizens groups

Mono County Collaborative Planning Team

Revive wetlands subcommittee as a means of coordinating implementation and revision of this watershed plan

Mono County

Revise General Plan to emphasize ecological values of streams, riparian areas, and wetlands

Consider county ordinance on water supplies for new development relying on legal logic similar to county's mining ordinance (new development must guarantee replacement water supplies if any damage occurs to existing water users)

Consider county ordinance on riparian protection

In cooperation with Lahontan RWQCB and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, create a tracking system for privately-owned wetlands subject to development

Create a county position of low-impact development specialist to assist builders and property owners (anyone seeking a grading or building permit gets x hours of design assistance to reduce the impacts of their project)

Inyo National Forest

Remove roads, trails, and campgrounds from riparian areas

Remove nonessential stream crossings by roads and rehabilitate the affected areas

Continue and expand fuel management program

Build and maintain additional outhouses and RV dump stations

Reexamine National Wild and Scenic River status for streams previously determined eligible: Lee Vining, Mill, Parker, and Walker creeks

Follow management guidelines for “critical riparian areas” in the 2004 Region 5 Forest Plan Amendment Record of Decision

Bureau of Land Management

Continue to manage recreational use and vehicle access in the Bodie Hills area

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power

Continue restoration program for streams under Decision 1631 and Water Rights Order WR 98-05

Adopt a simple conservation easement preventing subdivision or development of lands

State Water Resources Control Board

Continue to monitor compliance with Decision 1631 and Water Rights Order WR 98-05

Regional Water Quality Control Board – Lahontan

Continue regulatory program

In cooperation with Mono County and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, create a tracking system for privately-owned wetlands subject to development

Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District

Continue to monitor dust (PM-10) generation

Sierra Nevada Conservancy

Provide funds for conservation easements on private parcels with wetlands and riparian areas

Mono Lake Committee

Continue to advocate protection for the inflows to Mono Lake and associated riparian areas and fisheries

Continue to monitor progress on restoration efforts in the streams affected by water diversions

Continue efforts to prevent establishment of invasive flora and fauna

Continue multi-faceted public education programs

Eastern Sierra Land Trust

Continue to encourage private land owners to place conservation easements on property with special resource values

Continue to act as locally-based easement holder and steward

Create a program for conserving wetlands

Friends of the Inyo

Continue restoration projects on Inyo National Forest

Continue to assist Inyo National Forest with route inventory and evaluation

California Native Plant Society

Continue to educate public about values of native plants

Public education and outreach

Providing educational materials to residents, businesses, the construction industry, and visitors is critical to generating support for watershed programs and encouraging personal responsibility for healthy streams and lakes. If homeowners, landscaping contractors, and heavy equipment operators understand that their actions can keep soil in place and out of streams, most are likely to conduct their activities in ways to avoid damaging waterways. Similarly, if pet owners, anglers, and RV drivers understand that proper waste disposal can reduce pollution in streams, most are likely to adopt better waste disposal practices.

The following list of potential educational materials and programs illustrates some of the opportunities to involve private citizens in protecting and improving water quality and aquatic habitat.

Detailed information about Best Management Practices and low-impact development should be available on the county's website as well as in printed form to be distributed with building and grading permit applications. A portion of Mono County's website linked to Community Development, Building, and Public Works Departments could be an online source for watershed and BMP materials. A good model is the website of the Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (<http://www.mcstoppp.org>).

A simple educational brochure modeled upon the 2003 publication *Keeping water on the land longer* (U.S. Bureau of Land Management, et al., 2003) could be useful to include with building and grading permit applications.

Pamphlets and brochures on topics such as "what you can do for Mono County's streams", "Mono County's wetlands", "soil erosion and you", "keep exotic plants out of Mono

County”, and “reducing use of fertilizers and pesticides for healthy streams” could be prepared and distributed to reach a wide audience. The brochure on landscaping with native plants (circa 2002) could serve as a good model.

A public school education program similar to that currently underway in Inyo County and operational within Mono County in 2004 through the Eastern Sierra Watershed Program (<http://www.esice-eswp.org>) should be reintroduced if funding can be found.

Monitoring

In an ideal world (or watershed), comprehensive monitoring that provides detailed information about physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the watershed and its water bodies would be highly desirable. Detailed quantitative information and monitoring programs are now required for watershed plans funded with federal Clean Water Act section 319 funds or California proposition 50 (and presumably future state programs) funds (California Water Code section 79078). Unfortunately, such information is generally available only at extraordinary expense, and we must therefore function with uncertainty and incomplete knowledge about our watershed. Except in research settings or under legal orders, quantitative information about the condition of a watershed or waterbody tends to be intermittent, opportunistic, limited in spatial or temporal scale, and of unknown quality. Nevertheless, the occasional spot measurements and observations can provide indications about the state of a watershed or stream and are typically all we have as a basis for decisions and actions (as well as the basis for the watershed assessment accompanying this plan).

The fundamental goal in designing a monitoring program is to relate the monitoring to the goals or objectives – that is, the results of the monitoring should indicate whether or not the objective is being accomplished (e.g., MacDonald, et al., 1991; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005). Although we would really like to know whether the activities proposed in this plan will measurably reduce the concentration of some contaminant or at least limit further degradation, measurements and analyses necessary for that determination probably won't occur because of lack of funds. So, in our realistic watershed, what sort of monitoring can be accomplished at minimal cost? Perhaps, the best we can expect is to monitor the implementation of BMPs and other actions intended to address a water quality problem or other watershed issue. So-called implementation monitoring is considered the most cost-effective means of reducing nonpoint source pollution because it shows whether the BMP program is actually being carried out (MacDonald, et al., 1991). The effectiveness of a particular BMP must then be taken on faith because of the physical processes involved or from tests reported in scientific literature. The logical vehicle for conducting implementation monitoring of this plan is the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team and its member agencies.

Some sporadic water quality monitoring is likely to occur for various purposes independently of this plan. Hopefully, the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team

can take advantage of such measurements as general indicators of water quality trends, even though such measurements are unlikely to be collected at temporal or spatial scales adequate to be definitive of trends over time.

SUMMARY and CONCLUSIONS

Mono County and other member agencies of the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team have the opportunity to maintain and improve water quality, aquatic habitat, and riparian habitat in the Mono basin by carefully managing development of land and water resources throughout the area. Because this watershed plan has no statutory authority or interest group behind it, the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team and its member agencies need to adopt, revise, and implement this plan if it is to have any value.

The most serious problems in the Mono basin are being addressed by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power under the restoration program mandated by the State Water Resources Control Board. The ongoing relicensing process for the Lundy hydroelectric project may resolve at least some of the issues in the North Mono basin.

Although this plan for the Mono basin contains a variety of recommendations and ideas to sustain and improve the health of streams, most of the proposals are linked by a simple guiding principle of avoiding damage and disturbance of soils and vegetation close to water.

LITERATURE CITED

California Department of Transportation, 2002. Caltrans storm water quality handbooks-project planning and design guide. Sacramento.

California Department of Transportation, 2003. Construction site BMP manual. Sacramento.

California Stormwater Quality Association, 2003. Stormwater best management practice handbooks – development and redevelopment, construction, commercial and industrial, and municipal. Menlo Park.

Cobourn, J., B. Carlos. J. Christopherson, W. Johnson, R. Post, J. Skelly, and E. Smith, 2001. Home landscaping guide for Lake Tahoe and vicinity. Reno: Cooperative Extension, University of Nevada-Reno.

Institute for Environmental Negotiation, 2002. A stream corridor protection strategy for local governments. University of Virginia.

Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, 2006. LADWP progress on completing SWRCB restoration requirements.

MacDonald, L.H., A.W. Smart, and R.C. Wissmar, 1991. Monitoring guidelines to evaluate effects of forestry activities on streams in the pacific northwest and Alaska. EPA 910/9-91-001. Seattle: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

National Research Council, 1992. Restoration of aquatic ecosystems. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Santa Clara Valley Water District, 1996. Stream care guide for Santa Clara County. San Jose.

Sierra Business Council, 2006. Sediment source control handbook. Truckee: Sierra Business Council.

Sommarstrom, S. 2001. A water quality and stream habitat protection manual for county road maintenance in northwestern California watersheds.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, 1988. Handbook of best management practices, volume 2, water quality management plan for the Lake Tahoe region. Zephyr Cove: Tahoe Regional Planning Agency.

Team Engineering & Management, Inc, 2006. Surface water and groundwater availability assessment – Crowley Lake area. Report to Mono County Community Development Department. Bishop.

U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, and Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2003. Keeping water on the land longer. Washington, D.C.?

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2005. Handbook for developing watershed plans to restore and protect our waters. EPA 841-B-05-005. Washington, D.C.

Internet sources

Eastern Sierra Watershed Program:
<http://www.esice-eswp.org>

U.S. Bureau of Land Management land tenure adjustment program:
<http://gis.mono.ca.gov/LandTenure>

Marin County Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program:
<http://www.mcstoppp.org>

County road maintenance manual for water quality and habitat protection:
<http://www.5counties.org/Projects/FinalGeneralProjectPages/RoadsManual800.htm>

California Stormwater Quality Association:
<http://www.casqa.org> and <http://www.cabmphandbooks.com/>