**RELEVANT PLANNING DOCUMENTS**



INYO-MONO Integrated Regional Water Management Program: Updated June 27, 2019

|  | Document | Date | Affected Area | Location Information | Source | Document Summary |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FEDERAL** | FEDERAL |
| Clean Water Act: Federal Water Pollution Control Act – 2002 amendment | 1972 | Nation | [https://www.epa.gov/federal-water-pollution-control-act-.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-08/documents/federal-water-pollution-control-act-508full.pdf) | EPA | Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act requires that all states in the U.S. identify waterbodies that do not meet specified water quality standards and that do not support intended beneficial uses. Identified waters are placed on the Section 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies. Once placed on this list, states are required to develop a water quality control plan - called a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) - for each waterbody and each associated pollutant/stressor. |
| Safe Water Drinking Act | 1974 | Nation | <https://www.epa.gov/sdwa> | EPA | The Safe Drinking Water Act was originally passed by Congress in 1974 to protect public health by regulating the nation’s public drinking water supply. The law was amended in 1986 and 1996 and requires many actions to protect drinking water and its sources—rivers, lakes, reservoirs, springs, and ground water wells. |
| Endangered Species Act 16 U.S.C. §1531 et seq.  | 1973 | Nation | <https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/summary-endangered-species-act> | EPA | The Endangered Species Act (ESA) provides a program for the conservation of threatened and endangered plants and animals and the habitats in which they are found. Species include birds, insects, fish, reptiles, mammals, crustaceans, flowers, grasses, and trees. The law requires federal agencies, in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the NOAA Fisheries Service, to ensure that actions they authorize, fund, or carry out are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat of such species. The law also prohibits any action that causes a "taking" of any listed species of endangered fish or wildlife. Likewise, import, export, interstate, and foreign commerce of listed species are all generally prohibited. |
| Clean Air Act | 1970 (2008)\* | Nation | <http://www.epa.gov/air/caa/> | EPA | The Clean Air Act is the law that defines EPA's responsibilities for protecting and improving the nation's air quality and the stratospheric ozone layer. The last major change in the law, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, was enacted by Congress in 1990. Legislation passed since then has made several minor changes |
| Bioterrorism Act: Requirements of the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Act of 2002 | 2002 | Nation | [https://www.cbp.gov/bioterrorism](https://www.cbp.gov/trade/priority-issues/import-safety/bioterrorism) | EPA | The Bioterrorism Act requires community drinking water systems serving populations of more than 3,300 persons to conduct assessments of their vulnerabilities to terrorist attack or other intentional acts and to defend against adversarial actions that might substantially disrupt the ability of a system to provide a safe and reliable supply of drinking water. The requirements of the Act assign EPA and water utilities responsibilities to enhance water sector security and to develop response measures for potential threats to the nation's water supplies and systems, as outlined below. |
| EPA Water Quality Handbook | 2007 | State of CA, Nation | [http://water.epa.gov/swguidance/handbook](http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/standards/handbook/chapter01.cfm#section8) | EPA | The Water Quality Standards Regulation (40 CFR 131) describes State requirements and procedures for developing, reviewing, revising, and adopting water quality standards (WQS), and EPA requirements and procedures for reviewing, approving, disapproving, and promulgating water quality standards as authorized by section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act. This Handbook serves as guidance for implementing the Water Quality Standards Regulation and its provisions. |
| National Action Plan-Priorities for Managing Freshwater Resources in a Changing Climate | 2011 | Nation | [https://www.epa.gov/](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-12/documents/2011_national_action_plan_1.pdf) | DWR | The Draft National Action Plan for Managing Freshwater Resources in a Changing Climate recommends Federal agency actions to aid freshwater resource managers in managing and protecting the Nation’s water resources. It also outlines ways in which Federal agencies can support state, local and tribal governments in their water resources planning by improving access to quality data and information and best practices. The draft Action Plan responds to a 2010 report from the Obama Administration’s interagency Climate Change Adaptation Task Force that identified freshwater resources planning as a priority. |
| Code of Federal Regulations Title 40: Protection of the Environment Chapter 1: EPA, Subchapter D: Water Programs Part 131: Water Quality Standards | 2011 | Nation, State of California | <https://www.epa.gov/laws-regulations/regulations> | EPA | Part 131 describes the requirements and procedures for developing, reviewing, revising, and approving water quality standards by the States as authorized by section 303(c) of the Clean Water Act.  A water quality standard defines the water quality goals of a water body, or portion thereof, by designating the use or uses to be made of the water and by setting criteria necessary to protect the uses. States adopt water quality standards to protect public health or welfare, enhance the quality of water and serve the purposes of the Clean Water Act (the Act). |
|  |  STATE of CALIFORNIA |
|  | Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act: AB303 | 2000 | State of CA | [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/99-00/bill/pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/99-00/bill/asm/ab_0301-0350/ab_303_bill_20000927_chaptered.pdf) | CA State Govt. | The goal of the Local Groundwater Management Assistance Act of 2000 (Assembly Bill 303) is to help local agencies better understand how to manage groundwater resources effectively to ensure the safe production, quality, and storage of groundwater in the State. Eligible projects include groundwater studies, groundwater monitoring, and groundwater basin management. The program began in 2000, and as of 2009, six (6) rounds of AB 303 grants have been awarded to support local groundwater assistance projects. |
|  | California Fish and Game Code Section 5937  | 1937 | State of CA | [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water\_issues/pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/bay_delta/california_waterfix/exhibits/docs/CSPA%20et%20al/part2/cspa_294.pdf) | State of CA | Provides guidelines and requirements for fishways in and around water retaining infrastructure in waterways throughout California. |
|  | Senate Bill 1307 | 1997 | State of CA | [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/97-98/bill/.html](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/97-98/bill/sen/sb_1301-1350/sb_1307_bill_19971007_chaptered.html) | State of CA | Existing law sets forth definitions governing the California Safe Drinking Water Act.This bill would revise some of those definitions and would also require those definitions to govern a provision of law relating to certification of persons to supervise and operate water treatment plants. |
|  | California Water Action Plan | 2014, 2016 | State of CA | <http://resources.ca.gov/california_water_action_plan/> | Natural Resources Agency | The California Water Action Plan – issued at the direction of Governor Brown in January 2014 and updated in 2016 – sets forth 10 priority actions that guide the state’s effort to create more resilient, reliable water systems and to restore critical ecosystems. In the nearly five years since the plan’s release, state agencies and their local, federal and tribal partners have made steady advances on all 10 priority actions. |
|  | Department of Water Resources |  |  |  |  |
| STATE of CALIFORNIA | California State Water Conservation Act (SBX7-7) | 2009 | State of CA | [https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Water-Use-And-Efficiency](https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Water-Use-And-Efficiency/SB-X7-7) | DWR | Requires the state to achieve a 20% reduction in urban per capita water use by the year 2020. |
| California Groundwater Bulletin 118 Update | 2016 | State of CA | <https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/Bulletin-118> | DWR | California's Groundwater includes guidance and tools that will assist local agencies in effectively managing groundwater as a sustainable part of their water supplies. California's Groundwater includes a description of current groundwater management efforts by local water agencies, required and recommended components of effective groundwater management plans, and a model ordinance that can be used by local governments. In addition, the bulletin describes the roles of state and federal agencies in protecting groundwater quantity and quality. Online technical descriptions and GIS compatible maps of 515 groundwater basins and sub-basins were part of the effort to publish the bulletin. The basin/sub-basin descriptions include information about the geology, groundwater quantity and quality, and current groundwater management practices in the basins. This supplemental material will be updated as new information becomes available. |
| California State Urban Water Management Planning Act (CWC §§ 10610 -10656) | 1983 | State of CA | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/UWMPAct.pdf> | DWR | The Urban Water Management Planning Act requires that every urban water supplierthat provides water to 3,000 or more customers, or provides over 3,000 acre-feet of water annually, take action to ensure reliability in its water service sufficient to meet customer needs during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. To this end, urban water suppliers who meet the above criteria must complete an Urban Water Management Plan. The Act specifies the contents of Urban Water North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan. |
| California Water Plan Update | 2018 | State of CA | [https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR.pdf](https://water.ca.gov/-/media/DWR-Website/Web-Pages/Programs/California-Water-Plan/Docs/Update2018/PRD/California-Water-Plan-Update-2018-Public-Review-Draft.pdf) | DWR | The ***California Water Plan*** provides a framework for water managers, legislators, and the public to consider options and make decisions regarding California’s water future. The Plan, which is updated every five years, presents basic data and information on California’s water resources including water supply evaluations and assessments of agricultural, urban, and environmental water uses to quantify the gap between water supplies and uses. The Plan also identifies and evaluates existing and proposed statewide demand management and water supply augmentation programs and projects to address the State’s water needs. |
|  | Climate Change Handbook: Regional Water Management Planning with Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation- Handbook cont. | 2011 | State of CA | [https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/climatechange/docs/Front Matter-Final.pdf](https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/climatechange/docs/Front%20Matter-Final.pdf) | DWR | The purpose of this handbook is to provide a roadmap for water resources planners describing: 1) The steps that many water planning entities are taking to include climate change impacts and adaptation in planning strategies; 2) The steps that many water planning entities are taking to assess system‐wide and project‐associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and identify potential mitigation measures; and 3) A strategy for incorporating the steps identified in (1) and (2) into the IRWM process or other similar watershed‐level planning. The handbook discusses methods to quantify climate change impacts on water resources, and mitigation and adaptation measures that can be taken to reduce impacts. The handbook introduces a decision‐support framework for including climate change in the process of developing an IRWMP or similar watershed plan. |
|  | Managing an Uncertain Future: Climate Change Adaptation Strategies for California's Water Resources | 2008 | State of CA | <http://www.water.ca.gov/climatechange/docs/ClimateChangeWhitePaper.pdf> | DWR | Climate change is already affecting California’s water resources. Bold stepsmust be taken to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. However, even if emissions ended today, the accumulation of existing greenhouse gases will continue to impact climate for years to come. Warmer temperatures, altered patterns of precipitation and runoff, and rising sea levels are increasingly compromising the ability to effectively manage water supplies, floods and other natural resources. Adapting California’s water management systems in response to climate change presents one of the most significant challenges of this century |
|  | State Water Resources Control Board |  |  |  |
|  | California Pesticide Management Plan for Water Quality | 1997 | State of CA | <https://www.cdpr.ca.gov/docs/emon/surfwtr/maaplan.htm> | SWRCB | The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) and the SWRCB cooperatively developed the California Pesticide Management Plan. The Plan aims to protect water quality from the potential negative effects of pesticides. The Plan explicitly recognizes the importance of water quality throughout the state and the importance of pesticides to a strong economy and potential impacts to public health. The Plan provides for outreach programs (education, training, and public information), water quality standards compliance, ground and surface water protection programs, regulatory compliance, interagency communication, and dispute/conflict resolution (CEPA 1997). |
| STATE of CALIFORNIA | California State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act | 1969 (2018)\* | State of CA | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/laws_regulations/docs/portercologne.pdf> | SWRCB | Under the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne), the State Water Resources Control Board (State Board) has the ultimate authority over State water rights and water quality policy. However, Porter-Cologne also establishes nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Regional Boards) to oversee water quality on a day-to-day basis at the local/regional level. Regional Boards engage in a number of water quality functions in their respective regions. One of the most important is preparing and periodically updating Basin Plans, (water quality control plans). Each Basin Plan establishes:1) beneficial uses of water designated for each water body to be protected;2) water quality standards, known as water quality objectives, for both surface water and groundwater; and 3) actions necessary to maintain these standards in order to control non-point and point sources of pollution to the State's waters. |
| California State Rangeland Water Quality Management Plan | 1995 | State of CA | [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ucdavis.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/rwqcb3/water_issues/programs/tmdl/docs/arroyo_dela_cruz/ca_rland_wq_mngment_plan_ucdavis.pdf) | SWRCB | The primary goal of this Plan is to maintain and improve the quality and associated beneficial uses of surface water as it passes through and out of rangeland resources in the state. Approved by the SWRCB in July of 1995, the plan was developed cooperatively by industry, conservation organizations, and state and federal agencies. It is a “Tier 1” voluntary effort at the local level for compliance with the Plan for California’s Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program. The plan also describes voluntary compliance with the Clean Water Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and the Porter-Cologne Act (SWRCB 1995b). The RWQMP could serve as an example of bringing stakeholders to the table for development of plans to address TMDL implementation prior to regulatory action. Where appropriate, efforts such as this could be incorporated by the Regional Board as a Certification of Compliance. |
|  | Plan for California’s Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program | 2000 | State of CA | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/nps/> | SWRCB | The purpose of the NPS Program Plan is to improve the State’s ability to effectively manage NPS pollution and conform to the requirements of the Federal Clean Water Act and the Federal Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990. These documents were developed by staff of the State Water Resources Control Board's Division of Water Quality and the California Coastal Commission (CCC), in coordination with the Regional Water Quality Control Boards and staff from over twenty other State agencies |
|  | California State Senate Bill 739: Chapter 610 Stormwater Management | 2007 | State of CA | [http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/07-08/statute/ch_0601-0650/ch_610_st_2007_ab_739) | SWRCB | Under existing law, the State Water Resources Control Board and theCalifornia regional water quality control boards prescribe waste dischargerequirements for the discharge of stormwater in accordance with the nationalpollutant discharge elimination system (NPDES) permit program establishedby the federal Clean Water Act and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (state act). |
|  | Drops of Energy: Conserving Urban Water in California to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions | 2011 | State of CA | <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23750633> | DWR/EPA | Water use means energy use. The state pumps and treats water and consumersuse water in energy-intensive ways, such as through water heating and pressurizing.Consequently, the consumption of water in California requires approximately 20 percent of the state’s electricity, 30 percent of its non-power plant natural gas, and 88 million gallons of diesel fuel annually. The greenhouse gas emissions associated with water related energy consumption total more than 100 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent gases, while the burning of carbon-based fuels to power the state’s water infrastructure releases particulate matter that can cause asthma and other health effects. Conserving water therefore means conserving energy and limiting pollution. |
|  | Region-Wide Multi-Watershed Management Areas |
|  | State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) |
|  | Water Quality Control Plan for the Lahontan Region (Basin Plan) | 1995 | Lahontan Region | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/references.shtml> | SWRCB | The California Regional Water Quality Control Board adopts and implements this Basin Plan for the Lahontan Region, which extends from the Oregon border to the northern Mojave Desert and includes all of California east of the Sierra Nevada crest. This plan sets forth water quality standards for the surface and ground waters in the region, identifies general types of water quality problems, identifies required or recommended control measures for these problems, and summarizes applicable provisions of separate State/Regional Board planning and policy documents and other water quality management plans. This Plan also summarizes past and present water quality monitoring programs and identifies monitoring activities to provide the basis for future Basin Plan updates. |
|  | State Water Resources Control Board: Watershed Management Initiative | 1995-2016\* | Lahontan Region/ Upper Owens River | [https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water\_issues.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/watershed_management/index.html) | SWRCB | A five-year Strategic Plan guides the water resource protection efforts of the State and Regional Water Boards. A key component of the Strategic Plan is the Watershed Management Initiative (WMI.) The WMI promotes a watershed management approach for water quality protection.  It is intended to help meet our goal of providing water resources enhancement and restoration while balancing economic and environmental impacts. Each of the nine Regional Water Boards prepares its individual Chapter of the WMI, which is used both as an outreach and planning tool to identify the Region’s priorities and programs. The WMI Chapter is not a commitment to complete work but rather provides a framework to focus and integrate resources to more efficiently restore degraded waterways, encourage regional resource-based planning, and promote the use of urban and rural management practices for pollution control. The Upper Owens is called out specifically within the Inyo-Mono Region. |
|  | United States Forest Service (USFS) |
|  | A summary of current trends and probable future trends in climate and climate driven processes on the Inyo National Forest and adjacent lands | 2011 | Inyo National Forest, Inyo & Mono Counties | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/InyoNF_ClimateChangeTrendSummary_1-27-11.pdf> | USFS- Inyo N.F. | Several types of data are presented to illustrate climatic patterns within the Inyo National Forest and adjacent lands. First, spatially explicit weather records are presented as maps. These are derived using data from the PRISM climate dataset, which interpolates records from weather stations to all areas of the landscape for all years beginning in the late 19th century (Daly et al. 1994, PRISM 2010). Second, weather data are shown for the greater Mojave region http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/monitor/cal-mon/frames\_version.html; (Abatzoglou et al. 2009) as a whole, which includes the Inyo Mountains in the southeastern INF. This dataset is obtained by averaging PRISM data across the Mojave region for each year beginning in the late 19th century. Finally, data are also presented from three weather stations within the INF with long-term meteorological records. Records from these sites provide an indication of local-scale variation in climate patterns, and how patterns at individual stations differ in the extent to which they reflect those seen at broader, regional scales. |
|  | Humboldt National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan | 1986 | North Mono County | [https://inyo-monowater/Humboldt\_LandResMgmtPlan\_1986.pdf](https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Humboldt_LandResMgmtPlan_1986.pdf) | USFS-Inyo N.F. | Work on Forest Plan revision has been suspended as resources and personnel are devoted to travel management, environmental analysis of grazing, fire and fuels management, and implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest will make a public announcement when Forest Plan revision is re-initiated. |
|  | Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest Climate Change Vulnerability Report | 2011 | Mono County | <https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5294901.pdf> | USFS | Through research on woodrat middens and pollen deposition records, scientists have been able to examine changes in vegetation from the late Pleistocene (the last epoch of glacial activity) through the Holocene (11,000 years ago to present time – a period of post-glacial climate stabilization and warming). Past vegetation changes associated with climate variation provide a basis for predicting future risks associated with current climate change and a growing human interaction with natural processes. The following is a short summary of climate changes and associated biological adjustments that have occurred. |
|  | Inyo National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan  | 1988 | Inyo National Forest, Inyo & Mono Counties | [INF General Management Plan](http://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet/%21ut/p/c4/04_SB8K8xLLM9MSSzPy8xBz9CP0os3gDfxMDT8MwRydLA1cj72DTUE8TAwjQL8h2VAQAMtzFUw%21%21/?ss=110504&navtype=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&cid=FSBDEV3_003845&navid=130100000000000&pnavid=130000000000000&position=Feature*&ttype=detailfull&pname=Inyo%2520National%2520Forest-%2520Planning%2520)  | USFS- Inyo N.F. | This Plan provides direction for the management of all lands and resources administered by the Inyo National Forest and documents the environmental analyses conducted as part of the planning process. Describes current conditions and need for management actions. The plan lists alternatives and proposed actions describes affected environment and environmental consequences. In 2009 an update was given explaining the planning moratorium the Inyo National Forest is subjected to under Federal Law.  |
| USFS | Inyo National Forest Wilderness Management Plan revision and EIS | 2001 | Inyo National Forest, Inyo & Mono Counties | [http://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet](http://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet/%21ut/p/c4/04_SB8K8xLLM9MSSzPy8xBz9CP0os3gDfxMDT8MwRydLA1cj72DTUE8TAwjQL8h2VAQAMtzFUw%21%21/?ss=110504&navtype=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&cid=FSBDEV3_003888&navid=130100000000000&pnavid=130000000000000&position=Feature*&ttype=detailfull&pname=Inyo%20National%20Forest-%20Planning) | USFS-Inyo N.F. | This document is the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) that analyzes the effects of proposed amendments to the Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMP) for the Sierra and Inyo National Forests with respect to management direction for the Ansel Adams, John Muir, and Dinkey Lakes Wildernesses and replacement of the existing wilderness management plans. |
|  | Kern Wild and Scenic River Management Plan (North & South Forks) | 1994 | Kern River Watershed | <https://www.rivers.gov/documents/plans/kern-plan.pdf> | USFS-Inyo N.F. | This document presents reasons for selecting Alternative 3 to implement the management plan for the North and South Forks of the Kern Wild and Scenic River for the next 10 to 15 years. Long-term estimates of the Alternatives’ environmental and economic attributes contained in the environmental impact statement were considered in the decision. The Comprehensive Management Plan will be an amendment to the Inyo and Sequoia Forest Land and Resource Management Plans. |
|  | Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment | 2004 | Sierra Nevada forests | <http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/snfpa/final-seis/> | USFS | Amendment to the January 2001 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan. Plan adopts integrated strategy for vegetation management to reduce risk of wildfire to communities and to protect old forests, wildlife habitats and watersheds. Includes specific management strategies, actions and requirements to manage forest lands.  |
|  | Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment: Draft Supplemental EIS | 2013 | Sierra Nevada forests | <https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/stelprdb5434157.pdf> | USFS | This supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) to the 2004 Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA or Framework) Final SEIS is being prepared to comply with two orders issued by the Eastern District Court of California on November 4, 2009. These court orders, issued in *Sierra Forest Legacy v. Rey*, No. 2:05-cv-00205-MCE-GGH (E.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2009) and *People of the State of California v. USDA*, No. 2:05-cv-00211-MCE-GGH (E.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2009), require the Forest Service to remedy a violation of NEPA relative to the analysis of alternatives presented in the 2004 Framework FSEIS. |
|  | South Sierra Wilderness Management Plan: Environmental Assessment | 1991 | Southern Sierra Forests | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/SouthSierra_WildernessMP_EA.pdf> | USFS | The need for a Forest Plan amendment is due to the fact that not all the programmatic direction referenced in the South Sierra Wilderness Implementation Plan (SSWIP) was contained in the Forest Plan. The two-staged decision making process used by the USFS requires that programmatic directions be located at the Forest Plan level. Therefore, the purpose of the proposed amendment is to incorporate into the Inyo Forest Plan the specific programmatic direction that is presently unique to the SSWIP. |
| USFS | Toiyabe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan | 1986 | North Mono County | [Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest- Planning](http://www.fs.usda.gov/wps/portal/fsinternet/%21ut/p/c5/04_SB8K8xLLM9MSSzPy8xBz9CP0os3gjAwhwtDDw9_AI8zPwhQoY6IeDdGCqCPOBqwDLG-AAjgb6fh75uan6BdnZaY6OiooA1tkqlQ%21%21/dl3/d3/L2dJQSEvUUt3QS9ZQnZ3LzZfMjAwMDAwMDBBODBPSEhWTjJNMDAwMDAwMDA%21/?navtype=BROWSEBYSUBJECT&cid=fsm9_026859&navid=130100000000000&pnavid=130000000000000&ss=110417&position=Project.Html&ttype=detail&pname=Humboldt-Toiyabe%20National%20Forest-%20Planning) | USFS-HTNF | Work on Forest Plan revision has been suspended as resources and personnel are devoted to travel management, environmental analysis of grazing, fire and fuels management, and implementation of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest will make a public announcement when Forest Plan revision is re-initiated. |
|  | USDA- Watershed Condition Framework | 2011 | Nation | <https://www.fs.fed.us/sites/default/files/Watershed_Condition_Framework.pdf> | USDA-Forest Service | The Watershed Condition Framework (WCF) is a comprehensive approach for proactively implementing integrated restoration on priority watersheds on national forests and grasslands. The WCF proposes to improve the way the Forest Service approaches watershed restoration by targeting the implementation of integrated suites of activities in those watersheds that have been identified as priorities for restoration. The WCF also establishes a nationally consistent reconnaissance-level approach for classifying watershed condition, using a comprehensive set of 12 indicators that are surrogate variables representing the underlying ecological, hydrological, and geomorphic functions and processes that affect watershed condition. Primary emphasis is on aquatic and terrestrial processes and conditions that Forest Service management activities can influence. The approach is designed to foster integrated ecosystem-based watershed assessments; target programs of work in watersheds that have been identified for restoration; enhance communication and coordination with external agencies and partners; and improve national-scale reporting and monitoring of program accomplishments. The WCF provides the Forest Service with an outcome-based performance measure for documenting improvement to watershed condition at forest, regional, and national scales. |
|  | Bureau of Land Management |
|  | Bishop Field Office Resource Management Plan Record of Decision | 1993 | BLM Lands, Inyo-Mono Counties | <https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/70447/92777/111784/Bishop_RMP_ROD_1993_w_app_glossary_508.pdf> | BLM | Decision of the Bureau of Land Management for managing federal mineral leases and BLM public lands within the Bishop Resource Area. Decisions and strategies are presented for recreation use, wildlife management, mineral uses and land ownership and authorizations.  |
|  | California Desert Conservation Area Plan | 1980-2018\* | Southern Inyo County | [https://lccnetwork.org/sites/default/files/Resources/CDCA - DRECP Resources for the Desert LCC 2018 04 09.pdf](https://lccnetwork.org/sites/default/files/Resources/CDCA%20-%20DRECP%20Resources%20for%20the%20Desert%20LCC%202018%2004%2009.pdf) | BLM | This report is the compilation of all the changes to the Desert plan from 1980-1999 including the 147 amendments and the changes from the California Desert Protection Act. The BLM intends to update the CDCA plan following completion of the four ongoing bio-regional management plans, which cover a substantial portion of the California Desert. |
|  | Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert (NEMO) ROD | 2002 | Mojave Desert | <https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/73191/97521/117679/nemo_rod_12-02.pdf> | BLM | This Record of Decision (ROD) approves, with minor modifications, the Proposed Northern and Eastern Mojave Desert Management Plan (NEMO), an amendment of the 1980 Bureau of Land Management California Desert Conservation Area (CDCA) Plan. The minor modifications from the Proposed Plan include changes in format, wording, and other minor corrections to improve clarity. |
| BLM | West Mojave Plan | 2005 | Mojave Desert | <https://www.blm.gov/ca/pdfs/cdd_pdfs/wemo_pdfs/plan/wemo/Vol-1-Chapter1_Bookmarks.pdf> | BLM | The purpose of the West Mojave Plan is to develop management strategies for the desert tortoise, Mohave ground squirrel and over 100 other sensitive plants and animals that would conserve those species throughout the western Mojave Desert, while at the same time establishing a streamlined program for compliance with the regulatory requirements of FESA and CESA. Agencies, local jurisdictions and others with a stake in the future of the western Mojave Desert have collaborated in the development of the West Mojave Plan.  |
|  | National Park Service-NPS |
|  | Death Valley General Management Plan | 2002 | Death Valley National Park | [https://www.nps.gov/](https://www.nps.gov/deva/learn/management/upload/GMP_001.pdf) | NPS | This General Management Plan is Death Valley National Park’s overall management strategy for a 10-15 year period. This document summarizes the selected alternative from the Final General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (July 2001). The Record of Decision (ROD), signed on September 27, 2001, is included in this document as an appendix. The ROD includes a summary of public and interagency involvement. |
| NPS | Death Valley: Furnace Creek Spring Restoration and Adaptive Management Plan | 2012 | Death Valley National Park | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/FCSprings_Restoration_Final.pdf> | NPS | This plan compiles information from this work and integrates it to guide restoration and justify its goals and identify indicators to assess restoration progress. Accomplishing restoration requires adaptive management that incorporates information provided by monitoring to assess program efficacy and inform management decisions that are necessary to successfully achieve restoration. This plan provides guidance to achieve restoration. However, engineering and construction complexities that may be required to fully achieve restoration (primarily spring source restoration) are beyond the scope of this restoration plan. |
| Death Valley Fire Management Plan | 2007 | Death Valley National Park | <https://www.nps.gov/deva/learn/management/upload/Death-Valley-NP-Fire-Management-Plan-August-2010.pdf> | NPS | The 2007 Fire Management Plan for Death Valley National Park will guide management of Wildland fire over the next ten years. This plan fulfills responsibilities under several directives including the Federal Wildland Fire Management Policy, the National 10-year Comprehensive Strategy Implementation Plan for Reducing Wildland Fire Risks to Communities and the Environment, the Interagency Fire Management Plan Template, and NPS Director’s Order #18: Wildland Fire Management. This plan also incorporates the most current fire science. |
|  | Inyo-Mono Agriculture Commissioners Office |
|  | Annual Report- Invasive Weed Control and Eradication Activities in Inyo and Mono Counties | 2008-2010 | Inyo and Mono Counties | <http://www.inyomonoagriculture.com/eswma.html> | Inyo-Mono Ag Commissioner Office | The Inyo/Mono Counties’ Agricultural Commissioner’s office operates a noxious weed program as well as administering the Eastern Sierra Weed Management Area. The ESWMA includes public and private entities that aid in local weed issues. These reports summarize work performed as well as successes and challenges within the region directly related to noxious weeds.  |
|  | Eastern Sierra Weed Management Area Strategic Plan | 2008 | Inyo and Mono Counties | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Strategic-Plan.pdf> | Inyo-Mono Ag Commissioner Office | This strategic plan outlines actions designed to control the spread of noxious weeds utilizing integrated pest management practices. To accomplish this, the ESWMA members will integrate resources, priorities, and strategies into a unified action. The plan will be updated and revised on a continual basis to reflect program successes and new challenges. Unified action is the best method for reducing the extensive economic, ecological and social impacts of noxious weeds on Inyo and Mono Counties’ resources and people. |
| Inyo- Mono Ag. | Eastern Sierra Weed Management Area MOU | 2010 | Inyo and Mono Counties | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/MOU-ESWMA-2010.pdf> | Inyo-Mono Ag Commissioner Office | This Memorandum of Understanding is made and entered into by the California Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA), Inyo/Mono Counties Agricultural Commissioner’s Office, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP), Inyo County Water Department, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Bishop Field Office, Barstow Field Office, Needles Field Office, USDA, Forest Service, Inyo National Forest (USFS), Toiyabe National Forest (USFS), CalFire, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Inyo/Mono Resource Conservation District, Inyo/Mono Counties Cattlemen’s Association, California Department of Transportation District 9 (CalTrans), Bishop Paiute Tribe Environmental Management Office, and California State Parks. |
|  | REGIONAL PLANS |
|  | Watershed/Groundwater Management Plans/Reports |
|  | Amargosa River Report | 2014 | Amargosa River | <https://www.nrc.gov/docs/ML1610/ML16104A277.pdf> | Amargosa Conservancy | This report details the significance of and threats to the Amargosa River, describes the current legal environment surrounding the issue, outlines activities and actions in progress aiming to protect the water resources, and addresses what means there are to improving conservation efforts. |
| Bodie Creek, Mono County: Total Maximum Daily Loads for Metals (Project Report) | 2004 | Bodie Creek, Mono County | <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/bodie_creek/docs/bodie_creek_project_report_12_04.pdf> | Lahontan RWQCB | Bodie Creek is currently 303(d)-listed for non-specific "metals." Analytical results fromthis limited sampling effort indicate exceedances of water quality criteria for totalaluminum, iron, manganese, arsenic, mercury, and dissolved zinc. Beneficial uses ofBodie Creek include cold freshwater habitat (COLD), and domestic and municipal supply (MUN). The water quality criteria used for the comparisons in this report were selected to be protective of these beneficial uses. |
| Hillside Decree | 1940 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Hillside-Decree-1940.pdf> | Inyo County | Hillside Water Company vs. City of Los Angeles. Decision of the court governs Bishop Creek operation and diversions. |
| East Walker River Watershed Assessment and Plan | 2012 | East Walker River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/E-Walker-Assessment-FINAL.pdf> | ESLT | This report describes how the 400 square mile watershed of the East Walker River above the California/Nevada border influences the quantity and quality of the water flowing into the East Walker River. |
| Groundwater Management Plan for the Mammoth Basin Watershed  | 2005 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/groundwater/docs/GWMP/SL-3_MammothCWD_GWMP_2005.pdf> | MCWD | This plan presents a management strategy to guide management decisions and evaluate water resources within the Mammoth Basin watershed. The objectives of this report are to protect the environment, establish sustainable yields and meet the needs of the community. The plan outlines current basin conditions and groundwater monitoring programs based on existing reports and data. The plan presents specific action recommendations for groundwater protection and management.  |
| Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Plan | 2006 | Indian Wells Valley Basin | [https://inyo-monowater.IWV-Cooperative-Groundwater-Management-Plan.pdf](https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/IWV-Cooperative-Groundwater-Management-Plan.pdf) | IWVWD | The Cooperative Groundwater Management Plan was signed and approved in 1995, as the first step towards determining best management practices of groundwater resources in Indian Wells Valley. Funding was used to monitor wells used for groundwater; develop a GIS management system to archive, track and present data; develop a conceptual groundwater model; and to develop a website to allow public access to information. Based on above report, data gaps were identified. This plan proposes additional tasks: environmental documentation, construct monitoring wells, water sampling, continuous water level monitoring and geohydrologic data review. |
| Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement | 2017 | Owens Valley Groundwater Authority | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/SGMA.JPA_.pdf> | OVGA | The purpose of this agreement is to provide for the joint exercise of powers common to the members, including additional powers granted by. SGMA, to cooperatively carry out the powers of the SGMA including but not limited to serving as the GSA for the basin within the jurisdictional boundaries of the authority formed GSA and developing, adopting, and implementing a GSP that achieves groundwater sustainability in the Basin. |
| Mammoth Creek: Final Environmental Impact Report | 2011 | Mammoth Creek | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Final-Mammoth-Creek-EIR-5-02-11.pdf>/ | MCWD | The Mammoth Community Water District, as the Lead Agency under the CaliforniaEnvironmental Quality Act (CEQA), has prepared this Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the Mammoth Creek fishery bypass flow requirements, watershed operation constraints, point of measurement, and place of use. The project is located in the Mammoth Lakes Basin, on the eastern slope of the Sierra Nevada, encompassing Lake Mary and the Mammoth Creek watercourse, downstream to the United States Geological Survey flume gage on Hot Creek, the length of Bodie Ditch from Lake Mary to the head of Mammoth Meadows. |
| Mono Basin Watershed Management Plan  | 2007 | Mono Basin | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Mono-Basin-Watershed-Managment-Plan-3-07.pdf> | Mono County | This plan creates linkages between water quality and water quantity problems and conditions, processes, and activities occurring in the Mono Basin watershed. The study area includes 800 square miles of the Mono Basin watershed; the plan pertains only to lands in the Basin and not Mono Lake. It contains goals and objectives, describes desired future conditions and potential actions, and identifies data gaps. Issues described include water supply (for the June Lake area) and water quality. The guiding principle is to minimize disturbance to stream systems and riparian areas. The plan has no authority itself and must be adopted by the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team and its member agencies in order to achieve the projects/actions proposed. |
| Watershed/Groundwater Management Plans/Reports  | Mono Basin Watershed Assessment | 2007 | Mono Basin | [https://inyo-monowater.org/Assessments\_MonoBasin.pdf](https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Assessments_MonoBasin.pdf) | Mono County | This report describes how the 800-square mile (677 square miles within California) watershed influences the quantity and quality of water that flows into Mono Lake. It will largely ignore the lake itself except as an end point for the water contributed from the lands surrounding the lake. The Mono Basin is watershed #601 in the CalWater system of watershed delineation |
| North Mono Basin Watershed Analysis | 2007 | Mono Basin | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/North-Mono-Basin-Watershed-Analysis_-Appendix.pdf> | Mono Basin Clearinghouse | Analysis conducted during 2001 as part of the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan amendment “…to maintain or restore ecological sustainability to provide a sustainable flow of uses, values, products and services from these lands”. Document provides a framework to guide landscape management. Contains a characterization of the watershed, identifies issues and key questions, assesses current conditions, historical and “natural” conditions, interprets data, and suggests management opportunities and recommendations. Issues identified: 1) Human use to the aquatic environment, 2) Human use of the terrestrial environment, 3) Erosion and water quality, 4) Habitat composition (upland, wetland, riparian), 5) Fisheries and fish habitat condition, and 6) wildlife (terrestrial and avian). |
| Upper Owens River Watershed Assessment | 2007 | Owens River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Assessment_UpperOwensRiverBasin.pdf> | Mono County | This report describes how the 380-square mile watershed influences the quantity and quality of water that flows into the upper Owens River above the Crowley Lake dam. The study area has been called the Long Hydrologic Area (and Subarea) and is watershed #603.1 in the CalWater system of watershed delineation (http://www.ca.nrcs.usda.gov/features/calwater/ and http://cwp.resources.ca.gov). |
| Upper Owens River Watershed Management Plan | 2007 | Owens River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Upper-Owens-Watershed-Management-Plan-3-07.pdf> | Mono County | This plan creates linkages between water quality and water quantity problems and conditions, processes, and activities occurring in the Upper Owens River watershed. The study area is the 380 square mile Long Hydrologic Area. It contains goals and objectives and describes desired future conditions and potential actions. Issues include water supply and water quality. It identifies data gaps including water quality data, sediment budgets of Mammoth and Hot creeks, and groundwater systems. The guiding principle is to minimize disturbance to stream systems and riparian areas. The plan has no authority itself and must be adopted by the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team and its member agencies in order to achieve the projects/actions proposed. |
| Walker River Geographic Response Plan (Draft) | 2006 | Walker River | <https://ndep.nv.gov/uploads/documents/wrgrp_may_2006.pdf> | CWRAC | The Walker River Geographic Response Plan (WRGRP) establishes the policies,responsibilities, and procedures required to protect the health and safety of thepopulace, the environment, and public and private property from the effects ofhazardous materials incidents. |
| West Walker River Watershed Management Plan | 2007 | West Walker River Watershed | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/West-Walker-Watershed-Management-Plan-3-0.pdf> | Mono County | This plan creates linkages between water quality and water quantity problems and conditions, processes, and activities occurring in the West Walker River watershed. The study area is the 410 square mile watershed that includes the area above Topaz Reservoir at the California/Nevada border. It contains goals and objectives, describes desired future conditions and potential actions, and identifies data gaps. Issues described include water supply/water allocation and water quality. The guiding principle is to minimize disturbance to stream systems and riparian areas. The plan has no authority itself and must be adopted by the Mono County Collaborative Planning Team and its member agencies in order to achieve the projects/actions proposed. |
|  | Los Angeles-Inyo/Mono County Plans/Reports |
|  | Inyo/LA Long-Term Water Agreement | 1991 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/documents/governing-documents/water-agreement/> | Inyo County Water Dept. | The overall goal of the Agreement is to manage water resources in the Owens Valley to avoid causing certain described decreases in vegetation and to avoid significant effects on the environment which cannot be mitigated while providing a reliable supply for use in Inyo County and for export to Los Angeles. Conditions documented during a vegetation inventory conducted from 1984-87 serve as the basis for determining whether significant decreases and changes in vegetation have occurred. Inyo County and Los Angeles jointly prepared an EIR analyzing impacts of management according to the Agreement on the Owens Valley environment and water supply for Los Angeles. The Agreement established detailed procedures contained in the Green Book to manage groundwater pumping, to monitor environmental conditions, and to assess and mitigate impacts of increased water export to Los Angeles. A detailed summary of the history leading to adoption of the Agreement is contained in the EIR (pp. 2-10 to 2-19). |
|  | 1991 EIR | 1991 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/documents/governing-documents/1991-eir/> | Inyo County Water Dept. | In June of 1970, the Second Los Angeles Aqueduct was completed, adding an additional 300 cubic-feet-per-second of export capacity to the LA aqueduct system. To supply the additional water to the aqueduct system LA increased pumping in the Owens Valley, decreased irrigation in the Owens Valley, and increased exports of surface water from the Mono Basin. Also in 1970, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) was enacted. In 1972 Inyo County commenced CEQA litigation against LA seeking the preparation of a CEQA Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to analyze the potential impacts of the Second LA Aqueduct. From the 1970s through the 1980s most of the scientific analysis was conducted for the EIR and, after numerous legal battles, a Draft EIR (DEIR), titled “Water From the Owens Valley to Supply the Second Los Angeles Aqueduct,” was produced in September 1990 consisting of Volumes I and II. The Final EIR, with the header “Response To Comments on September 1990 Draft Environmental Impact Report,” was produce in August 1991 consisting of Volumes I, II, III. The Final EIR is referred to as “the 91 EIR.” |
|  | Annual Report: Owens Valley Monitor | 2018 | Owens Valley | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/05/FINAL-LADWP-2018-OWENS-VALLEY-REPORT.pdf> | LADWP | This document are intended to satisfy the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power’s(LADWP) annual reporting obligations pursuant to the Agreement between the County of Inyo and the City of Los Angeles and its Department of Water and Power on a Long Term Groundwater Management Plan for Owens Valley and Inyo County (Water Agreement); the 1991 Environmental Impact Report Water from the Owens Valley to Supply the Second Los Angeles Aqueduct, 1970 to 1990, 1990 Onward, Pursuant to a Long Term Groundwater Management Plan (1991 EIR); the Laws Type E transfer; the1997 Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, County of Inyo, the California Department of Fish and Game, theCalifornia State Lands Commission, the Sierra Club, and the Owens Valley Committee(1997 MOU); and the August 2004 Amended Stipulation and Order in CaseNo. S1CVCV01-29768 (Stip/Order). |
| Annual Compliance Report to SWRCB (Re: Mono Basin) | 2003-2010 | Mono Basin | <http://www.monobasinresearch.org/onlinereports/#HYDROLOGY> | Mono Basin Clearinghouse | Pursuant to the SWRCB Decision 1631and Orders No. 98-5 and 98-7 and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power Mono Basin Water Right License No. 10191 and 10192, the following compliance reports fulfill legal reporting requirements under Orders 98-5 and 98-7. |
| Conservation Strategy for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher | 2005 | Owens River/ Rock Creek | <https://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/tm2a10/pdf/tm2a10.pdf> | LADWP | Includes conservation strategies for the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher in proposed critical habitat, which includes riparian habitat along a 69-mile reach of the Owens River and a 0.9-mile-long reach of Rock Creek in Inyo and Mono counties. |
| City of Los Angeles Water Supply Plan: Securing LA’s Water Supply | 2008 | Inyo-Mono IRWM Region | [https://planning.lacity.org/eir/668SoAlamedaStreet/Deir/4.13.2 Water Supply.pdf](https://planning.lacity.org/eir/668SoAlamedaStreet/Deir/4.13.2%20Water%20Supply.pdf) | Mono Basin Clearinghouse | In 2007, we reached a boiling point as several factors converged to create watershortages from all major sources, sparking the need to rethink existing and future water supplies to meet the demand of more than 4 million people in Los Angeles. This City of Los Angeles Water Supply Plan, “Securing L.A.’s Water Supply,” provides a blueprint for ensuring a reliable water supply for Los Angeles residents and businesses and for future generations of Angelenos. |
| City of Los Angeles Urban Water Management Plan | 2010 | Inyo-Mono Region/ City of Los Angeles | [https://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/faces/wcnav\_externalId/a-w-sos-uwmp?\_afrLoop=476117944395168&\_afrWindowMode=0&\_afrWindowId=null - %40%3F\_afrWindowId=null%26\_afrLoop=476117944395168%26\_afrWindowMode=0%26\_adf.ctrl-state=4g7b1y72x\_4](https://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/faces/wcnav_externalId/a-w-sos-uwmp?_afrLoop=476117944395168&_afrWindowMode=0&_afrWindowId=null#%40%3F_afrWindowId%3Dnull%26_afrLoop%3D476117944395168%26_afrWindowMode%3D0%26_adf.ctrl-state%3D4g7b1y72x_4) | LADWP | The LADWP’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) serves two purposes: (1) compliance with the requirements of California’s Urban Water Management Planning Act (Act), and (2) as a master plan for water supply and resources management consistent with the City’s goals and policy objectives. |
| Final Ad Hoc Yellow Billed Cuckoo Habitat Enhancement Plan | 2005 | Hogback Creek, Baker Creek | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/YBCHabitatEnhancePlanFinal.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | The 1997 MOU between LADWP and Inyo County and others required that habitat be evaluated in the riparian woodland areas of Hogback and Baker creeks so that enhancement plans could be developed. These plans identify reasonable and feasible actions or projects to maintain and improve the habitat of the Yellow-billed Cuckoo. |
| Grant Lake Operations and Management Plan | 1996 | Grant Lake, Mono Basin | <https://www.monobasinresearch.org/images/1996glomp.pdf> | Mono Basin  | The Grant Lake Operations and Management Plan addresses four separate but interrelated components: Grant Lake operation, Lee Vining Conduit diversions, exports, and stream flows. In addressing these components, the plan also meets the Decision 1631requirements regarding the upper Owens River. In providing the streamflows that are required by Decision 1631, both base flows as well as channel maintenance flows, the Grant Lake Operations and Management Plan provides the necessary flows for stream and stream channel restoration. Further, by adhering to the Decision's export criteria, the Plan allows the elevation of Mono Lake to rise to the target elevation, thus providing the most significant element of waterfowl habitat restoration. |
| Los Angeles-Inyo/Mono County Plans/Reports | Green Book for the Long-term Groundwater Management Plan for the Owens Valley and Inyo County | 1990 | Inyo County | <https://water.ca.gov/LegacyFiles/groundwater/docs/GWMP/SL-2_InyoCounty-LosAngelesDWP_GWMP_1990.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | This Green Book was created in agreement between the County of Inyo and LADWP for the Long-term Groundwater Management Plan for the Owens Valley and to accompany the environmental impact report (EIR). The Green book describes goals of the Agreement that pertain to vegetation management and sets forth procedures and methods to achieve those goals. It describes techniques, procedures and criteria to compile vegetation inventories, create vegetation management maps and monitor vegetation data. Further studies and supporting technical vegetation information are presented. |
| Habitat Management Plan- Owens Lake | 2010 | Owens Dry Lake | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/HabitatMgmtPlan_OwensDryLake_LADWP.pdf> | LADWP | This document describes the Owens Lake Habitat Management Plan (OLHMP) for the Owens Lake Dust Mitigation Project (Project). This plan is a requirement of Mitigation Measure Biology-14 of the 2008 State Implementation Plan Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (2008 SIP FSEIR). The overall goal of the plan, as stated in the 2008 SIP FSEIR is to avoid direct and cumulative impacts to native wildlife communities that may result from the Project. As noted in Mitigation Measure Biology-14, the plan will apply to all emissive areas subject to dust control measure on lands owned by either the City of Los Angeles (City) or the California State Lands Commission (CSLC). The OLHMP was developed by staff of LADWP. |
| Inyo County Annual Reports  | 1991-2019 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Hillside-Decree-1940.pdf> | Inyo County | The 1997 MOU requires LADWP and Inyo County to prepare an annual report describing environmental conditions in the Owens valley.  Each agency prepares an annual report independently although much of the same data are contained in both reports.  The LADWP report also contains results of activities it was required to perform by the Agreement and associated governing documents, but that do not involve Inyo County staff. |
| Inyo County Resolutions No. 99-43: Extraction and Use of Inyo County’s Water Resources | 1999 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/documents/governing-documents/water-policy-resolution-99-43/> | Inyo County Water Dept. | A resolution of the Inyo County Board of Supervisors which affirms the extraction and use of Inyo County’s water resources for the Lower Owens River Project in order to meet the obligations under the Inyo/Los Angeles Long Term Water Agreement, Final EIR, and Memorandum of Understanding, while protecting the County’s environment, citizens and economy from adverse effects. This document establishes policies and procedures to implement the obligations of the County and evaluate results. |
| LADWP Urban Water Management Plan | 2015 | LADWP | <https://www.ladwp.com/ladwp/faces/wcnav_externalId/a-w-sos-uwmp> | LADWP | The 2015 UWMP builds upon the goals and progress made in the 2010 UWMP and continues to serve as the City’s master plan for reliable water supply and resources management. The 2015 UWMP is based on a 25-year planning horizon through 2040 |
| LORP: Action Plan (Appendix to MOU between Inyo County, LADWP and others. Re: Implementation of the LORP | 1997 | Lower Owens River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Action-Plan-for-Implementation_LORP_Detailed_Oct19_05.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | This plan describes the tasks and objectives for preparing an ecosystem management plan, which will guide the implementation of the Lower Owens River Project (LORP), as part of [Inyo/Los Angeles Long Term Water Agreement](http://www.inyowater.org/Water_Resources/water_agreement/default.html) to restore wetland and riparian habitats and to re-water the full 60-mile reach of the Lower Owens River. |
| LORP: Work Plan, Budget, and Schedule | 2017 | Lower Owens River | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/LORP-Work-Plan-FY2016-2017-20160314-FINAL-TG-Approved.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | This document is intended to satisfy LADWP’s annual reporting obligations pursuant to the Water Agreement; the 1991 EIR; the Laws Type E transfer; the 1997 MOU between LADWP, Inyo County, the California Department of Fish and Game, the California State Lands Commission, the Sierra Club, and the Owens Valley Committee; and the August 2004 Amended Stipulation and Order in Case No. S1CVCV01-29768. |
| LORP: Annual Report | 2017 (draft) | Lower Owens River | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Draft-2017-Annual-LORP-Report.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | The Lower Owens River Project (LORP) is a large-scale habitat restoration project in Inyo County, California being implemented through a joint effort by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) and Inyo County (County). The LORP was identified in a 1991 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as mitigation for impacts related to groundwater pumping by LADWP from 1970 to 1990. The description of the project was augmented in a 1997 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed by LADWP, County, California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California State Lands Commission (SLC), Sierra Club, and the Owens Valley Committee. As described in the *Lower Owens River Monitoring Adaptive Management and Reporting Plan* (Ecosystem Sciences, 2008), copies of the annual monitoring report will be distributed to the other MOU parties (CDFG, SLC, Sierra Club, and the Owens Valley Committee) and made available to the public. This document represents the reporting requirements for the LORP Annual Report for 2010. |
| LORP: Ecosystem Management Plan | 2002 | Lower Owens River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/EcosystemManagementPlans.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | The Ecosystem Management Plan describes Management Concepts for the LORP and includes a River Management Plan, Wetland Management Plan, Land Management Plan, LORP Conservation Plan, Recreation Management Plan, and Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan. |
| LORP: Final EIR | 2004 | Lower Owens River | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/LORP/DOCUMENTS/LORPFinalEIREIS.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | This final EIR was prepared by the LADWP as part of the agreement to restore various wetland and riparian habitats along the Owens River, known as the Lower Owens River Project (LORP). The objective of the EIR is to evaluate the impacts of the proposed LORP in order to allow LADWP and the County to make informed decisions about the final design and implementation of the Project and to implement the LORP in the most environmentally sound manner. A description of the project, current environmental conditions, potential impacts of the project, and alternatives are presented. |
| LORP: Monitoring, Adaptive Management, and Reporting Plan | 2008 | Lower Owens River | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/LORP/default.htm> | Inyo County Water Dept. | Describes the long-term monitoring plan for collecting and analyzing data on the progress toward meeting LORP goals. Using this data, the LORP will be adaptively managed and project management will be modified if data from ongoing monitoring and analysis reveal that such modification is necessary to ensure the attainment of the LORP goals. |
| LORP: Recreation Use Plan (Existing Conditions Memo) | 2011 | Lower Owens River | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Lower-Owens-River_Recreation-Use-Plan-DRAFT_011513.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | This memorandum is a summary of existing conditions, opportunities and constraints with respect to developing and managing recreation within the Lower Owens River Project Area (LORP). Inyo County is partnering with the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) to create a long-range Recreational Use Plan for the Lower Owens River. The goal of the Plan is to enhance and better manage community and visitor recreation experiences in the LORP area. This plan will create a foundation for the continued investment and collaboration needed to establish the Lower Owens River area as a destination for local and regional outdoor enthusiasts. Resource conservation and recovery, improved recreational access and local economic development are fundamental goals of this plan |
| Los Angeles-Inyo/Mono County Plans/Reports | Mono Basin EIR (Draft) | 1993 | Mono Basin | <https://www.monobasinresearch.org/onlinereports/mbeir.php> | Mono Basin Clearinghouse | The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has prepared a draftenvironmental impact report (EIR) for the review and modification of certain Mono Basin water rights held by the City of Los Angeles. The draft EIR was prepared in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The project evaluated in the draft EIR consists of: 1) The establishment and maintenance of instream flow requirements in the Mono Lake tributaries from which the City of Los Angeles diverts water; 2)The establishment and maintenance of water elevation requirements in Mono Lake to provide appropriate protection for public trust resources and beneficial uses of Mono Lake. The SWRCB will incorporate the appropriate instream flow requirements, lake level requirements, and mitigation measures into the City of Los Angeles' water right licenses for diversion from Mono Basin. |
| Mono Basin: Rush and Lee Vining Creek Instream Flow Study | 2009 | Mono Basin | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/water_issues/programs/mono_lake/docs/instreamflowstudy_rushleevining.pdf> | SWRCB | The SWRCB Order 98-05, Section 1 b.(2)(a), directed the Mono Basin Stream Scientists to “evaluate and make recommendations based on the results of the monitoring program, regarding the magnitude, duration and frequency of the SRF flows necessary for the restoration of Rush Creek”. The Rush Creek and Lee Vining Creek Instream Flow Study (IFS) was designed to quantify adult trout holding (primarily winter) and foraging (spring, summer, fall) microhabitat areas over a range of test flows, then assess trout microhabitat area in conjunction with water temperature, fish passage, and riffle hydraulics where trout food resources (benthic macroinvertebrates) are concentrated. The IFS results and flow needs are presented in this Report. |
| Mono Basin: Stream and Stream Channel Restoration Plan | 1996 | Mono Basin | <http://www.monobasinresearch.org/legal/1996streamplan.pdf> | Mono Lake Committee | The restoration plan prepared by LADWP has the overall goal to 'develop functionaland self-sustaining stream systems with healthy riparian ecosystem components.This complies with the order of the SWRCB which defined the objective for the Streamand Stream Channel Restoration Plan to be " ... to restore, preserve and protect the streams and fisheries in Rush, Lee Vining, Walker and Parker creeks." |
| Mono Basin: Waterfowl Habitat Restoration Plan | 1996 | Mono Basin | <http://www.monobasinresearch.org/legal/1996waterfowlplan.pdf> | Mono Lake Committee | The Mono Lake Basin Water Right Decision 1631 was adopted by the State WaterResources Control Board (SWRCB) on September 28, 1994. This Decision amendedWater Right Licenses 10191 and 10192, held by the City of Los Angeles, to meet thepublic trust needs of the Mono Basin environment, and to comply with Fish and GameCode Sections 5937 and 5946. The Decision defined instream flow requirements in the four streams from which the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) diverts water, and established water diversion criteria to protect wildlife and other environmental resources (air quality, scenic value, water quality standards) in the Mono Basin. Decision 1631 requires LADWP to prepare a Waterfowl Habitat Restoration Plan, to help mitigate the loss of waterfowl habitat due to the diversion of water. This document is the plan required by the SWRCB. |
| Mono Lake Basin Water Right Decision 1631 | 1994 | Mono Basin | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/board_decisions/adopted_orders/decisions/d1600_d1649/wrd1631.pdf> | Mono Basin Clearinghouse | In Decision 1631, the State Water Board modified licenses 10191 and 10192 for the purpose of establishing instream flow requirements below Los Angeles Department of Water and Power’s points of diversion on four affected streams, which are tributaries to Mono Lake. The decision also established conditions to protect public trust resources at Mono Lake. Subsequent Orders WR 98-05 and WR 98-07 amended Decision 1631. Pursuant to the State Water Board determinations, the Licensee is required to undertake restoration and monitoring activities to be in compliance with the terms and conditions of its licenses. |
|  | MOU: Inyo County, City of Los Angeles, Sierra Club, Owens Valley Committee, CA Dept of Fish and Game and CA State Lands Commission | 1997 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/documents/governing-documents/mou/> | LADWP | The MOU resolved disagreements on the scope and details of several environmental projects and studies described in the Agreement and required additional land and habitat management plans be developed. The majority of the MOU provisions pertain to the implementation of the Lower Owens River Project (LORP) to re-water 53 62 miles of the original channel below the LAA intake dam. This project will establish a viable warm water fishery and healthy functioning ecosystem and wetlands associated with the river. This It is the single largest mitigation project in required by the Agreement. The MOU also establishes a commitment for frequent communication among representatives of the parties to discuss issues that arise during implementation of the MOU and sets out dispute resolution procedures to settle future disagreements. |
| Los Angeles-Inyo/Mono County Plans/Reports | Owens Lake Master Plan (Working Draft) | 2011 | Owens Dry Lake | <https://owensvalley.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Owens-Lake-Master-Project.pdf> | Owens Lake Master Planning Committee | The purpose of the plan is to promote/protect the resources of the lakebed, while achieving water‐efficient dust control and maintaining or improving the lakebed’s overall public trust value. The core elements of the plan are water‐efficient dust control and wildlife habitat. The Master Plan includes consideration of other public trust resources associated with the playa, including public access and recreation, and other lakebed resources such as cultural resources, renewable energy, grazing, and mining. The Master Plan reflects the outcome of collaborative planning among local, state, and federal stakeholders and it represents the collective vision for the future of the lakebed |
| Owens Valley Land Management Plan (Draft) | 2008 | Owens Valley | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Owens-Valley-Land-Management-Plan-Final.pdf> | LADWP | Provides management direction for water supply, habitat, recreation, and land use on all City of Los Angeles-owned lands in Inyo County, excluding the Lower Owens River Project area. This plan provides a framework for implementing management prescriptions through time, monitoring resources, and adaptively managing changed land and water conditions. |
| Owens Valley PM10 Planning Area Demonstration of Attainment State Implementation Plan | 1998 | Owens Dry Lake | <https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/planning/sip/planarea/gbasin/owens/owens_1998sip.pdf> | GBAPCD | Calls for an addition of 13.2 square miles of dust control on Owens Lake by April 2010, bringing a total of 42.1 square miles of dust control measures into operation on Owens Lake. Dust control measures used under this plan include managed vegetation, shallow flood, and gravel cover. |
| Owens Valley PM10 Planning Area Demonstration of Attainment State Implementation Plan: Final SEIS | 2008 | Owens Dry Lake | <https://www3.epa.gov/region9/air/owens/pmplan.html> | GBAPCD | This Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes the potential for significant environmental impacts in association with the 2008 Owens Valley PM10 Planning Area Demonstration of Attainment State Implementation Plan (SIP)1 (proposed project). This Subsequent EIR incorporates the 1998 EIR and 2003 EIR by reference and provides broad program-level and project-specific environmental analyses for the 2008 SIP revision. |
| Mono Basin: State Water Resources Control Board Restoration Orders: WR 98-05 | 1998 | Mono Basin | <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/waterrights/board_decisions/adopted_orders/orders/1998/wro98-05.pdf> | Mono Basin Clearinghouse | Decision 1631 substantially resolved the long-standing debate over imposing restrictions on water diversions from the Mono Basin in order to protect environmental and public trust resources. In recent years, attention has shifted to examining other actions that could be taken to help restore various resources damaged through years of water diversions and in-basin development. The focus of this order is on the still narrower issue of determining the stream and waterfowl habitat restoration measures that Los Angeles should be required to implement or participate in under the provisions of Decision 163 I which amended the conditions governing Los Angeles’ diversion of water under Licenses 10191 and 10192. |
|  | RELEVANT REPORTS (Research, Advocacy, Conservation, Compliance) |
|  | Bodie Creek Project Report: Total Maximum Daily Loads for Metals | 2003 | Bodie Creek Watershed | <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/bodie_creek/docs/bodie_creek_project_report_12_04.pdf> | SWRCB | Bodie Creek is included on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list for metalsImpairment. In April, May and June of 2004, staff of the Lahontan Regional WaterQuality Control Board (RWQCB) collected surface water samples from the creek todetermine if metals detected in sediment during previous investigations (Dynamac, 2002) were present in surface water of Bodie Creek. Water samples from Bodie Creek were analyzed for dissolved and total metals and cyanide (see Bodie Creek Sampling and Analysis Plan, Lahontan RWQCB, April 2004). This report explains the initial findings. |
|  | Bridgeport Reservoir: Report on Beneficial Use Impairment: Limnology in the Summer-Fall 2000 and comparisons with 1989 | 2003 | Bridgeport Reservoir | <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/bridgeport/docs/bridgeport_reservoir_year_2000_final_report_figures.pdf> | SWRCB | A comprehensive study of the reservoir’s limnology was carried out in summer-fall 2000 and compared with a smaller study conducted in 1989. The specific purpose of the 2000 study was to understand the physical, chemical and biological processes in the reservoir in relation to impairment of beneficial uses. The information will be used as part of the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) process to determine numerical and/or narrative water quality standards to attain designated beneficial use. |
| Crowley Lake: Assessment of internal nutrient loading to Crowley Lake | 2003 | Crowley Lake | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/crowley_lake/docs/final_00-196-160-0_int_loading_crowley_1.pdf> | SWRCB | Crowley Lake (Long Valley Reservoir) is a valuable aquatic resource identified as impaired by nutrients by the CA Water Resources Control Board. The lake is eutrophic and is characterized by an ample supply of nutrients and significant summer algal blooms (EPA 1978, Melack and Lesack 1982). Adverse impacts of increased eutrophication at Crowley Lake have included de-oxygenation of the hypolimnion and downstream fish kills (Milliron 1997), and decreased water quality as indicated by taste, odor, and large areas of floating algal mats. |
| Crowley Lake: Environmental Assessment for Crowley Lake Watershed Grazing Allotment Analysis | 2009 | Crowley Lake | <http://www.fs.fed.us/nepa/nepa_project_exp.php?project=17526> | USFS | Today, there are 15 grazing allotments in the Crowley Lake Basin ranging in size from 500 to 50,500 acres. Twelve of the allotments are subject to this environmental analysis. Grazing in the allotments is authorized by Term Grazing Permits that specify the terms and conditions for grazing on the allotment, including the type and timing of livestock as well as any management actions necessary o meet desired rangeland conditions. |
| Crowley Lake: Recommendation to delist Crowley Lake for Nitrogen and Phosphorus | 2005 | Crowley Lake | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/integrated_report/docs/r6_irstaff_report.pdf> | SWRCB | In 1994, Crowley Lake (also known as Long Valley Reservoir) was listed as an impaired water body in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) based on information and listing criteria available at that time. The most current 303(d) list, updated in 2002 by Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board (Regional Board), shows Crowley Lake to be impaired by nitrogen and phosphorous, with grazing, atmospheric deposition, internal nutrient cycling, erosion/siltation, and undifferentiated non-point and natural sources listed as the potential sources of nitrogen and/or phosphorous loading (LRWQCB, 2002). A November 1994 Water Body Fact Sheet prepared by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB, 1994) described the impairment of Crowley Lake as eutrophication, “…with the hypolimnion anoxic in1991.” |
| Crowley Lake: Restoration of riparian habitat and assessment of riparian corridor fencing and other watershed best management practices on nutrient loading and eutrophication of Crowley Lake, CA | 2003 | Crowley Lake, Mono County | \<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.636.6612&rep=rep1&type=pdf> | SWRCB | Crowley Lake (Long Valley Reservoir), Mono County is a valuable aquatic resource.The lake and its tributaries are the premier trout fishery in the Eastern Sierra and the reservoir constitutes 60% of the storage capacity of the Los Angeles Aqueduct system. The watershed is approximately 380 sq. miles and is predominately public lands administered by Inyo National Forest (INF), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the City of Los Angeles. Crowley Lake was first classified as eutrophic by EPA’s National Eutrophication Survey (1975), is ‘listed’ for nutrients per Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act and is a TMDL priority for the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. The purpose of the work covered by this contract was to restore a substantial length of the main tributary (Owens River) immediately upstream of Crowley Lake by implementing grazing BMPs including riparian fencing (Chapter 2), to develop an annual nutrient loading budget for Crowley Lake (Chapter 3), to determine the major sources of nutrients (Chapter 4), and monitor continuing eutrophication via transparency, nutrient concentrations, and characterization of the plankton communities (Chapter 5). |
| Dry Creek: Hydrologic Assessment of the Dry Creek Drainage for Mammoth Mountain Ski Area | 2007 | MMSA, Town of Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.fs.usda.gov/nfs/11558/www/nepa/88378_FSPLT2_287524.pdf> | MCWD | Not available for public review at this time.  |
| Relevant Reports (Research, Advocacy, Conservation, Compliance) | Fish Slough Milk Vetch: 5 Year Review and Summary | 2009 | Fish Slough | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Fish-Slough_Milk-vetch_5yrReview_2009.pdf> | USFWS | The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is required by section 4(c)(2) of theEndangered Species Act of 1973 (Act) to conduct a status review of each listed species at least once every 5 years. The purpose of a 5-year review is to evaluate whether or not the species’ status has changed since it was listed (or since the most recent 5-year review). Based on the 5-year review, we recommend whether the species should be removed from the list of endangered and threatened species, be changed in status from endangered to threatened, or be changed in status from threatened to endangered. Our original listing of a species as endangered or threatened is based on the existence of threats attributable to one or more of the five threat factors described in section 4(a)(1) of the Act, and we must consider these same five factors in any subsequent consideration of reclassification or delisting of a species. In the 5-year review, we consider the best available scientific and commercial data on the species and focus on new information available since the species was listed or last reviewed. If we recommend a change in listing status based on the results of the 5-year review, we must propose to do so through a separate rule-making process defined in the Act that includes public review and comment. |
| Haiwee Reservoir: Total Maximum Daily Loads for Copper | 2001 | Haiwee Reservoir | <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/lahontan/water_issues/programs/tmdl/haiwee/docs/haiwee_tmdl_all.pdf> | Lahontan RWQCB | The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Lahontan Region (Regional Board) has developed this Progress Report to present the technical and scientific background for the forthcoming Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for copper in Haiwee Reservoir, Inyo County. This Progress Report contains the draft TMDL technical support elements as recommended by United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region IX staff to restore the water in Haiwee Reservoir to meet State water quality standards. |
| Kern River: Restoration of the California Golden Trout in the South Fork Kern River, Kern Plateau | 2008 | South Fork Kern River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/KernRiverGoldenTroutRestoration_Final_031809.pdf> | CA Dept. of Fish and Game | This paper describes a major recovery effort for California golden trout, *Oncorhynchus mykiss aguabonita*, started in 1966 and still in progress, to remove an invasion of brown trout and hybrid golden x rainbow that had invaded and spread throughout the South Fork Kern River drainage and nearly caused extinction of the California State Fish and namesake of Inyo National Forest’s Golden Trout Wilderness. The paper condenses and presents an historic and joint effort by the California Department of Fish and Game and Inyo National Forest involving construction of major fish barriers, application of pesticides to more than 100 miles of stream to remove invading fishes, restocking of native fishes, habitat restoration, and reduction of grazing levels and resting of grazing allotments to allow physical recovery of trout habitat. Continuing research by geneticists will allow us to better understand the golden trout resource and its future. The recovery effort almost certainly represents the most extensive such project ever undertaken for a fish, either freshwater or marine. |
| Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Plan | 1995 | Walker River Watershed | <http://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/950130.pdf> | USFWS | Lahontan cutthroat trout currently exist in about 155 streams and 6 lakes and reservoirs in Nevada, California, Oregon, and Utah. The species has been introduced outside its native range, primarily for recreational fishing purposes. Currently LCT occupy approximately 0.4 percent of former lake habitat and 10.7 percent of former stream habitat within native range. This plan outlines recovery strategies and aims to eventually delist the species. |
| Owens Basin Wetland and Aquatic Species Recovery Plan: Inyo and Mono Counties | 1998 | Inyo & Mono Counties | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/OV_Wetland_Aquatic_spp_Recovery_Plan_1998.pdf> | USFWS | Establishes recovery objectives for the Owens pupfish, Owens tui chub, and Astragalus lentiginosus var. piscinensis and identifies actions needed to protect species of concern in the Owens Basin. The goal is to restore target species to viable and interacting populations within their ecosystems. Includes an implementation schedule to achieve these recovery objectives. |
|  | Owens Pupfish: 5 Year Review and Summary Evaluation | 2009 | Owens River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Owens_Pupfish_5yrReview_2009.pdf> | USFWS | See summary for Fish Slough Milk Vetch above |
| RELEVANT REPORTS | Owens Tui Chub: 5 Year Review and Summary Evaluation | 2009 | Owens River | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/Owens_Tui-Chub_5yrReview_2009.pdf> | USFWS | See summary for Fish Slough Milk Vetch above |
| Proposition 13: Southwest Wellfield Recharge Feasibility Study | 2005 | Indian Wells Valley Basin | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/SWWF-Recharge-Study-Final-Report.pdf> | IWVWD | The Indian Wells Valley Water District constructed two one-acre percolation/recharge ponds, two 6-inch monitoring wells, and assembled a weather station. 527 acre-feet of water were pumped into the recharge ponds while transducers in the monitoring wells tracked water levels. The weather station recorded wind speed, atmospheric temperature, and rainfall. An evaporation pan was used to estimate the on-site evaporation rate. |
| Proposition 50: Testing of Zero-Liquid Discharge Technologies Using Brackish Groundwater for Inland Desert Communities | 2010 | Indian Wells Valley Basin | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/ZeroLiquidDischargeStudy_IWVWD_.pdf> | IWVWD | The Indian Wells Valley Water District completed a comprehensive feasibility investigation to desalt water from the Water District's Northwest Well Field (NWWF). The Water District then applied for a Proposition 50 Grant and was selected to proceed with pilot testing of the major components of the selected treatment train. When fully implemented, the NWWF brackish water treatment project creates a new source of potable water, furthers the use of economically and environmentally acceptable desalination, advances the desalination technology and evaluates a novel reversible reverse-osmosis treatment plant configuration. |
| Prospects for Wetland Conservation in Mono County | 2007 | Mono County | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/ProspectsforWetlandsConservation.pdf> | Mono County/ ESLT | Defines and describes wetlands of Mono County and provides a discussion on wetlands mitigation banking. |
| Short-Term Action Plan for Lahontan Cutthroat Trout in the Walker River Basin | 2003 | Walker River | <http://www.fws.gov/lahontannfhc/fish/lahontan_cutthroat_trout/documents/final_writ.pdf> | USFWS | The Action Plan identifies short-term activities or research that will further our understanding of the conservation needs of LCT specific to the Walker River basin and utilizes adaptive management to refine the long-term recovery strategy. |
| West Walker River Lahontan Cutthroat Trout Recovery Plan | 2003 | West Walker River | [https://inyo-monowater.org/WWalker\_LahontanRecoveryPlan\_2003.pdf](https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/WWalker_LahontanRecoveryPlan_2003.pdf) | USFWS | This Action Plan and the tasks identified herein are intended to eliminate or minimize the threats that impacted Lahontan Cutthroat Trout and through continued implementation of this process ensure the long-term persistence of the species. |
|  | Local Government Plans |
|  | County Plans |  |  |  |  |  |
| County Plans | Inyo County General Plan (Update) | 2001 | Inyo County | <http://inyoplanning.org/general_plan/index.htm> | Inyo County | The Inyo County General Plan sets out the goals and policies of the County and provides for implementation measures to ensure the policies are carried out. Policies have been established to support the implementation of the Agreement and MOU and to manage groundwater resources in the County to provide for a viable economy, enhance the natural environment, and protect water quality and quantity through ordinance, project approvals, and agreements with other agencies.  |
| Inyo County Groundwater Ordinance  | 1998 | Inyo County | <http://www.inyowater.org/wp-content/uploads/legacy/Water_Resources/Inyo_County_Ordinance_1004.pdf> | Inyo County Water Dept. | Establishes policy for the County of Inyo to manage the transport, transfer, acquisition and sale of surface and groundwater to protect the overall economy and environment of the County. |
| Kern County General Plan | 2009 | Southwest Inyo-Mono Region | <https://www.kerncounty.com/planning/pdfs/kcgp/kcgpintroduction.pdf> | Kern County | The General Plan is a policy document with planned land use maps and related information that are designed to give long-range guidance to those County officials making decisions affecting the growth and resources of the unincorporated Kern County jurisdiction, excluding the metropolitan Bakersfield planning area. This document helps to ensure that day-to-day decisions are in conformance with the long-range program designed to protect and further the public interest related to Kern County’s growth and development. The General Plan also serves as a guide to the private sector of the economy in relating its development initiatives to the public plans, objectives, and policies of the County. |
| Kern County Groundwater Ordinance | 1998 | South-west corner of Region | <https://www.kerncounty.com/planning/pdfs/waterord.pdf> | Kern County | Establishes county policy regarding transfers or transport of native groundwater to areas outside Kern County and the watershed of the aquifer. |
| Mono County General Plan (Update) | 2015 | Mono County | [https://monocounty.ca.gov/](https://monocounty.ca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning_division/page/8022/2_draft_eir_with_appendices_7.31.15.pdf) | Mono County | A long-term comprehensive general plan to guide decisions on future growth, development, and conservation of natural resources for Mono County until 2010. This Plan has authority and established policies are upheld by law. The Plan has a section for land use, circulation, housing, conservation, safety, noise, and hazardous waste management. The County's Regional Planning Advisory Committees (RPACs) and community planning groups reviewed drafts of the general plan; their comments were incorporated into a revised draft. |
| San Bernardino County General Plan | 2007 (2011)\* | San Bernardino County | <http://cms.sbcounty.gov/lus/Planning/GeneralPlan.aspx> | San Bernardino County | The policies and programs of the General Plan are intended to underlie most land use decisions. Preparing, adopting, implementing, and maintaining a general plan serves to: 1) Identify the community’s land use, transportation, environmental, economic, and social goals and policies as they relate to land use and development. 2) Form the basis for local government decision-making, including decisions on proposed development. 3) Provide residents with opportunities to participate in the planning and decision-making processes of their community. 4) Inform residents, developers, decision makers, and other cities and counties of the ground rules that guide development within the community. |
|  | Urban Water Management Plans |
|  | Indian Wells Valley Urban Water Management Plan | 2016 | Ridgecrest | <http://www.iwvwd.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/IWVWD-UWMP2015-Final-06-17-2016.pdf> | IWVWD | The 2016 UWMP, as presented here, supersedes the 2010 UWMP and fulfills the requirements of Part 2.6 (the Urban Water Management Planning Act) and Part 2.55 (applicable sections of the Water Conservation Act of 2009, also known as SBX7-7) of Division 6 of the California Water Code, as amended. |
|  | Mammoth Community Water District Urban Water Management Plan | 2015 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.mcwd.dst.ca.us/assets/final-2015-uwmp.pdf> | MCWD | The 2015 UMWP is an important long-term planning document for the District and the community it serves, which is primarily the incorporated area of the Town of Mammoth Lakes (Town). The conclusions and recommendations from the 2015 UWMP will determine key aspects of long term capital investment by the District for water supply and treatment, and influence future land use planning and development levels within the Town, to the extent these are influenced by the practical and regulatory requirements linking water supply reliability and land use decisions. |
|  | City/Town Plan |
|  | City of Bishop General Plan and Update | 2011 | Bishop | <https://cityofbishop.com/PublicWorks/Planning/GeneralPlan/GeneralPlan.html> | City of Bishop | The General Plan has been prepared pursuant to CA Government Code Section 65300 eq set. which requires all general service local governments to prepare and adopt a general plan. |
|  | City of Bishop Wastewater Master Plan | 2008 | Bishop | <https://cityofbishop.com/Misc/WaterMasterPlan2008.pdf> | City of Bishop | The primary goals of this Master Plan are to guide the development and operation of the City’s water system, and to develop a Capital Improvements Plan that is responsible, realistic, and appropriate for the City. From this, the City will have a solid foundation to continue providing water service to the City and to proceed with projects to improve and maintain that service. |
|  | City of Bishop Water Master Plan | 2008 | Bishop | <https://cityofbishop.com/Misc/WaterMasterPlan2008.pdf> | City of Bishop | The primary goals of this Master Plan are to guide the development and operation of the City’s water system, and to develop a Capital Improvements Plan that is responsible, realistic, and appropriate for the City. From this, the City will have a solid foundation to continue providing water service to the City and to proceed with projects to improve and maintain that service. |
|  | City of Bishop Parks and Recreation Master Plan | 2008 | Bishop | <https://cityofbishop.com/CommunityServices/ParkAndRecMasterPlan200805.pdf> | City of Bishop | The master plan has arisen from the conviction that parks and recreational services are a fundamental service of the City of Bishop California. It represents a comprehensive planning process to determine ways recreational and leisure services can be efficiently and effectively delivered to the citizens of Bishop and Inyo County. It is a plan of action for the next several years that addresses management, parks, facilities, and programming. |
| City of Ridgecrest General Plan | 1991-2010 | Ridgecrest | [https://ridgecrest-ca.gov/uploadedfiles/Departments/Public\_Services/Planning\_Department/General Plan.pdf](https://ridgecrest-ca.gov/uploadedfiles/Departments/Public_Services/Planning_Department/General%20Plan.pdf) | City of Ridgecrest | This General Plan is a policy document designed to guide the future growth and development of Ridgecrest in a manner consistent with it’s physical, social, economic, and environmental goals. The plan provides a framework of policies and programs with which local decision makers may direct the growth of the community. At the same time, it constitutes a vehicle for citizen involvement both during the plan’s development and throughout its implementation.  |
| June Lake Area Plan | 2010 | June Lake | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/June_Lake_Area_Plan.pdf> | Mono County | The June Lake 2010 Area Plan summarizes existing conditions in the June Lake area, identifies community issues and potentials, and specifies goals, objectives and policies to guide community development over the next 20 years. This Area Plan supplements the Mono County General Plan by providing area-specific directives. |
| Town of Mammoth Lakes Air Quality Maintenance Plan  | 2014 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4508/3c-Enc-1a-TOML-AQMP-Final?bidId=> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | This document is a revision to the 1990 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) for the Town of Mammoth Lakes. It includes 1) a request to redesignate the area from nonattainment for the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for PM10 (NAAQS) to attainment based on monitoring data and a modeling analysis, and 2) a maintenance plan that contains requirements to ensure the federal PM10 standard will not be violated in the future.  |
| Town of Mammoth Lakes: General Plan Update | 2007 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/162/General-Plan> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | Strategic plan that establishes guidelines and priorities for the community of Mammoth Lakes. It addresses: land use, circulation, housing, conservation, open space, noise, and safety. |
| Town of Mammoth Lakes: General Plan-Final EIR | 2007 | Mammoth Lakes | <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=163> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | EIR in support of the General Plan for the Town of Mammoth Lakes. |
| Town of Mammoth Lakes: Erosion, Drainage, and Flooding Project | 2008 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/572/2008-Final-Recommendations-Erosion-Drainage-and?bidId=> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | The Town of Mammoth Lakes (Town) has contracted with Nichols Consulting Engineers (NCE) to assist Town Staff with the identification of existing erosion, drainage and flood related problem areas and to develop a prioritized list of localized solutions which will allow the Town to become proactive in the way it manages its stormwater. The work performed as part of this project is intended to supplement and enhance work previously conducted as a part of the 2005 Storm Drain Master Plan Update.  |
|  | Town of Mammoth Lakes: Final Parks and Recreation Master Plan  | 2012 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/5567/Final-_TOML_Parks_Rec_Master_Plan_Adopted-2-1-12X?bidId=> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | The recommendations for parks and recreation elements outlined in this Master Plan are based on the results of field analysis, inventories, demand analysis, workshop planning sessions, and survey results from residents and second households. The Plan outlines the vision for developing parks and recreation within Mammoth Lakes for the next 18 years. It anticipates future conceptual designs for parks and lands in the Town inventory. These lands may be subject to further study and coordination with public and private participants, which may modify the outcome of some aspects of the Plan. When implemented, this Plan will enable the Town to provide accessible parks and recreation facilities for its residents and visitors and foster a sense of community through its facilities and programs. |
| City /Town Plans | Town of Mammoth Lakes: Storm Drain Master Plan | 1984\* | Mammoth Lakes | <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=222> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | By the early 1980’s, development in the Community of Mammoth Lakes had reached a point where peak flows from Spring snowmelt and thunderstorms caused increased erosion and localized flooding in many areas of the community. Uncontrolled runoff accelerates erosion and increases sediment loads and attendant water quality problems in Mammoth Creek. These problems are also aggravated by discharges directly to Mammoth Creek of surface water runoff from heavily developed commercial areas containing sediment, oil, grease and nutrients. According to the USFS and CA Dept. of Fish and Game, declining water quality has resulted in decreased fish populations downstream of Mammoth Lakes. This plan was developed in response to those findings.  |
| Town of Mammoth Lakes: Storm Drain Master Plan Update | 2005 | Mammoth Lakes | <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=222> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | This 2005 Storm Drain Master Plan for the Town of Mammoth Lakes (Town) updates the existing 1984 study for Mono County. This Master Plan sets forth to attain the following objectives: 1) Assess the adequacy of the existing conveyance structures of the storm drain system in the Town.2) Make specific recommendations for future improvements to the storm drain system. 3) Recommend and assess the impact of specific detention facilities as specified by the Town. The intent of these facilities is to reduce the drainage burden on downstream storm drain system. 4) Provide a basis for the cost estimates and financing necessary to make the storm drain and detention improvements recommended in (2) and (3) above. 5) Review the area’s hydrology for both winter rain and snow and summer rain events. 6) Provide a concise and simple hydrologic methodology necessary for developers to plan and design specific design improvements and assess the impact of development on downstream constituents.This methodology will be designed so that it will be compatible with methods adopted in the 1984 study. |
| Town of Mammoth Lakes: Downtown Neighborhood District Plan | 2010 | Mammoth Lakes | <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=133> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | This Study Report summarizes the outcomes of the Neighborhood District Planning(NDP) process for districts within Mammoth Lakes’ Downtown area, encompassingthe Main Street/Highway 203 corridor from the Town entry to Minaret Road, theNorth Old Mammoth Road area, and the 25-acre Shady Rest Site. Successfulplanning through the NDP process is critical to redefining the character, form andfunction of Main Street and the entire downtown as the town’s major gateway andcommercial district, providing a catalyst for reinvestment and change. |
|  | Town of Mammoth Lakes: Stormwater Master Plan | 2015 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/5592/TOML-Stormwater-Master-Plan?bidId=> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | The Town has identified key issues related to stormwater including aging and inadequate stormwater infrastructure and a variety of erosion, drainage and flooding issues that are inextricably linked. Many of the roads and stormwater infrastructure was built before the Town was incorporated and at a time when minimal emphasis was placed on erosion control, water quality, or facility design.  |
|  | Town of Mammoth Lakes: Stormwater Resources Plan (SRP) | 2017 | Mammoth Lakes | <https://www.townofmammothlakes.ca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/7942/DRAFT-Mammoth-Stormwater-Resource-Plan?bidId=> | Town of Mammoth Lakes | The Stormwater Resources Plan was born out of the Stormwater Master Plan developed in 2015. The SRP identifies and prioritizes stormwater projects and outlines an implementation strategy and schedule.  |
|  | Tribal Plans |  |  |  |  |
|  | Bishop Paiute Tribe Water Quality Control Plan | 2007 | Bishop | <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-12/documents/bishop-tribes.pdf> | EPA | The Bishop Paiute Tribe Water Quality Plan contains a characterization of the Reservation, its climate, geology, surface and ground waters. The plan identifies water quality and quantity issues and describes water quality standards. Includes a discussion of general control actions and recommendations to protect water resources for municipal, industrial and cultural uses as well as to protect wildlife and aquatic habitat.  |
|  | Water Quality Standards, Big Pine Reservation | 2005 | Big Pine | <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-12/documents/bigpine-tribe.pdf> | EPA | Plan outlines water quality standards within the boundaries of the Big Pine Paiute Reservation to protect public health and welfare and to maintain or enhance water quality in relation to existing and/or potential beneficial uses of the water. Water quality standards are presented in numerical and narrative form. Describes current water uses and policies for implementation. |
|  | Small Water Companies/ CSD Plans |
|  | June Lake PUD Master Water Plan | 2007 | June Lake PUD | <https://inyo-monowater.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/JLPUD_Master-Water-Plan-Final-2007.pdf> | June Lake PUD | The document describes present/projected land and water use in the June Lake District and proposes future improvements needed to meet future demands along with estimated capital costs. Estimates of future water usage are based on the land use projections. |

\* denotes year of most recent update to the document