

0001

01 PUBLIC HEARING  
02 STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD  
03 DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS  
04 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

05  
06 ---o0o---

07  
08 SUBJECT: AMENDMENT OF CITY OF LOS ANGELES' WATER RIGHT  
09 LICENSES FOR DIVERSION OF WATER FROM STREAMS  
10 THAT ARE TRIBUTARY TO MONO LAKE

11  
12 ---o0o---

13  
14 Held in  
15 State Water Resources Building  
16 901 P Street  
17 Sacramento, California  
18 Thursday, February 17, 1994

19  
20 VOLUME XXXX

21  
22 ---o0o---

23  
24 Reported by: Kimberley R. Mueller  
25 CSR No. 10060

0002

01  
02 BOARD MEMBERS

03  
04 MARC DEL PIERO  
05 JOHN CAFFREY  
06 JAMES STUBCHAER  
07 JOHN W. BROWN  
08 MARY JANE FORSTER

09  
10  
11 STAFF MEMBERS

12  
13 DAN FRINK, Counsel  
14 JAMES CANADAY, Environmental Specialist  
15 STEVE HERRERA, Environmental Specialist  
16 RICHARD SATKOWSKI, Engineer  
17 HUGH SMITH, Engineer

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
24

25  
25  
0003  
01  
01 COUNSEL AND OTHERS  
02  
02 For the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:  
03  
03 ERIKA NIEBAUER  
04 Assistant Regular Solicitor  
04 Office of Solicitor  
05 Pacific Southwest Region  
05 2800 Cottage Way  
06 Sacramento, California 95825  
06  
07  
07 For the Sierra Club:  
08  
08 LARRY SILVER:  
09  
09  
10 For California Department of Fish and Game:  
10  
11 HAL THOMAS  
11 VIRGINIA CAHILL  
12 McDonough, Holland & Allen  
12 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 950  
13 Sacramento, California 95814  
13  
14  
14 For the U.S. Forest Service:  
15  
15 JACK GIPSMAN  
16 Office of General Counsel  
16 U.S. Department of Agriculture  
17  
17  
18 For the National Audubon Society and Mono Lake  
18 Committee:  
19  
19 BRUCE DODGE  
20 PATRICK FLINN  
20 Attorneys at Law  
21 Morrison and Foerster  
21 755 Page Mill Road  
22 Palo Alto, California 94304  
22  
23  
23  
24  
24  
25  
25  
0004  
01 For California Trout:  
01  
02 RICHARD ROOS-COLLINS  
02 CYNTHIA KOEHLER  
03 Attorneys at Law  
03 National Heritage Institute

04 114 Sansome Street, Suite 1200  
04 San Francisco, California 94104  
05  
05  
06 For the City of L.A. and L.A. DWP:  
06  
07 THOMAS W. BIRMINGHAM  
07 JANET GOLDSMITH  
08 Attorneys at Law  
08 Kronick, Moskovitz, Tiedemann & Girard  
09 400 Capitol Mall, 27th Floor  
09 Sacramento, California 95814  
10  
10  
11 For State Lands Commission, Department of Parks and  
11 Recreation:  
12  
12 JOHN STEVENS  
13 MARY SCOONOVER  
13 Assistant Attorney General  
14 1515 K Street  
14 Sacramento, California 95814  
15  
15  
16 For Meteropolitan Water District of Southern California  
16 and L.A. MWD:  
17  
17 VICTOR GLEASON  
18 Attorney at Law  
18 Metropolitan Water District of Southern California  
19 350 South Grand Avenue  
19 Los Angeles, California 90054-0153  
20  
20  
21 FRANK HASELTON  
21 Haselton Associates  
22  
22  
23 JOHN ARCULARIUS  
23  
24  
24  
25  
25  
0005  
01 For the California Air Resources Board:  
01  
02  
02 OFFICER OF LEGAL AFFAIRS  
03 2020 L Street  
03 Sacramento, California 95814  
04 BY: KIRK C. OLIVER, Senior Staff Counsel  
04  
05  
05 For the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control  
06 District:  
06  
07 PAUL BRUCE, District Counsel  
07  
08

08  
09  
09  
10  
10  
11  
11  
12  
12  
13  
13  
14  
14  
15  
15  
16  
16  
17  
17  
18  
18  
19  
19  
20  
20  
21  
21  
22  
22  
23  
23  
24  
24  
25  
25  
0006

I N D E X

		PAGE
01		
01		
02	PANEL	
02		
03	DR. SCOTT STINE	
03		
04	Direct Examination by Mr. Dodge	8
04	Cross-examination by Mr. Birmingham	39
05	Cross-examination by Mr. Roos-Collins	63
05	Cross-examination by Mr. Valentine	97
06	Cross-examination by The Staff	114
06	Redirect Examination by Mr. Dodge	130
07	Recross Examination by Mr. Birmingham	139
07	Cross-examination by Ms. Cahill	153
08	Recross Examination by Mr. Roos-Collins	155
08	Recross Examination by Mr. Valentine	159
09	Recross Examination by The Staff	161
09	Cross-examination by The Board	167
10		
10		
11	DR. STACY LI	
11		
12	Direct Examination by Mr. Dodge	169
12	Cross-examination by Mr. Birmingham	180

13	Cross-examination by Ms. Cahill	201
13	Cross-examination by Mr. Roos-Collins	205
14	Cross-examination by The Staff	207
14	Cross-examination by The Board	209

15  
15  
16  
16

17 E X H I B I T S

17		ID	EV
18			
19	NAS/MLC Exhibit No. 265	30	
20	L.A. DWP Exhibit 165		62
21	NAS/MLC Exhibits Nos. 1-A-F,		
21	246 to 254, 258, 259, 265		173
22			
22	DFG Exhibit No. 164		173
23			
23	L.A. DWP Exhibit 166	201	
24			
24	NAS/MLC Exhibit No. 264		209

25  
25  
0007

01 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA  
02 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1994, 1:30 P.M.  
03 ---o0o---

04 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ladies and gentlemen,  
05 this hearing will come to order.  
06 This is a continuation of the hearing regarding  
07 the amendment of the City of Los Angeles' water rights  
08 licenses for diversion of water from streams that are  
09 tributary to Mono Lake.  
10 My name is Marc Del Piero. I'm Vice-Chairman of  
11 the State Water Resources Control Board. I'm acting in  
12 the capacity of Hearing Officer.  
13 With us today is my good friend and colleague,  
14 Mr. John Brown, who is also on the State Water  
15 Resources Control Board.  
16 Mr. Canaday, we have -- is it Dr. Stine and  
17 Mr. Vorster?  
18 MR. CANADAY: Dr. Stine and -- I'm not sure how  
19 Mono Lake wants to bring their witnesses on.  
20 MR. DODGE: Dr. Stine, towards the end of his  
21 presentation, will be joined by Stacy Li, and then we  
22 plan to call Tim Messick. I think that will probably  
23 be a pretty full day.  
24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Do we have any  
25 procedural issues to take care of before we begin,

0008

01 Mr. Dodge?  
02 MR. DODGE: I just have one. I saw something in  
03 writing that we were going to set the briefing  
04 schedule. I thought we'd already done that.  
05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I thought we had,  
06 also, but Mr. Frink, perhaps, was reiterating in  
07 writing what we had indicated orally already.

08 MR. FRINK: Yes. All that letter was intended to  
09 state was that we would announce the dates. As it  
10 happens, 30 days after the close of hearing, assuming  
11 the hearing ends tomorrow, would be on a Saturday or  
12 Sunday. I think we would go forward to the Monday, and  
13 the same thing occurs with the 20 days for submittal of  
14 reply briefs. So we were going to set dates certain  
15 assuming that we end tomorrow.

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham?  
17 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I was just going to announce that  
18 Department of Water and Power was not going to call  
19 Mr. Roos, Department of Water Resources, as a witness.

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much,  
21 sir.

22 Any other procedural issues?  
23 Ms. Cahill? Mr. Roos-Collins?  
24 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: No issues.

25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge, why don't  
0009 you proceed, sir?

01 MR. DODGE: We'll call Dr. Stine as our next  
02 witness.

03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, you've  
04 already been sworn in these procedures.  
05 DR. STINE: I have this year.

06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Nice to see you, sir.  
07 DR. STINE: Good to see you.

08 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DODGE  
09 Q. Dr. Stine, I have in front of me, and I hope you  
10 do, too, National Audubon Society rebuttal testimony of  
11 Scott Stine, and then there are various subject matters  
12 listed.  
13 Can you identify that as a accurate copy of your  
14 rebuttal testimony?  
15 A. BY DR. STINE: I can, though I would like to point  
16 out or remind you, as well as inform everyone else,  
17 that there was an initial copy of this that was  
18 apparently faxed that was the wrong one. There's one  
19 change that went in in a slightly later rendition, two  
20 hours later. I don't know which one people have.  
21 If they look at the very last page of this  
22 exhibit, what they will see is that it is page 11, and  
23 if the last entry on page 11 is D, rather than 5, then  
24 we all have the same thing in our hands.

0010 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Everyone have the one  
01 that has A, B, C, and D on the page 11? Mr. Birmingham?  
02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Yes, I have.

03 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Dr. Stine, are there any --  
04 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Wait. Wait,  
05 Mr. Dodge.  
06 Mr. Roos-Collins, do you have a copy?  
07 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Yes.  
08 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ms. Cahill?  
09 MS. CAHILL: Yes.  
10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ms. Scoonover?  
11 MS. SCOONOVER: Yes.

12 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Are there any changes you wish to  
13 make in Exhibit 1-A?  
14 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, very briefly. On page 6, I

16 used the word "measured." That should be changed to  
17 "measures," and perhaps that's already changed. I  
18 guess it is already changed on here.

19 And there is a reference in here to a "natural"  
20 channel. This is in the second paragraph, second line  
21 from the bottom. That, rather than reading "natural,"  
22 should read "previously existing." We're using natural  
23 in a different sense in this hearing when related to  
24 Rush Creek, so that should be "previously existing  
25 channel."

0011

01 And that's the one change, I guess, that I would  
02 want to make.

03 Q. With that, sir, can you summarize your rebuttal  
04 testimony? And let me say you've also been designated  
05 as our witness in surrebuttal and to the extent you  
06 could weave the two of them together, that would be  
07 fine.

08 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham?

09 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Before Dr. Stine begins his oral  
10 summary of his written rebuttal testimony, we'd like to  
11 interpose an objection to page 5 of the written  
12 testimony, Mono Lake Committee and National Audubon  
13 Society Exhibit 1-A-F.

14 Quoting a great legal mind, F. Bruce Dodge,  
15 rebuttal testimony should be --

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I just want to check  
17 the Court Reporter to make sure she's got that on the  
18 record.

19 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Did you get the quotation marks  
20 around "great legal mind"?

21 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Proceed,  
22 Mr. Birmingham.

23 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Quoting Mr. Dodge, "Rebuttal  
24 testimony should be limited to rebutting something that  
25 was entered in some other party's case in chief." We

0012

01 are unaware of any evidence in any party's case in  
02 chief which page 5 would rebut.

03 The Hearing Officer has previously ruled on this  
04 issue when Dr. Stine tried to introduce similar  
05 evidence during his some of his earlier testimony and  
06 it was excluded.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge?

08 MR. DODGE: I have, I guess, two points. One, of  
09 course, I have made that argument several times, and  
10 I've lost it consistently. So I would hate to lose the  
11 other side of it now.

12 So I guess that's point one: I agree in  
13 principle, but that argument has not been winning.

14 Secondly, I don't believe it was the Hearing  
15 Officer that excluded the information. I believe  
16 Mr. Del Piero was out of the room. If I'm recalling it  
17 right, it was Mr. Brown who excluded the evidence.

18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Actually, it was  
19 Mr. Stubchaer who excluded that. I happen to know that  
20 because I read the record.

21 MR. DODGE: I believe at the time it was  
22 explicitly stated this would come up in rebuttal.

23 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Actually, it was the Hearing

24 Officer because Mr. Del Piero was out of the room and  
25 Mr. Stubchaer was acting as the Hearing Officer.

0013

01 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Yes, that's correct.  
02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: So I'll correct Mr. Dodge on that  
03 point.  
04 We'll submit -- I told Ms. Goldsmith that I would  
05 raise this objection just as a point of order.  
06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you.  
07 Mr. Dodge, you're absolutely correct. Your  
08 previous argument has not been previously successful.  
09 Mr. Birmingham is not going to be particularly  
10 successful in his objection, either.  
11 MR. DODGE: Thank you.  
12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: So it will be allowed  
13 into the record.  
14 Dr. Stine, proceed, sir.  
15 DR. STINE: Thank you.  
16 My first rebuttal point concerns the elevation of  
17 the playa ring at Mono Lake. There was testimony early  
18 on that at lake elevation of 6390 feet, the playa ring  
19 would be under water and Mono Lake would appear as a  
20 full-looking lake.  
21 I would simply point out that the playa ends where  
22 I'm pointing it out here on Exhibit NAS/MLC 142, and  
23 approximately one inch to the south of the line that  
24 I'm pointing out where we go from a light band to a  
25 dark band.

0014

01 One inch south of there on this same exhibit, we  
02 encounter a line that is exhibit -- pardon me, that is  
03 lake level 6390 feet. And I have a slide of that as  
04 well that shows at a lake level of 6390 feet, there  
05 will still be a ring around Mono Lake that is  
06 approximately 1500 feet in width.  
07 And this is NAS/MLC Exhibit 184 previously shown.  
08 The playa ring ends here at an elevation of  
09 approximately 6400 feet where we go from the light  
10 material to the dark material. 6390 feet is this line  
11 right through here approximately 1500 feet, then, of  
12 width, 1500 feet of width between 6390 and 6400 feet.  
13 The second point that I would like to make  
14 concerns the role of vegetation in instigating multiple  
15 channels on Lee Vining and Rush Creeks.  
16 Mr. Tillemans, in his discussion of the role of  
17 vegetation in affecting the stream, noted that there  
18 were multiple channels on Lee Vining Creek that had  
19 been caused by vegetation.  
20 I would simply like to point out again, by way of  
21 slide here, that those multiple channels were already  
22 in place on Lee Vining Creek and that the vegetation  
23 grew up around the existing channels rather than having  
24 caused those multiple channels.  
25 Here we are on the Lee Vining Creek delta. This

0015

01 is in 1982, and we can see that there are lots of  
02 braids on the Lee Vining Creek delta.  
03 There's no vegetation to speak of out here at  
04 all. These multiple channels are very shallow.  
05 They're very wide and over the ensuing years up to



06 today, vegetation has colonized these channels, and it  
07 did not cause the multiple channels, rather the  
08 multiple channels dictated where the vegetation would  
09 grow.

10 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Does the slide have an exhibit  
11 number?

12 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, it does. And it was Exhibit  
13 NAS/MLC 245.

14 Now, these channels are the result of deltaic  
15 processes on the delta there. They have nothing to do  
16 with the processes that created these very narrow, deep  
17 channels that we see on the bottomlands of Rush and  
18 Lee Vining Creek.

19 If we want these channels back, if we want the  
20 narrow, deep, and multiple channels back, we have to  
21 start doing some work out there. We can't count on the  
22 vegetation to make these multiple channels in any short  
23 period of time at all.

24 The third rebuttal point concerns Rush Creek above  
25 Grant Lake prior to 1941, and this is shown on

0016

01 Department of Fish and Game Exhibit 164, which I'm not  
02 sure, perhaps Ms. Cahill can tell us whether this was  
03 accepted and introduced before --

04 MS. CAHILL: It has been identified. To be sure  
05 that it's admitted, we should admit it today.

06 DR. STINE: This is Department of Fish and Game  
07 Exhibit 164. It's the upper half, as it were, of Grant  
08 Lake, and we can see that Rush Creek flowing into Grant  
09 Lake will follow a very sinuous path here that was  
10 highly wooded, there were a lot of wooded wetlands down  
11 here.

12 And in 1940 and '41 when the Department of Water  
13 and Power enlarged Grant Reservoir, Grant Reservoir  
14 made its way up into these lands taking out, inundating  
15 approximately 10,000 feet of channel and some hundreds  
16 of acres or about a hundred acres of wooded bottomlands  
17 and marsh.

18 Now, I haven't --

19 HEARING OFFICER del PIERO: Excuse me, Dr. Stine.  
20 What year was that photograph taken?

21 DR. STINE: This is 1929 or '30. December of '29  
22 or January of '30. And sometimes these aren't marked,  
23 but it's one or the other.

24 I'm not suggesting that this, in itself, is  
25 recoverable. As long as the City of Los Angeles is

0017

01 going to be using Grant Lake as a storage facility,  
02 it's going to be tough to get this back, but I have  
03 suggested several times here that Mill Creek could  
04 perhaps be rewatered. And in rewatering Mill Creek, we  
05 could mitigate for the lost riparian vegetation that we  
06 lost here and above Grant Lake.

07 I don't pretend to be an expert on the water  
08 rights of Mill Creek, but I have walked the channel  
09 that would be used to get water back into the stream,  
10 and I consider it to be hydrographically feasible.

11 The persistence of sand tufa is the subject of the  
12 fourth rebuttal. Sand tufa, I want to say, will break  
13 down naturally independent of any lake rise. We have a

14 number of instances of deposits of sand tufa that have  
15 been on the shore and exposed for anywhere from 50  
16 years to 300 years.

17 My sense is that sand tufa, independent of any  
18 lake rise, breaks down over a period of 50, 60 years,  
19 something like that.

20 When I say "break down," I'm talking about  
21 collapsing, rounding down to be similar to the forms  
22 that today have been exposed for 50 or 60 years.

23 So I don't expect the sand tufa out there to  
24 persist beyond, say, a half a century, or something  
25 like that, plus or minus.

0018

01 My fifth rebuttal point concerns drought and its  
02 effect on Mono Lake.

03 As I've previously explained, I found what I  
04 consider to be compelling evidence for very severe and  
05 persistent droughts in California. And with that in  
06 mind, I have suggested that what Jones and Stokes used  
07 as sort of a model drought as a basis for recommending  
08 a buffer, is probably not a strident enough drought to  
09 be safe to protect certain critical elevations at Mono  
10 Lake.

11 I considered those critical elevations, the ones  
12 that we should take into consideration at least, to be  
13 6378 feet, which is the level at which Drs. Shufford  
14 and Winkler say that Negit Island can be invaded by  
15 coyotes; 6372 feet, which is the level below which Rush  
16 Creek, Lee Vining Creek, and Mill Creek will undergo a  
17 new wave of incision that will work its way upstream;  
18 and 6368 feet, which is the elevation of the nickpoint  
19 that surrounds Mono Lake.

20 And as I explained, if that nickpoint is exposed,  
21 we can expect widespread incision of the Mono  
22 shorelands, toppling of all the towers, all of the  
23 major tufa groves and draining of the wetlands that  
24 surround Mono Lake.

25 What we did was to not plug in hundreds of years

0019

01 to find out what the response to drought of hundreds of  
02 years -- or the response of the lake to hundreds of  
03 years of drought would be.

04 Rather, we plugged in 25 years of drought similar  
05 to the drought of the period of 1986 to 1990. And when  
06 we plug that into the Vorster model, we find the  
07 following.

08 If we start the lake at an elevation of 6377 feet,  
09 that elevation, because it's one of the lake level  
10 alternatives, obviously, the lake is already below 6378  
11 feet, so we've already allowed coyotes on to Negit  
12 Island.

13 In the seventh year of drought, the lake would  
14 drop below 6372 feet instigating incision of the major  
15 influence streams, and in the 14th year of drought, the  
16 lake will drop below 6368 feet causing the problems  
17 associated with the exposure of the nickpoint.

18 If we start the lake at 6383.5 feet, again chosen  
19 because it's one of the lake level alternatives, in the  
20 sixth year of drought, Negit Island becomes susceptible  
21 to coyote invasion.

22 In the 14th year of drought, a new wave of  
23 incision is instigated in the streams, and in the 21st  
24 year of drought, the lake drops below 6368 feet  
25 exposing the nickpoint with the problems associated

0020

01 with it.

02 Starting at the lake level alternative 6390 feet,  
03 in the 14th year of drought, Negit Island becomes  
04 susceptible to coyote invasion.

05 In the 21st year of drought, the new wave of  
06 incision is instigated on the major influence streams,  
07 and given the drought conditions that we've assumed  
08 here, 25 years of drought similar to our most recent  
09 drought, given those conditions, 6390 would protect  
10 Mono Lake against exposure of the nickpoint.

11 If we start at a level of 6405 feet, which has  
12 been suggested as an elevation where we would get back,  
13 among other things, a great deal of duck habitat, after  
14 25 years of drought, Mono Lake remains above 6378 feet  
15 and, therefore, that elevation, 6405 feet, is  
16 sufficient to protect all these three critical lake  
17 levels against 25 years of drought.

18 I'd simply point out that the 25 years is not even  
19 close to the persistence of the drought that we have  
20 seen in the prehistoric past nor is the present-day  
21 drought, the last six years of drought, as severe as  
22 the droughts of the prehistoric period. So we're being  
23 very, very conservative here both in severity of  
24 drought and in the duration of drought.

25 Now, the remainder of my rebuttal concerns Rush

0021

01 and Lee Vining Creeks. I've broken this down into  
02 three subjects; first, the armored meander of the Rush  
03 Creek, Rush Narrows. And I'm not going to say too much  
04 about the armored meander bend.

05 Secondly, some misconceptions concerning the  
06 historical and existing conditions along the stream.

07 And, thirdly, the Los Angeles Department of Water  
08 and Power video on the Rush Creek bottomlands.

09 Let me confine my discussion of the armored  
10 meander bend to the following. I guess it was last  
11 week, I wasn't here, but I guess it was last week that  
12 Dr. Kondolf introduced some cross-sections of that  
13 meander bend site, and what those cross-sections showed  
14 was that between 1989 and 1992 -- this is before any  
15 treatment was done on that meander bend -- the stream  
16 was both widening and shallowing as a result of the  
17 collapse of the bank.

18 When we went in to do that armored meander bend  
19 site, it was continuing. The stream was continuing to  
20 plane to the westward, and the bank was collapsing. As  
21 a result of the bank collapsing, we were not getting  
22 any deepening there.

23 The RTC, not Trihey and Associates, but the RTC  
24 deemed that as an immediate need site. We went in and  
25 armored it with so-called soft armor tree boughs and

0022

01 whatnot, in a sense, stapled it to the bend there, and  
02 we planted vegetation right along the stream margins  
03 with the hopes that if we keep the stream from

04 collapsing anymore, that we could establish vegetation  
05 along there, later on go back and take off the soft  
06 armoring and have the stream start to work on the root  
07 systems of newly established vegetation. And that  
08 would stabilize the bank.

09 This is still -- our purpose, though, we're going  
10 to go out within the next year, two years, three years,  
11 as soon as we consider that bank to be stable, and  
12 remove the soft armoring. And we will have a nice  
13 protective root system in there, and the stream will  
14 start doing what I think everybody in the room and all  
15 the witnesses would like to see the stream do; that is,  
16 undercut root systems, create overhangs, create deep  
17 water, et cetera.

18 Now, on to the misconceptions about the historical  
19 and modern conditions of Rush and Lee Vining Creek.

20 Here is Rush Creek on NAS and MLC Exhibit 213,  
21 Rush Creek below The Narrows, the so-called  
22 bottomlands. And there are a number of points that  
23 were made by Mr. Tillemans and particularly by Dr.  
24 Beschta about this. And I'd like to make sure the  
25 record, at least my reasoning on this, is very, very  
0023 clear.

01 clear.  
02 Firstly, I have said that there was 35 cfs at the  
03 time this photograph was taken, which was either  
04 December '29 or January 1930, the 35 cfs flowing  
05 through the bottomlands, and I said that was measured  
06 here at The Ford. There was not 35 cfs flowing into  
07 the entire bottomlands.

08 In fact, here at The Narrows, there was only from  
09 7 to 10 cfs flowing through The Narrows, and spring  
10 flow added to that 7 to 10 cfs giving a total of 35 cfs  
11 by the time we got down to The Ford.

12 Secondly, Dr. Beschta stated that there was more  
13 than a natural amount of water in the bottomlands at  
14 the time this photograph was taken, which is not the  
15 case. Mr. Vorster went back through the wintertime  
16 records and found that at this time, or in the years  
17 prior to DWP's operation, that there would have been  
18 approximately 35 cfs flowing into Grant Lake, 35 cfs  
19 flowing out of Grant Lake, and 35 cfs flowing down  
20 through here the entire bottomlands, 35 at The Narrows,  
21 35 at The Ford. There would have been 35 cfs  
22 throughout the bottomlands.

23 Here, on this particular photograph, we have only  
24 7 to 10 at The Narrows, 35 by the time we get down  
25 here. The conditions here in the bottomlands,

0024 particularly in the middle part of the bottomlands, are  
01 not abnormally wet for this time of year. They're  
02 abnormally dry. There would normally be more water  
03 than is shown here in this photograph at this  
04 particular time.

05 particular time.  
06 A third point, despite these low flows here at the  
07 bottomlands -- or pardon me, at The Narrows, only about  
08 7 to 10 cfs coming through here. We have two channels.  
09 And I would invite those who have not yet taken a close  
10 look at this up here to see this second channel right  
11 here that very definitely does have water in it. It's

12 a dark line. It's a black continuous line.

13 I would also ask that people compare these water  
14 channels in here which show up as black lines, with a  
15 dewatered stretch such as that right up here. And you  
16 can see here on this photograph, in the very northern  
17 part of photograph, a dry channel that has no water in  
18 it. It appears to be very, very light.

19 These channels down here are, indeed, watered.  
20 Now, I'm not sure that Dr. Beschta and I disagree on  
21 this anymore. He originally said on his transparencies  
22 that this channel did not have water in it, the second  
23 channel immediately below The Narrows.

24 But then upon questioning, he said that, "Yes, it  
25 does have water in it, but there's not a significant  
0025

01 amount of water in it." I don't know what he means by  
02 a "significant amount of water," but I think we now  
03 both agree that there is water in the second channel  
04 here despite the fact that there's only 7 to 10 cfs  
05 down here.

06 The fourth point, Dr. Beschta said the stream is  
07 abutting the channel's rolls in only one place. And he  
08 pointed out one spot, right here, at this little ravine  
09 where the little ravine, which, in fact, is a fault  
10 running right through here, where the stream abuts the  
11 small ravine right here.

12 So that's the one place that the stream is  
13 abutting the canyon wall and quarrying gravels, the  
14 natural supply of gravels. In fact, again, I would  
15 invite people to look at this and see, for instance,  
16 right here, that the stream is right up against the  
17 canyon wall right there. That this meander bend that  
18 I'm pointing out in the center of Exhibit 213 goes  
19 right along the canyon wall there for a couple hundred  
20 feet. It is abutting the canyon wall. It is  
21 undercutting the canyon wall, and it is quarrying  
22 gravels out of it. And you can go up to that site today  
23 and see the layer of gravels in there that this stream  
24 was indeed undercutting.

25 A fifth point with regard to the natural versus  
0026

01 artificial nature of the eastern-most channel. This  
02 channel that runs right over through here which shows  
03 up very, very nicely on this photograph and shows up  
04 very nicely today on the ground, there was some  
05 suggestion early on that that was an irrigation  
06 channel. And I think I'm not misrepresenting  
07 Dr. Beschta by saying that he's backed off that  
08 somewhat.

09 He's saying that it's not a dug channel; it's a  
10 natural channel. But that it had somehow been affected  
11 by artificial rewatering or something like that.

12 I've talked to a number of people, including  
13 Mr. Banta and Auggie Hess. Now, Auggie Hess spent a  
14 lot of his childhood down here in the Rush Creek  
15 bottomlands, because his grandmother lived down here,  
16 and they both say this was a very natural channel  
17 through here, that it had not been modified in any way.  
18 It has no spoils piled next to it.

19 It certainly is a natural channel. And there's no

20 indication anywhere along here that water was being  
21 taken out of this channel, and the lands adjacent to  
22 the channel watered.

23 And why would anybody take the time and the energy  
24 to pull water out of a channel and water lands in  
25 through here which are already absolutely saturated

0027

01 because of all the water coming in from the canyon  
02 sides?

03 A sixth point regards the road cutoff. And  
04 Dr. Beschta has maintained that the road cutoff here at  
05 what I call "Biggest Bend" did not occur in 1967, that  
06 it occurred some time after 1967. And he also contends  
07 that the road across here was the factor that  
08 instigated the meander cutoff, causing incision,  
09 causing channel shrinking and, therefore steepening, et  
10 cetera.

11 I have photographs, aerial photographs along for  
12 those people who want to look at them, and to look at  
13 them with a hand lens so you can really get in on it.  
14 This meander is in place in 1964 on the 1964 photos.  
15 On the 1968 photos, one year after 1967, the stream has  
16 cut that off and it is flowing right across here. And  
17 if you want to take a look at it, as I say, I brought  
18 the photographs along.

19 Furthermore, the road here has nothing to do,  
20 nothing whatsoever to do with that cutoff. The stream  
21 did not enter the cutoff by the way the road. It did  
22 not travel across the meander by way of the road. It  
23 did not exit the meander by the way of the road. The  
24 road is irrelevant.

25 The reason for this cutoff was very simple. We

0028

01 had Mono Lake drawn to a low elevation exposing that  
02 nickpoint on the delta. And as a result of the high  
03 flows that came down Rush Creek, we started to get  
04 incision, head-warned incision here from the mouth of  
05 stream.

06 Now, previously, when water had flowed across the  
07 meander neck here. It had gone down a low gradient  
08 surface from one overflowing stream to one overflowing  
09 channel to the same overflowing channel. There was no  
10 real hydraulic gradient right here for incision to  
11 occur.

12 Now, what happens is that we've got this  
13 unnaturally large amount of water moving down the  
14 stream across the meander right here, and we have an  
15 incision working its way headward. What happens is the  
16 incision works its way headward as all of a sudden,  
17 because of headward incision to the bottom point of  
18 meander right here, the water that's crossing the  
19 meander cascades down into the channel.

20 We've got a waterfall there all of a sudden, and  
21 that is what instigates incision, and we cut this off  
22 in a matter of minutes. Certainly, less than an hour  
23 would be required to cut that thing off.

24 MR. HERRERA: Excuse me, Dr. Stine.

25 20 minutes has expired, Mr. Dodge.

0029

01 MR. DODGE: Mr. Chairman, we would apply for an

02 additional 20 minutes, and I hope Dr. Stine can finish  
03 in that time. There is a variety of subject matters,  
04 and we're dealing with both rebuttal and surrebuttal.  
05 I've asked him to be as brief as he can, but I think 40  
06 minutes is the best we can do.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I'll grant the 20  
08 minutes, Mr. Dodge.

09 MR. DODGE: Thank you.

10 DR. STINE: Thank you.

11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: However, I would  
12 observe that asking Dr. Stine to be as brief as he can  
13 be is an oxymoron.

14 DR. STINE: Only because Dr. Stine is always as  
15 brief as he can be.

16 MR. DODGE: I don't think that was my upshot.  
17 (Laughter.)

18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Please note everyone  
19 in the room is laughing.

20 DR. STINE: With me, not at me.

21 MR. DODGE: If you believe that, Dr. Stine, you  
22 may wish to purchase this bridge I have for sale.

23 DR. STINE: In your pocket, no doubt.

24 Dr. Beschta has said that stream widths today in  
25 the bottomlands are approaching those of 1941. And I  
0030 would simply point out that he incorrectly quoted my  
01 materials.

02 I mentioned that the channel itself was 25 to 30  
03 feet wide in 1930 and 1940. What I was talking about  
04 there, what I was actually measuring in the field, was  
05 the top width of the channel.

06 The point that I was making there was that because  
07 this was such a narrow channel, not stream width, not  
08 water width now, because it was such a narrow channel,  
09 the stream could readily overflow the channel and go up  
10 and flood the bottomlands. And there was a lot of  
11 flooding that went on in those bottomlands.

12 Today we have indeed many places where the water  
13 surface is 25 to 30 feet wide, but the channel itself  
14 has been greatly widened so as to now preclude the  
15 ability of the stream to get up on that surface  
16 anymore. We were dealing with sort of an  
17 apples-and-oranges situation there. The 25 to 30 feet  
18 is my channel width; it's his water surface width.

19 MR. HERRERA: Could you identify that?

20 DR. STINE: I sure could. I don't have a number  
21 on this, actually. Next in order.

22 MR. DODGE: We'll make that National Audubon  
23 Society and Mono Lake Committee Exhibit 265.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Any objection?  
0031

01 None? Fine. Continue, Dr. Stine.

02 (NAS/MLC Exhibit 265 was  
03 marked for identification.)

04 DR. STINE: The eighth point here, then, regards  
05 the vegetation of the bottomlands. I think  
06 Mr. Beschta, Dr. Beschta is under the --

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, would you  
08 be good enough to write NAS/MLC on there?

09 DR. STINE: Yes.

10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you.

11 DR. STINE: Dr. Beschta seems to be of the  
12 impression that during the 1940s and '50s, and  
13 certainly by the 1960s, there had been a large  
14 vegetation die off in the Rush Creek bottomlands, and  
15 that was not the case. And I pointed that out in my  
16 reports that were written several years ago without the  
17 heat of battle being a factor here.

18 In fact, because these lands adjacent to Rush  
19 Creek continue to be irrigated up until 1970, at the  
20 time the second barrel of the aqueduct was completed,  
21 because those lands continued to be irrigated, the Rush  
22 Creek bottomlands stayed wet.

23 And this is something that had been confirmed by  
24 Mr. Wes Johnson of the Department of Fish and Game.  
25 The vegetation die off in here came after 1967 and 1969

0032

01 when the irrigation water was cut off, and that has  
02 some bearing here because there was, in '69, '70, and,  
03 indeed, even today, vegetation persisting in the  
04 bottomlands that had been there for many, many decades.

05 And with that in mind, I'd like to now, if it's  
06 okay, examine the last Los Angeles Department of Water  
07 and Power video. And I'd ask people to keep in mind  
08 not only the fact that there's a lot of old vegetation  
09 in mind there, but there are narrow places on the  
10 stream, as Dr. Beschta and Mr. Tillemans pointed out.

11 But I think you'll agree as you look at this, that  
12 every place the stream is narrow, it's because the  
13 stream is abutting not three-year-old vegetation, not  
14 ten-year-old vegetation, which is irrelevant and very,  
15 very small, it's because it's abutting vegetation  
16 that's been there for decades.

17 And every place, where we go through here, every  
18 place you see a narrow channel, it's not something  
19 that's narrowing today, something that would be clear  
20 when Dr. Li, I'm sure, shows his revisited  
21 cross-sections, it's places where the stream is  
22 abutting very, very old vegetation.

23 MR. DODGE: I was going to indicate that Dr. Stine  
24 is now going to show the video that Dr. Beschta and  
25 Mr. Tillemans showed. It has a DWP exhibit number.

0033

01 I've forgotten it.

02 MR. SMITH: I'm looking for it.

03 DR. STINE: L.A. DWP Exhibit 139.

04 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay.

05 DR. STINE: Great video, I might add.

06 (The videotape was viewed at this time.)

07 DR. STINE: I believe we're playing. It says  
08 play.

09 I know what happened, Mr. Roos-Collins -- oh, he  
10 did rewind it. Bless you.

11 Here we're approaching The Narrows, and we can see  
12 just off to the right, in the upper right corner, where  
13 the stream used to go off to the right. Today, it  
14 doesn't go off to the right as it did under natural  
15 conditions. Rather, it goes down what I have for years  
16 referred to as the Gun Barrel, a big relatively  
17 straight reach with little complexity.



18           It's riffle and run. There's very little  
19 vegetation along it, and we can see here the kind of  
20 vegetation recruitment in this reach that we've gotten  
21 over the past three and four and five years occasional  
22 willows, but not doing an awful lot to the channel.  
23           Just below here, we'll see where the stream abuts  
24 vegetation that is very clearly on the 1964 photographs  
25 and arguably on the 1940 photographs. Now, that's a  
0034  
01 little less clear.  
02           And it's right here in this area here, top of the  
03 screen, this vegetation is old vegetation. And you'll  
04 notice how the camera nicely focuses in for us, because  
05 it's narrow in through here. We have some deep water,  
06 and there the stream is interacting with old  
07 vegetation.  
08           At this point now, the stream goes back into its  
09 old channel, and all along the old channel here, there  
10 is very old vegetation. Notice the size of this  
11 cottonwood right here. Notice the size of this tree.  
12 It's not three-year-old vegetation.  
13           And in through here where we have a nice narrow  
14 stream here, the vegetation is old. As soon as we lose  
15 the old vegetation, it gets wide again. When we go  
16 back into the old vegetation like this, not a  
17 three-year-old tree by any means, we go back into the  
18 old vegetation, it gets narrow again.  
19           This is the story throughout the channel here.  
20 Wherever we're against old vegetation, it's narrow.  
21 Wherever we're against new vegetation or  
22 non-vegetation, it's wide.  
23           Likewise, right in from here, we get in abutting  
24 the root systems of this old vegetation, and the stream  
25 narrows way down. We get some nice bends in it. We  
0035  
01 get a lot of complexity in here as well.  
02           I should say here, too, that what we don't see on  
03 this is the rest of the bottomlands. The bottomlands  
04 was a phenomenal area in that it had multiple channels,  
05 again, narrowing here because of the big vegetation.  
06 It had multiple channels, large amounts of wetland.  
07           We're concentrating here simply on one stream.  
08 This channel can no longer overflow into those other  
09 channels because of the widening that has gone on in  
10 places.  
11           Old vegetation again in here; old vegetation here  
12 along this bank. I believe Mr. Messick is going to say  
13 something about this. He's a riparian expert, and he  
14 may want to comment on this video as well.  
15           We go in here to an area that has no old  
16 vegetation, and it's a wide reach.  
17           This is old vegetation in through here. Not only  
18 that, but a lot of logs from old deadwood lying around  
19 causing the stream to be turbulent right there, causing  
20 some deep water associated with this.  
21           But that's all old wood. And we do need old wood,  
22 as Dr. Platts has pointed out, to get the stream  
23 complex and to get the stream narrow and deep again.  
24           We're into old wood again now, here, and the  
25 stream slims way, way down. This is not three-year-old

0036

01 vegetation. And, again, as Dr. Li will point out, this  
02 is not something that has narrowed during the last  
03 three years or even ten years.

04 Wide channel, there, where we have no vegetation,  
05 wide where we have no vegetation. And then it goes  
06 back into some old vegetation again, vegetation that we  
07 can find on the 1964 photos, and then it slims down.  
08 We get a lot of complexity in here again.

09 And here, notice the age of these trees or at  
10 least, the size of the trees; not three-year-old  
11 vegetation, not ten-year-old vegetation, by any means.

12 Wide where we're lacking old vegetation, then into  
13 old vegetation again. Notice how it slims down again  
14 where it hits that old vegetation.

15 Very non-complex in through there where we don't  
16 have the old stuff.

17 Couple ducks take off. Imagine how many more  
18 there would be if this was all a wetlands.

19 This is all old wood down in here, and we do get  
20 some complexity associated with all those old logs  
21 right there.

22 Here's an area where the bank is actively being  
23 cut back, where the stream impinges upon a bank with  
24 very little vegetation.

25 Notice here that we have a collapsing bank right

0037

01 along in through here where the bank is actually being  
02 undercut.

03 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Would you mark that spot in the  
04 video, please, on the tape?

05 DR. STINE: I think it's tough for her to do on  
06 the tape because there's no numbers.

07 And all of a sudden, we go down here in the old  
08 vegetation here and things start to narrow down and  
09 become more complex.

10 Very little old vegetation in through here, but  
11 right there, all of a sudden, we go into the old stuff,  
12 and it slims down and starts taking all kinds of bends,  
13 becomes much more insinuous, much more irregular, holes  
14 undercut banks because of the root systems that we can  
15 see through here.

16 This is the kind of bend that we just do not get  
17 here if there's no vegetation. The stream is  
18 undercutting the banks causing them to collapse.

19 Very regular channel in through here. No  
20 vegetation to speak of on the sides, no old vegetation,  
21 that is.

22 Notice right here we go from a very regular  
23 channel into a channel with some undercut banks and  
24 whatnot, when we get into this old vegetation, not  
25 three-year-old vegetation.

0038

01 Here's three-year-old, five-year-old vegetation  
02 right through here.

03 This is the where the helicopter decided to  
04 circle, so we're seeing some more of what we just saw.

05 A big log jam right here. But there's old wood  
06 that's caused by trees having been there for a long  
07 time, rather than by anything that's been going on

08 during the last three years.

09 The complexity here, the undercut banks, the old  
10 vegetation.

11 Very little vegetation in through here, and then  
12 down to The Ford.

13 And that's where we ended the video right there.

14 I would like to introduce, if I could, NAS/MLC  
15 Exhibit 251, which was a photograph taken by Chestley  
16 Wakeley, I believe, in the 1940s and, likewise,  
17 Exhibit 252, NAS/MLC 252.

18 It shows a young guy climbing into the stream.  
19 You can see how narrow the stream is there. We can see  
20 the kind of stream that existed prior to the diversions  
21 by the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

22 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me. May I see the  
23 photographs, please?

24 DR. STINE: Certainly.

25 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Are we going to be provided

0039

01 copies of these?

02 MR. DODGE: I thought you already had.

03 MR. CAIN: They have.

04 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you.

05 DR. STINE: And I'd like to also put in three  
06 exhibits that are labeled NAS/MLC 248, 49, and 50,  
07 which are photographs of some of these same channels as  
08 they exist today that I believe can be rewatered. And  
09 we would recoup very rapidly some of these same  
10 conditions that existed out there in pre-1940 times,  
11 rather than having to wait for the existing vegetation  
12 to grow up all along the stream and create the  
13 conditions that existed out there prior to 1940.

14 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Any objection,  
15 Mr. Birmingham?

16 MR. BIRMINGHAM: No.

17 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: All right.

18 DR. STINE: And I believe that that concludes my  
19 rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony.

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge, did you  
21 want those exhibits introduced into the record now, or  
22 do you want to wait until you introduce all the rest of  
23 your exhibits?

24 MR. DODGE: I think we'll wait. Thank you.

25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you.

0040

01 Mr. Dodge, was Dr. Stine's presentation on behalf  
02 of the National Audubon Society/Mono Lake Committee  
03 singularly only?

04 MR. DODGE: Yes.

05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham?

06 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me, one moment.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I thought you might be  
08 leaving, Mr. Birmingham. I wasn't quite sure.

09 MR. DODGE: Mr. Chairman, I had indicated that I  
10 was going to put Stacy Li on with Dr. Stine. I think  
11 it might be simpler if we went through the  
12 cross-examination and then go to Dr. Li.

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I assumed that by  
14 virtue of the fact that you had not called him and  
15 moved back to your chair, that that was the case. But

16 thank you for clarifying that.

17 Mr. Birmingham?

18 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you.

19 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BIRMINGHAM

20 Q. I'd like to go through NAS/MLC 1-A-F with you,  
21 Dr. Stine. That's the rebuttal testimony that you  
22 prepared?

23 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, it is.

24 Q. And the first page of that rebuttal testimony has  
25 a title on it, "Rebuttal Testimony of Scott Stine

0041

01 Regarding the Persistence of Sand Tufa in the Mono  
02 Basin."

03 What evidence were you trying to rebut when you  
04 drafted this? Was that the evidence presented by  
05 Ranger Carl?

06 A. I'm not sure what "rebuttal" means, to tell you  
07 the honest to goodness truth, because it's been used so  
08 very, very loosely in the proceeding.

09 There was a question that was left hanging, in my  
10 opinion, and what I'm trying to do is simply clarify  
11 that question that was left hanging.

12 Q. That was the --

13 A. I'm not sure that there was anything ever resolved  
14 on this question to actually rebut, so I may be  
15 breaking the rules by bringing this up.

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Would the Court  
17 Reporter please mark that section so I can refer to it  
18 later on?

19 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Well, in fact, it was a  
20 question that was asked of Ranger Carl by  
21 Mr. Del Piero; isn't that correct?

22 A. BY DR. STINE: I think it was directed to both  
23 Ranger Carl and myself, and I explained some things and  
24 then Ranger Carl came in and explained some other  
25 things. And we went on to another topic, and it was

0042

01 left hanging.

02 Q. And the question that was asked of Ranger Carl  
03 and you by Mr. Del Piero was how long you would expect  
04 the sand tufa to persist; is that correct?

05 A. Something to that effect.

06 Q. And Ranger Carl -- first, Ranger Carl was called  
07 by the State Parks Service and by the State Lands  
08 Commission; is that right?

09 A. I believe that's correct, yes.

10 Q. And when you were asked the question by  
11 Mr. Del Piero concerning the persistence of sand tufa,  
12 you were appearing as a witness on behalf of the State  
13 Lands Commission and State Parks Service; is that  
14 right?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. So you're offering rebuttal testimony to what was  
17 offered by State Lands Commission and State Parks  
18 Service; is that right?

19 MR. VALENTINE: Objection. That's argumentative.

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: It is argumentative.

21 You don't have to answer that, Dr. Stine.

22 Mr. Birmingham, why don't you go on?

23 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Ranger Carl said they had a

24 photo. They were taking photos of sand tufa for some  
25 time period of approximately ten years. And in his

0043

01 opinion, he thought that the concern over the delicacy  
02 of sand tufa was a little bit overstated.

03 Was that his opinion?

04 A. BY DR. STINE: I don't think that he said that. I  
05 think what he said was that he saw relatively little  
06 change in the sand tufa, this is how I remember it,  
07 saw relatively little change in the sand tufa over the  
08 ten years that he had been photographically documenting  
09 the sand tufa.

10 My feeling on that, Mr. Birmingham, if you're  
11 still with us --

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham is  
13 securing an exhibit.

14 DR. STINE: My feeling on that, if you extrapolate  
15 his conclusion, is that sand tufa will be here 50,000  
16 years from now. And I don't think that's going to be  
17 the case.

18 I think that sand tufa is something like an old  
19 barn. You build a barn, and for the first number of  
20 years, it looks awfully good. And as weather takes a  
21 toll, that barn starts to look a little shabby. And  
22 the shabbiness progresses very, very slowly at first,  
23 but pretty soon the termites have taken a toll on the  
24 bottom. And the more the thing collapses, the more  
25 it's going to collapse.

0044

01 And that's the way sand tufa is going to weather  
02 as well. We're going to have a period out there where  
03 it weathers very, very slowly. But there's going to be  
04 some undermining due to weathering, salt crystal  
05 growth, freeze-thaw, a number of other things that is  
06 then going to start to take a toll. The bigger the  
07 toll, the faster the toll will progress.

08 It's not, then, a linear degradation. It's a  
09 curvilinear degradation, the degradation proceeding  
10 faster as time goes on.

11 We see this in a lot of different rock types.  
12 This isn't peculiar to sand tufa.

13 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'd like to refer to page 12  
14 of State Lands Commission and Department of Parks and  
15 Recreation, Exhibit 4, testimony of David Carl on  
16 behalf of the State Department of Parks and Recreation.

17 Do you have a copy of that with you, Dr. Stine?

18 A. BY DR. STINE: I don't.

19 Q. What I'll do is read with you, and I'll ask to  
20 read along while I read it aloud so you can confirm I  
21 read it accurately.

22 Or better yet, why don't I ask you to read the  
23 fourth full paragraph of Ranger Carl's testimony into  
24 the record? That's the fourth full paragraph on page  
25 12.

0045

01 A. Which states, "The DEIR overstated the impacts of  
02 weather on the sand tufa. We have closely monitored  
03 sand tufa sites for over ten years with a photo  
04 inventory. We have documented very few obvious visual  
05 changes in that decade. The density of the sand tufa

06 material and the shelter provided by the surrounding  
07 hills appear to offer some protection from weather  
08 forces."

09 Q. By surrounding sand hills.

10 A. Surrounding sand hills, excuse me, yes.

11 And I would respond to that only by saying that  
12 what I said two minutes ago still stands.

13 Q. You disagree with the opinion expressed by Ranger  
14 Carl on page 12 of his written testimony?

15 A. Well, I'm not sure. I don't remember exactly what  
16 the DEIR said, so I don't know if it was overstated or  
17 not.

18 But my point remains the same: That we can go to  
19 50-year-old sand tufa that's out there that we know to  
20 be 50 years old. We can go to 300-year-old sand tufa  
21 that we know to be 300 years. And, to me, that  
22 represents a much better way of assessing how sand tufa  
23 stands up over time than this photographic record.  
24 Then I get back to my barn analogy again.

25 Q. Now, as I recall Ranger Carl's oral testimony,  
0046

01 during his oral testimony, he presented a bunch of  
02 slides that depicted sand tufa in different states; is  
03 that correct?

04 A. You may be right, but that's not how I remember  
05 it. I believe that he was showing different sand tufa  
06 localities all of which had been exposed by the modern  
07 drop of the lake. So relatively young deposits or  
08 young exposures of sand tufa.

09 Q. And he testified that some of the sand tufa that  
10 had been exposed for longer periods that had fallen  
11 down, or had become decayed were in that state because  
12 of the impact of livestock that had been grazing in the  
13 area of the sand tufa.

14 Do you recall him testifying to that?

15 A. I recall something to that effect, although, I  
16 would state that the areas that I've looked at and the  
17 sand tufa exposure that I've looked at, have not been  
18 trampled by grazing.

19 When you trample something with grazing, it's a  
20 big impact. It's an obvious impact. I'm talking about  
21 sand tufa exposures that have been weathered  
22 in cetu (phonetic), in place.

23 Q. So the condition of the sand tufa that Ranger Carl  
24 showed us in the slides, in your opinion, that's not a  
25 result of livestock grazing?

0047

01 A. That's not what I said at all. He may very well  
02 have shown slides of sand tufa that may have been  
03 impacted by grazing.

04 What I'm saying is that the models that I used to  
05 determine how long or to estimate, because it is an  
06 estimate, estimate how long sand tufa would persist,  
07 irrespective of a lake level rise, had obviously not  
08 been trampled. It was standing, somewhat dilapidated,  
09 the very thin plates were all removed. The sharp edges  
10 had all been subdued way down.

11 Q. Now, I may be mistaken, but as I recall, when  
12 Mr. Del Piero asked the question of you and Ranger Carl  
13 concerning how long the sand tufa would persist, Ranger

14 Carl responded and you leaned over and whispered  
15 something to Ranger Carl.

16 Do you recall what you whispered to Ranger Carl?

17 MR. VALENTINE: Excuse me, Mr. Del Piero. If  
18 there's going to be a long line of questioning on what  
19 happened six weeks ago, maybe Dr. Stine should have the  
20 benefit of the transcript.

21 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Do you have a copy of  
22 the transcript, Mr. Birmingham?

23 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I probably could find it  
24 somewhere, if necessary. Although, what he whispered  
25 to Ranger Carl isn't going to infringe on --

0048

01 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, do you  
02 recall what you whispered into Ranger Carl's ear six  
03 weeks ago?

04 DR. STINE: I better say something otherwise  
05 imaginations in here will soar. I don't recall.

06 MR. BIRMINGHAM: You and I whisper things all the  
07 time, Dr. Stine, and I would not want imaginations to  
08 soar.

09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: That didn't get into  
10 the transcript now, did it?

11 DR. STINE: I'm not sure how it got in. I didn't  
12 mean S-O-R-E.

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Please proceed,  
14 Mr. Birmingham.

15 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I will.

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Quickly.

17 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Dr. Stine, let's go through  
18 the video.

19 First, before we do, I take it from your  
20 description of some of the video that, in your opinion,  
21 some segments of Rush Creek are in pretty good shape;  
22 is that right, Dr. Stine?

23 A. BY DR. STINE: I would hesitate to remark about --  
24 I think you've got it on fast there.

25 I would hesitate to talk about stream reaches

0049

01 without indicating exactly which stream reaches it is  
02 we're talking when. I feel much more comfortable  
03 talking about the bottomlands in its entirety if we're  
04 going to generalize.

05 If you want to go reach by reach, I'll be more  
06 than happy to. This, I think, is in abysmal shape.  
07 Here, the stream is not where it was prior to 1940.

08 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, you need  
09 identify where "here" is.

10 DR. STINE: I'm sorry. This is the first 1,800  
11 feet, 1,700 feet or so below The Narrows.

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you.

13 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, we're looking at  
14 vegetation. I've stopped this, Dr. Stine, at what is  
15 indicated on the frame counter as frame 42, and we see  
16 depicted in this frame some vegetation.

17 Is that vegetation old vegetation or is it young  
18 vegetation?

19 A. BY DR. STINE: I think that that's probably young  
20 vegetation right there. But this branch right here  
21 that's clogging the channel is probably some old

22 vegetation and, once again, having old vegetation in  
23 the system is really very, very important.

24 The old vegetation, branches like this, will do  
25 things to the stream that three-year-old vegetation  
0050

01 can't do; indeed, probably ten-year-old vegetation  
02 can't do. So we do have a constriction right here, and  
03 it has to do with vegetation.

04 I would guess that that is probably ten-year-old  
05 vegetation, though, rather than three-year-old  
06 vegetation, because remember, we did have flows down  
07 here in 1980, '82, '83, and '86. It isn't just the  
08 last three years that we've had flow in the Rush Creek  
09 bottomlands.

10 Right here we're dealing, of course, with much  
11 older vegetation.

12 Q. I'm stopping this at what's identified as frame 58  
13 on the counter. And you indicated this is older  
14 vegetation?

15 A. Yes, it is. I believe Mr. Messick will have  
16 something to say about that as well.

17 Q. Now, we're looking at a portion of stream. Is  
18 this old vegetation or young vegetation that we're  
19 looking at, Dr. Stine?

20 A. Well, I think that what we see here, perhaps, on  
21 the left bank, is young vegetation. What we're seeing  
22 here on the right bank of the stream looks to me to be  
23 old root systems sticking out into the stream. So I  
24 would say the right bank is probably old vegetation.  
25 The left bank is probably quite young vegetation.

0051  
01 Q. That was frame 62 that we were looking at.

02 We're moving further down the stream.

03 A. Now, I would like to say, if possible, we're now  
04 in a place on the stream where the stream is occupying  
05 the same channel that it occupied in 1940. We're not  
06 into a new channel anymore.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Can we identify the  
08 frame, please?

09 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Yes. I stopped this at frame  
10 72.

11 And I'm pointing, Dr. Stine, to some vegetation  
12 that exists on the right bank of the channel. That  
13 vegetation is young vegetation, isn't it?

14 A. BY DR. STINE: I would first like to clear up and  
15 say that that's not on the right bank of the channel.  
16 It's actually on a bar that is within the vegetation.

17 I would say it is young, though I would hesitate  
18 to say it's three years old. I suspect that it is due  
19 to the flows of the early and mid 1980s rather than  
20 anything that was there prior to 1940. This is all  
21 very old vegetation in here at frame 78, 79, and 80.

22 Q. I've stopped this at frame 82, and I'm pointing to  
23 some vegetation which appears to the right bank of the  
24 stream.

25 Is that vegetation young vegetation, Dr. Stine?

0052  
01 A. I would say that is probably vegetation from the  
02 early and mid 1980s, whereas to the left bank, we're  
03 dealing with vegetation that's much older.



04 Q. Now, we're looking at some vegetation during the  
05 winter; is that right, Dr. Stine?  
06 A. That is correct.  
07 Q. And is it correct that this vegetation would  
08 appear green during the summer period?  
09 A. Yes, it would. And I would point out that from  
10 frame 88 through 98, now, we're in through some very  
11 old vegetation, much older than we were looking at  
12 before. It would appear green. Now, it's pretty  
13 fluorescent orange.  
14 Q. I'm going to fast forward this, if I may, to a  
15 point where I asked the Reporter to mark the  
16 transcript.  
17 A. Nice old vegetation through there.  
18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Can I -- excuse me.  
19 Mr. Herrera, how much time left?  
20 MR. HERRERA: Five minutes and 30 seconds.  
21 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, I'm  
22 assuming that you have some additional questions to ask  
23 of Dr. Stine?  
24 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I do.  
25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: In order to facilitate  
0053  
01 this process and not cause Mr. Birmingham to ask  
02 repeatedly for extensions of time, Dr. Stine, it may be  
03 appropriate for you to limit your answers to the  
04 questions he's asking.  
05 DR. STINE: I will, sir.  
06 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, I think I've found the  
07 place on this video that I wanted to ask you about,  
08 Dr. Stine. Let me just stop it, if I may.  
09 Now, Dr. Stine, this is a place where you  
10 indicated that a bank was being sloughed off; is that  
11 correct?  
12 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, it is. And we can see it  
13 through here on the left.  
14 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: You need to back that  
15 up, Mr. Birmingham. Either that or I'll move to the  
16 other side. When Dr. Stine stands up to point  
17 something out, I can't see.  
18 DR. STINE: And here is the sloughing I was  
19 talking about, and here is some more of the sloughing  
20 that I was talking about here. The bank is being  
21 actively undercut, and it is playing to the left.  
22 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, that undercutting, is  
23 that what you attempted to stop through the project at  
24 the meander bend further downstream?  
25 A. BY DR. STINE: I think that we have successfully  
0054  
01 stopped it, yes. That was done at the request of the  
02 RTC.  
03 And here is the bank right here; and here is the  
04 soft armory here. And you can see how, in the past,  
05 this material was pulled away from the bank.  
06 MR. HERRERA: Could you identify that frame,  
07 please?  
08 DR. STINE: 252.  
09 MR. HERRERA: Thank you.  
10 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: And you indicated that it was  
11 the sloughing off and undercutting which you attempted

12 to stop through the project of the meander bend at RC  
13 4.5?

14 A. BY DR. STINE: That's correct.

15 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Excuse me. Let me interpose an  
16 objection.

17 Mr. Birmingham said "you" referring to Dr. Stine.  
18 Dr. Stine is not the restoration consultant and,  
19 therefore, is not responsible for the choice of the  
20 intervention which is being addressed here.

21 MR. BIRMINGHAM: The reason I selected the term  
22 "you" is because repeatedly throughout Dr. Stine's  
23 testimony, he used the term "we." He may have been  
24 referring to "we, the planning team," "we, the  
25 restoration technical committee." But the term he used  
0055 was "we."

02 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I'm going to overrule  
03 the objection. However, I'll point it out, although  
04 it's not necessary. The RTC is well identified in the  
05 record. Dr. Stine's functions and activities on that  
06 stream are also well documented in the record. It's  
07 not a problem.

08 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, Dr. Stine, with respect  
09 to your description of the old vegetation that has  
10 caused the channel to narrow, are you telling us that  
11 at those places where there is old vegetation,  
12 narrowing is no longer a continuing process, but it is,  
13 in fact, a completed process?

14 A. BY DR. STINE: You've set up an assumption there  
15 that's incorrect. And if you could restate the  
16 question, I think I would not be tripping over it. You  
17 said something in there that implied that narrowing had  
18 been caused by this vegetation. And what I'm saying is  
19 that the stream has not narrowed at these sites, nor  
20 has it widened at these sites. The stream is very  
21 much, at many of these old vegetation sites, it is very  
22 much the way it was prior to 1940.

23 I think that Dr. Beschta was incorrect in talking  
24 about ongoing narrowing on the stream.

25 Q. So it's your opinion that there is no ongoing  
0056 narrowing on the stream?

02 A. It's my opinion, having looked at Dr. Li's  
03 cross-sections data, rather than speculation, that the  
04 stream is narrowing ever so slightly in the top six  
05 inches of the stream locally. It is actually doing  
06 quite a bit of widening in places at that depth, and  
07 that, overall, the stream has changed very little in  
08 width and in depth not only in the last three years  
09 but, in fact, since 1987. And that's based on actual  
10 data rather than speculations.

11 Q. Is that data that you've collected?

12 A. That is data that Dr. Li collected both in 1987  
13 and in January of this year. And it's data that I've  
14 reviewed.

15 Q. I'd like to talk about your testimony concerning  
16 the future drought and its effects on Mono Lake. You  
17 indicate that this was -- the analysis that's contained  
18 in the testimony was prepared using the Vorster water  
19 balance model; is that correct?

20 A. That's correct.

21 Q. You didn't use the LAAMP model?

22 A. Didn't use the LAAMP model because I didn't have  
23 access. And at the time we did this, there was still  
24 questions about the LAAMP model. It was very simple  
25 for me to use the Vorster model, because I have

0057

01 depended on things that I've published on the Vorster  
02 model.

03 And Peter and I have worked together using his  
04 model to create the hydrologic conditions of the past  
05 couple thousand years at Mono Lake.

06 I should say, too, if I may, that either the LAAMP  
07 model -- and I think Mr. Hasencamp pointed this out,  
08 that both the LAAMP model and the Peter Vorster model  
09 actually underestimate the effect of drought. So in  
10 that respect, either model would be very conservative.

11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, I ask you  
12 to focus on the questions Mr. Birmingham is asking you.

13 DR. STINE: I'm sorry.

14 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: That's twice.

15 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, you make reference to  
16 droughts from prehistoric periods that were in excess  
17 of 25 years; is that right, Dr. Stine?

18 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, that's correct.

19 Q. Is part of the basis of your opinion there were  
20 droughts that lasted in excess of 25 years, tree-ring  
21 analysis?

22 A. In part tree-ring analysis, but not tree-ring  
23 analysis in a dendro-climatological sense, tree-ring  
24 analysis in a dendro-chronological sense. I used the  
25 tree-ring to help date the phenomenon rather than to

0058

01 actually put climatic boundaries on the phenomenon.

02 Q. So you did not use tree-ring analysis to determine  
03 the duration of a drought, instead you used tree-ring  
04 analysis to determine when the drought occurred?

05 A. No. I used tree-ring analysis for both things  
06 that you've just stated. I simply didn't use tree-ring  
07 analysis to judge the severity of the drought.

08 Q. Now, is it correct, Dr. Stine, that -- well, tell  
09 me the analysis that you performed using tree-rings to  
10 determine the duration of drought.

11 A. There are trees, very long-lived trees, rooted in  
12 wetlands today, areas that are today very, very wet.  
13 One of those areas is Mono Lake. Another is Tinemaha  
14 Lake up by Tioga Pass. It's a lake that even during  
15 the past six years of drought overflowed in every year,  
16 yet that lake was over 60 feet below its overflow level  
17 for a long time during this drought for which we have  
18 evidence at a whole bunch of sites, Tinemaha Lake  
19 simply being one of them.

20 Those trees have upwards of 140 rings in them.  
21 That means that the lake has to have been below its lip  
22 for over 140 years for those trees to persist there.

23 And it isn't just at Tinemaha Lake. I give that  
24 as one example. Also, the West Walker River, the East  
25 Carson River, those other sites that I have pointed out

0059

01 to you. So there we're using ring counts to determine

02 the duration of drought.

03 MR. HERRERA: Mr. Birmingham, that's 20 minutes.

04 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I make an application for an  
05 additional 20 minutes.

06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Granted.

07 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: The existence of a tree below  
08 the existing lip of Tinemaha Lake for a period of 140  
09 years would not indicate a drought of that duration;  
10 isn't that right, Dr. Stine?

11 A. BY DR. STINE: In combination with all of the  
12 other evidence that dates precisely the same as the  
13 Tinemaha Lake work, and here it's Osgood Swamp,  
14 Tinemaha Lake, Mono Lake, East Carson River, West  
15 Walker River, Walker Lake, and a number of other sites,  
16 Yuba River and Independence Lake, we're getting more  
17 and more data, all of these lakes disappeared at this  
18 time.

19 In and of itself, I would say that it strongly,  
20 strongly suggests that there was drought. In  
21 combination with all of these other sites, I would say  
22 it's overwhelmingly compelling.

23 Q. Are you familiar with the work that's been done by  
24 the Department of Water Resources in connection with  
25 the duration of droughts in the San Joaquin and

0060

01 Sacramento Valleys?

02 A. You'll have to be a little more explicit, if you  
03 would, on the actual studies. I'm familiar with  
04 several of them, yes, but perhaps you could point out  
05 which one you're talking about.

06 Q. Are you familiar with the study performed by the  
07 Department of Water Resources at the conclusion of our  
08 most recent drought that was performed by the  
09 University of Arizona?

10 A. Yes, I am. I think that that was done by Fritz  
11 and his co-workers, and it was actually some work that  
12 followed up on work that was done within the last ten  
13 years, which took the tree-ring record back to  
14 approximately 1500 or 1550 A.D.

15 They looked then at the duration of droughts from  
16 about 1500 or 1550 A.D. to the present time.

17 Q. And it's correct, Dr. Stine, that that analysis  
18 concluded that a drought of six or seven years was the  
19 maximum duration of a drought during that period in the  
20 Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys?

21 A. That is correct. Although, I would like to point  
22 out that 1550 A.D. to 1850 A.D. was the coldest and  
23 wettest period of the last 2,000 to 3,000 all over the  
24 world, and I brought this book along called The Little  
25 Ice Age that documents that cool, wet period all over

0061

01 the world, including in the Sierra Nevada of  
02 California.

03 At that time, Mono Lake was 28 vertical feet  
04 higher than at any time during the last 3800 years. It  
05 was a very cool, very wet period, and I would suggest  
06 that it would be prudent for the State of California to  
07 not use the Little Ice Age as their criterion for  
08 determining drought in California. They should look  
09 beyond the Little Ice Age, which is this very, very

10 aberrant time.

11 Q. Dr. Stine, NAS/MLC 245, when was this photograph  
12 taken?

13 A. That was taken in -- if I could check here, I can  
14 give you a month and a year, like a toaster -- it was  
15 taken in August of 1983.

16 Q. What was the flow in Lee Vining Creek in August of  
17 1983?

18 A. The flow was probably on the order of 200 to 300  
19 or so cfs, and I'm guessing here in July it maxed out,  
20 I believe, on about July 4th in excess -- well, in  
21 excess of 300 cfs. And it was still fairly high in  
22 August of 1983.

23 Q. Dr. Stine, I'd like to hand you a slide, and I'd  
24 ask if we can use your slide projector to show the  
25 slide which I'd ask to be marked next in order

0062

01 L.A. DWP, and I'll provide copies to the Board and to  
02 the other parties.

03 Now, Dr. Stine, do you recognize this slide which  
04 will be L.A. DWP 165 as the mouth of Lee Vining Creek?

05 A. Yes, I do.

06 Q. And is that what the mouth of Lee Vining Creek  
07 looked like in the fall of 1993?

08 A. I can't vouch for the actual year on here. This  
09 slide may have been taken before that. This doesn't  
10 depict terribly well the amount of vegetation that's  
11 out there. I think maybe that there may be even a  
12 little more vegetation out there in that month that you  
13 mentioned than there is on the slide.

14 Q. I'll have to apologize for the quality of the  
15 slide.

16 Dr. Stine, I will represent to you that it's a  
17 slide that was taken from the video prepared by the  
18 Department of Water and Power in the fall of 1993,  
19 which is of very poor quality.

20 A. Okay.

21 Q. But generally speaking, is that the way the mouth  
22 of Lee Vining Creek appears today?

23 A. Similar to that, certainly, yes.

24 Are you done with this?

25 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I move for the admission of

0063

01 L.A. DWP Exhibit 165.

02 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Any objection? So  
03 ordered.

04 (L.A. DWP Exhibit 165 was  
05 admitted into evidence.)

06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Are we going see more  
07 slides, Mr. Birmingham?

08 MR. BIRMINGHAM: No more slides, at least not that  
09 I'm aware of. No more slides. And, in fact, I don't  
10 think I have any further questions of Dr. Stine at this  
11 moment.

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much,  
13 Mr. Birmingham.

14 Mr. Roos-Collins -- I'm sorry. Ms. Cahill?

15 MS. CAHILL: No.

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Roos-Collins?

17 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Mr. Del Piero, could we take a

18 few-minute recess before my cross-examination?  
19 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: That's a good idea.  
20 We'll take ten minutes.  
21 (A recess was taken at this time.)  
22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ladies and gentlemen,  
23 this hearing will again come to order.  
24 Mr. Roos-Collins?  
25 ///

0064  
01 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS  
02 Q. Dr. Stine, good afternoon.  
03 A. BY MR. STINE: Good afternoon.  
04 Q. You know, there's an old story about two blind men  
05 touching an elephant. One blind man says, you know,  
06 "This is a tail." The other blind man says, "No, it's  
07 a trunk."  
08 Are you familiar with that story?  
09 A. Yes, I am.  
10 Q. Now, Dr. Beschta and you look at the same 1929  
11 photographs, and you don't appear to describe the same  
12 reality.  
13 Would you agree that you and Dr. Beschta see  
14 different things in the 1929 photographs?  
15 A. Yes, I believe so, though I'm getting the  
16 impression, as time goes on, that our views are  
17 becoming somewhat convergent.  
18 And I would point out the fact that on his  
19 transparencies, he points to a canal which he  
20 identifies as an irrigation canal, and he apparently is  
21 no longer calling that an irrigation channel.  
22 He points to another place that says, "Relic  
23 channel unused in 1929," but in his testimony now, he's  
24 saying that, indeed, there was water in there.  
25 So I think that as time goes on, our views are,  
0065  
01 perhaps, converging, and maybe the elephant is turning  
02 out to be a more like a round ball.  
03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I don't know this  
04 story of the round ball.  
05 (Laughter.)  
06 DR. STINE: Let me tell you.  
07 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I don't know the story of the  
08 elephant. Is somebody going to tell me?  
09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Not in this record.  
10 Please proceed, Mr. Roos-Collins.  
11 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: For Mr. Birmingham's benefit, I  
12 will stipulate that it has something to do with seeing  
13 the parts and not the whole.  
14 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: In any event, Dr. Stine,  
15 having reviewed Dr. Beschta's written and oral  
16 testimony in this proceeding, do you understand the  
17 method that he used to interpret the 1929 photographs?  
18 A. BY DR. STINE: The physical and logistical method,  
19 yes. He looked at it with a magnifying stereoscope  
20 just as I did, and I think he was probably looking for  
21 certain things. I got the impression, and it's only an  
22 impression, from Dr. Beschta's testimony that he went  
23 out there and looked at particular controversial  
24 questions.  
25 For instance, I had mentioned several years ago in

0066

01 publication that the meander bend had been cut off, and  
02 that was from having tried to understand the entire  
03 bottomland system and the way it worked, top to bottom,  
04 side to side, and through time, because I have a record  
05 that goes back thousands of years of the bottomlands.

06 And I think what Dr. Beschta did, which might be  
07 what I would do if I was in a similar position to  
08 Dr. Beschta, coming in without a lot of time to try to  
09 understand an entire system, I think what Dr. Beschta  
10 did was say, "All right. Let's concentrate on the  
11 meander. Okay. Let's concentrate on the one channel  
12 over here. Dr. Stine says that's such and such a way.  
13 It isn't that way."

14 I think he did it, by his own admission, without  
15 the benefit of having talked to the early residents of  
16 the time, and I'm sure he did it without the benefit of  
17 having spent hundreds and hundreds of hours on the  
18 ground in the bottomlands.

19 I get the impression from his testimony that only  
20 after he had formulated his decisions that he voiced in  
21 here in, I guess it was, November or December, only  
22 after that, did he go out and actually check out on the  
23 ground some of the things he had stated in here. And  
24 it was after that visit, that he seems to have changed  
25 his opinion on whether something was a irrigation

0067

01 channel or relic channel, et cetera.

02 To answer your question, yes, I think I understand  
03 what he did.

04 Q. And your understanding you just stated?

05 A. Yes.

06 Q. Let's discuss your method. Specifically, as used  
07 to develop Cal Trout Exhibit 13, which is your  
08 September 1992 report entitled "Past and Present  
09 Geomorphic, Hydrologic and Vegetative Conditions on  
10 Rush Creek."

11 A. Yes. That has been introduced and, I think,  
12 discussed not under that number but, rather, under  
13 NAS/MLC 122.

14 Q. Dr. Stine, it's been discussed under both numbers,  
15 and I used the Cal Trout number because I have it  
16 marked on my cover.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. That report refers to your review of 1929 and 1940  
19 photographs?

20 A. It does.

21 Q. And it also refers to your review of old timers'  
22 reports?

23 A. Anecdotal evidence having interviewed some of  
24 these people. In a few cases, it's written. In other  
25 cases, it's stuff I have gleaned through conversations

0068

01 with them.

02 Q. It also refers to your field inspection of the  
03 relic channels?

04 A. It does, yes.

05 Q. It refers to your field measurement of the relic  
06 channels?

07 A. Yes, it does.

08 Q. Would it be fair to say that your method for  
09 interpreting pre-1941 conditions combines these  
10 different analyses?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Anything else?

13 A. Lots else, but not in relation to that question.

14 Q. Let's discuss the key features of the Rush Creek  
15 Reach Five to bottomlands prior to 1941.

16 A. Okay.

17 Q. In the course of discussing the pre-1941 features,  
18 I will also ask you questions about how those features  
19 have changed between 1941 and the present.

20 On page 23 of Cal Trout Exhibit 13, first  
21 paragraph, you state that, "Even a moderate amount of  
22 flow; i.e., approximately 30 cubic feet per second,  
23 created relatively deep water, say, 2 to 4 feet deep  
24 and more depending on channel bottom efficacies. At  
25 these moderate flows, water reached depths exceeding 2  
0069  
01 feet along thousands of linear feet of channel through  
02 the bottomlands."

03 That is your opinion today?

04 A. Yes, it is.

05 Q. Do you have an opinion how Rush Creek today in the  
06 same reach compares?

07 A. Yes. Although, I should clarify that the same  
08 reach of the stream today is not necessarily Rush Creek  
09 in the same location.

10 Q. Understood.

11 A. And so that the stream is, in many places, in  
12 actually a different location.

13 First of all, I'd like to point out that it's more  
14 difficult to have thousands of feet of channel within  
15 certain reaches of Rush Creek, because these multiple  
16 channels no longer have water in them. So we've  
17 immediately done away with about, I believe it's 15,000  
18 linear feet of channel in the bottomlands, because we  
19 not longer have multiple channels watered.

20 I would also point out that along much of the  
21 stream course that still does have water in it, we  
22 don't have as much deep water as existed previously.  
23 And I would point to, for instance, the upper 1800  
24 feet, or so, of channel through the bottomlands.

25 If we look at that on the ground today, we can go  
0070  
01 back and reoccupy the channel that used to have water  
02 in it, and we can see how narrow and deep that channel  
03 was. It is not at all like the present-day channel  
04 which I refer to as the "Gun Barrel." It's much wider.  
05 A Gun Barrel is much wider, and it's just a shallow run  
06 the whole way down.

07 Q. Dr. Stine, on page 28 in paragraph 5 of Cal Trout  
08 Exhibit 13, you state, "Narrow channels with steeply  
09 sloping banks are rare. As a result of these changes  
10 in channel width and bank steepness, the same flow  
11 volume that previously created 2 to 4 feet of water  
12 depths creates only approximately 6 inches to  
13 approximately one foot of depth along most of the  
14 modern waterway."

15 Is that your opinion today?



16 A. Yes, it is. Though, what I'm talking about there  
17 is Rush Creek from The Narrows down to well below The  
18 Ford, down to where we got to that lower, say, Clover  
19 Ranch area.

20 So when I say "most of the stream," I'm taking  
21 that entire reach into consideration. And we've become  
22 focused and almost fixated here on certain parts of the  
23 Rush Creek bottomlands largely because of what the  
24 video covered.

25 The video stops at approximately, what we called  
0071

01 The Ford today, which is a slightly different location  
02 than the old Ford, but there's still all that other  
03 area down below The Ford between The Ford and Clover  
04 Ranch House. And that down there, too, is much, much  
05 wider as is the area above the first 1800 feet of  
06 channel below The Narrows.

07 Q. Do you have Dr. Beschta's written rebuttal  
08 testimony in front of you?

09 A. Not handy.

10 Q. Are you familiar with Figure 2 in that written  
11 rebuttal testimony, the Rush Creek thalweg profile  
12 dated January of 1994?

13 A. Yes, I am.

14 Q. Are you familiar with the area covered by that  
15 profile?

16 A. Yes, I am.

17 Q. Does that area roughly correspond with the area  
18 described in paragraph 5, page 28, of Cal Trout Exhibit  
19 13?

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Do you have  
21 Dr. Beschta's testimony in front of you?

22 DR. STINE: I do. And I think I understand the  
23 question regarding paragraph 5, page 28, did you say,  
24 of 13?

25 No. Actually, it doesn't, because I was taking  
0072

01 into consideration a considerably longer stream length  
02 here than exists on the thalweg profile. The thalweg  
03 profile starts approximately 1800 feet below The  
04 Narrows and goes down to The Ford, I believe.

05 I'm talking about the area from The Narrows down  
06 to considerably below The Ford where we have the  
07 multiple channels, and the standing water, and the  
08 narrow channels, and those kinds of things.

09 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Let's focus on the area  
10 actually addressed in Figure 2 of Dr. Beschta's  
11 rebuttal testimony.

12 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes.

13 Q. In your opinion, is that figure an accurate  
14 reflection of the thalweg profile today?

15 A. I have no reason to doubt that it isn't. I trust  
16 Mr. Tillemans went out there and accurately measured  
17 and recorded the thalweg of Rush Creek insofar as he  
18 did it here, 1800 feet below The Narrows down close to  
19 The Ford.

20 Q. Is that figure in any way inconsistent with your  
21 opinion that below The Narrows, the thalweg has grown  
22 substantially more shallow since 1941?

23 A. It is not inconsistent whatsoever. And, in fact,

24 to assess that, perhaps unbeknownst to you, I asked  
25 Mr. Vorster to run a histogram on the depths of the  
0073  
01 thalweg along Mr. Tillemans' profile there. And I  
02 believe at some point, this was going to be introduced  
03 as NAS and MLC Exhibit 258, which is labeled, "The  
04 Frequency Distribution of Tillemans' Thalweg Depths in  
05 the Rush Creek bottomlands at a Flow of 80 cfs."  
06 Q. Dr. Stine, is it a good exhibit?  
07 A. Darn good exhibit.  
08 Q. Are there any typos in it?  
09 A. Yes. And I don't think Mr. Vorster shows this.  
10 It's actually not on 258. It's actually on 259 --  
11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Excuse me,  
12 Mr. Roos-Collins. I know it's been a long time, and  
13 I've been sitting here for all of it, but I thought you  
14 represented Cal Trout.  
15 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: I do. I'm prepared to have  
16 these marked as Cal Trout exhibits. I'm less inclined  
17 to do so if there are typos which have been attributed  
18 to Morrison Foerster.  
19 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I just wanted to make  
20 sure I hadn't lost it entirely.  
21 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: I would request that these be  
22 marked as --  
23 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, I'm  
24 anticipating that you're going to have something to say  
25 about this, right?  
0074  
01 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: -- Cal Trout next in order.  
02 MR. DODGE: They're already marked as National  
03 Audubon Society 258. Why don't we just leave it?  
04 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: I request that they be  
05 distributed as National Audubon Society 258.  
06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay. Do you have any  
07 objection to that?  
08 MR. BIRMINGHAM: To them being distributed? No.  
09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Have you got copies of  
10 them, Mr. Birmingham?  
11 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'm not sure that I do.  
12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Could we arrange to  
13 have a representative of the Los Angeles Department of  
14 Water and Power copy them?  
15 Fish and Game have a copy?  
16 MS. CAHILL: Yes, we do.  
17 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Mr. Del Piero, I'm having  
18 National Audubon Society 258 and 259 distributed at  
19 this time.  
20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Fine. Any objection?  
21 None? Good.  
22 Please proceed, Mr. Roos-Collins.  
23 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Dr. Stine, what does  
24 National Audubon Society Exhibit 258 purport to show?  
25 A. BY DR. STINE: This is a histogram that is labeled  
0075  
01 "Frequency Distribution of the Tillemans' Thalweg  
02 Depths in the Rush Creek bottomlands at a Flow of 80  
03 cfs."  
04 And what Mr. Vorster has done here, at my request,  
05 is to create an X and Y axis histogram that shows the

06 percent of the thalweg measurements that lie between  
07 zero and .5 feet, a half a foot and a foot, a foot and  
08 a foot and a half, a foot and a half and two feet, et  
09 cetera, in half-a-foot increments up to four and a half  
10 to five feet.

11 And what this shows, for instance, is that 35  
12 percent of the Tillemans' thalweg measurements are  
13 less than a foot and a half deep. And 68 percent,  
14 approximately, of his thalweg measurements are under  
15 two feet deep. And 75, 76 percent of his thalweg  
16 measurements are under two and a half feet. And 85  
17 percent or so of the thalweg measurements -- make that  
18 95 percent, excuse me, of the thalweg measurements are  
19 under three feet in depth.

20 And I would point out here for clarification that  
21 the thalweg is not some average depth of a channel  
22 someplace. These are the deepest places on the  
23 channel.

24 So if we're talking about percent of total channel  
25 floor area that is less than three feet, it's going to  
0076

01 be way, way up above 95 percent. It's going to be  
02 99.99 percent of the channel floor that is under three  
03 feet deep.

04 This, I would also stress, is at 80 cfs. And if  
05 we took this down to the 25 to 30 cfs that I believe  
06 DWP is recommending on the stream, it would have the  
07 effect of taking every one of these bars and moving it  
08 one category to the left, so that we would not only  
09 have 95 percent of our thalweg depth less than three  
10 feet, indeed, if we lowered the flow, 95 percent of our  
11 thalweg depth would be less than two and a half feet  
12 deep.

13 And this represents the present-day condition 1800  
14 feet below The Ford and 1800 feet below The Narrows,  
15 that is, and The Ford.

16 Q. Dr. Stine, what does National Audubon Society  
17 Exhibit 259 purport to show?

18 A. The same thing with one important modification.  
19 What we did was to take Stacy Li's data from the  
20 present day for the upper 1800 feet of the channel,  
21 and we looked at channel width -- pardon me. We looked  
22 at thalweg depth in that upper 1800 feet, then added an  
23 appropriate number of measurements that represented  
24 that 1800 feet to the total thalweg number that  
25 Mr. Tillemans had come up with.

0077  
01 So that what we're doing here is simply creating a  
02 histogram that shows, that approximates now, that  
03 approximates the depth of channel from The Narrows down  
04 to The Ford.

05 And what that does very strongly is up the number  
06 of shallow water thalweg measurements and so tends to  
07 throw the histogram bars to the left.

08 We can play that same game, as I talked about on  
09 Exhibit 258 there, of knocking the flow from 80 cfs  
10 down to 25 to 35 cfs. When we do that, we find that 95  
11 percent of the thalweg depths are less than two and a  
12 half feet, and 98 percent of the thalweg depths are  
13 less than three feet deep.

14 Q. Dr. Stine, in your opinion, do National Audubon  
15 Society Exhibits 258 and 259 show that Rush Creek, for  
16 the area addressed in Figure 2 of Dr. Beschta's  
17 rebuttal testimony, at any given flow, tends to be  
18 substantially shallower today than it was in 1941?

19 A. As a whole, yes, certainly. There are a very few  
20 places, there are a handful of places on Rush Creek  
21 today where there are, for instance, stacks of old wood  
22 that have built up in the channel. Flow going around  
23 those stacks of old wood are, as Mr. Tillemans has  
24 correctly pointed out, digging holes.

25 So in a handful of places on Rush Creek today, we  
0078

01 have areas that are representative depth-wise of what  
02 used to be out there at a particular flow, but they're  
03 few and far between.

04 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Before I proceed, I'd like to  
05 thank Mr. Dodge for his courtesy in allowing me to use  
06 these very helpful exhibits before he intended to have  
07 them being used today.

08 MR. DODGE: I didn't know I had any choice.

09 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: You didn't, but you didn't  
10 object, either.

11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: We all know Mr. Dodge  
12 is a decent fellow.

13 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Dr. Stine, let's turn to a  
14 related subject. The number of channels in the  
15 bottomlands of Rush Creek before 1941. And for this  
16 purpose, I need Dr. Beschta's testimony back.

17 Now, you missed that part of my cross-examination  
18 of Dr. Beschta where I attempted to use my pencil, a  
19 ruler, and other instruments of measurement to discuss  
20 the reliability of 1929 photographs to describe pre-41  
21 conditions?

22 A. BY DR. STINE: I missed it, but I got the story  
23 from a number of different people including  
24 Mr. Birmingham. And Mr. Birmingham and I were  
25 whispering in one another's ear about that.

0079  
01 Q. Suffice it to say, it confused everyone, including  
02 the witness. But it did produce one clear  
03 understanding between Dr. Beschta and myself.

04 Dr. Beschta testified that notwithstanding the  
05 1-to-12,000 scale of the 1929 photographs, those  
06 photographs can be used to detect a two-foot wide  
07 channel or other object.

08 Would you agree with that testimony?

09 A. I do agree, and I would point out one  
10 misconception that lingers. These photographs are  
11 stamped 1-to-12,000. Every photograph there has a  
12 slightly different scale to it and, indeed, if you  
13 scale a whole bunch of it, what you find is that it's  
14 much, much closer to 1-to-17,000.

15 So that the estimated scale is not the actual  
16 scale on the photograph; nevertheless, even at  
17 1-to-17,000, one can discern a two-foot-wide channel,  
18 largely because it's not just the channel that you see,  
19 but other features associated with the channel, shadows  
20 and whatnot from the topography that allows you to see  
21 that feature.

22 Q. Now, in Los Angeles Exhibit 125, Dr. Beschta  
23 indicated that a side channel in Reach 5-A was relic  
24 and unused in 1929.  
25 Do you have LA Exhibit 125 in front of you?  
0080  
01 A. Yes.  
02 Q. Now, reviewing National Audubon Society Exhibit  
03 213, which is a poster of the 1929 photographs, can you  
04 locate the relic side channel to which Dr. Beschta  
05 referred in LA Exhibit 125?  
06 A. Yes. Though, as I've stated before, I disagree  
07 that it was unused at that time. One can see water in  
08 that channel coming right through here very, very  
09 clearly. It's a dark line, and as I say, if one wants  
10 to look and see what an unwatered channel looks like,  
11 one should look up here at this channel right through  
12 here and see how very light in color it is. The black  
13 line through here is a watered channel. We have two  
14 watered channels through here.  
15 And I don't think --  
16 Q. Dr. Stine --  
17 A. If I understood Dr. Beschta, I don't think he  
18 thinks that it's an unwatered channel anymore.  
19 Q. Understood. But you anticipated a line of  
20 questions which I haven't asked yet.  
21 A. I'm sorry.  
22 MR. BIRMINGHAM: He's been doing that all  
23 afternoon. I guess we shouldn't stop him now.  
24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: He treats all of you  
25 guys equally.  
0081  
01 DR. STINE: Deservedly.  
02 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: In your interpretation of  
03 National Audubon Society Exhibit 213, you call a dark  
04 area, a dark linear area, a channel. Dr. Beschta calls  
05 it a relic channel.  
06 Now, what, in your opinion, distinguishes that  
07 area in that photograph such that you were confident it  
08 is a channel?  
09 A. BY DR. STINE: It is linear, and it is dark, and  
10 it coincides or comports very nicely with those lines  
11 on here which I think even Dr. Beschta says is the main  
12 channel of Rush Creek.  
13 Q. Couldn't the darkness be shading?  
14 A. Shading is along the stream here. And once again,  
15 I would invite people to come up and look at this. We  
16 have a very low sun angle on these photographs, which  
17 is one of the things which makes them stand out and be  
18 wonderful, because they're wintertime shots when the  
19 sun is low.  
20 What we end up with in shadows, even shadows cast  
21 by trees that themselves are in a line, is a very, very  
22 ragged edge. This is not a ragged edge. It is a very  
23 straight consistent width very much like the channels  
24 that Dr. Beschta maintains are channels.  
25 Q. Are you testifying that the dark area, which  
0082  
01 Dr. Beschta calls the relic side channel, is filled  
02 with water?  
03 A. Yes.

04 Q. The darkness in that photograph is water itself?

05 A. Yes, it is.

06 MR. HERRERA: Excuse me, Mr. Roos-Collins. 20  
07 minutes has expired.

08 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: I request an additional 20  
09 minutes.

10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Granted.

11 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Now, with that  
12 understanding, let me compare two statements. The  
13 first comes from Cal Trout Exhibit 13, page 24, first  
14 paragraph, where you discuss the bottomlands. You  
15 state, "This, and the many spring-fed tributary rurals  
16 that fed the stream, created a situation in which water  
17 flowed across the bottomlands in as many as five  
18 channels abreast."

19 Let me compare paragraph number 1 on page 1 of  
20 Dr. Beschta's rebuttal testimony. "On the 1929 aerial  
21 photographs, Rush Creek is a relatively visible stream  
22 that throughout most of its length, occupies a sinuous,  
23 single-thread channel."

24 Now, let's assume that that paragraph applies to  
25 the bottomlands as well as the remainder of Rush

0083

01 Creek.

02 When you look at National Audubon Society Exhibit  
03 213, what gives you confidence that there are, in fact,  
04 or were, in fact, as many as five channels abreast  
05 through the bottomlands?

06 A. BY DR. STINE: I have a hard time accepting your  
07 assumption. I don't think Dr. Beschta meant to focus  
08 in just on the bottomlands. I think his statement was  
09 throughout most of its length. Rush Creek occupied a  
10 single channel. And I wouldn't disagree with him on  
11 that if we're talking about Rush Creek to Mono Lake.

12 But in the bottomlands it, indeed, did have  
13 multiple channels.

14 Q. Let's leave the comparison and my assumption out  
15 of it, and let's focus only on your opinion.

16 What gives you confidence that there were as many  
17 as five channels abreast through the bottomlands in  
18 Rush Creek prior to 1941?

19 A. Two things. First of all, the 1929-40 photographs  
20 and the 1940 photographs on the one hand.

21 And secondly, the fact that we can go back there  
22 today and find those very channels that are still  
23 intact. In some cases, sometimes full of cobbles and  
24 gravels from the quarry upstream. But we can go back  
25 and confirm on the ground today that there were

0084

01 channels there.

02 Q. Let's break that answer into two parts. You said  
03 that "we can go back and confirm those channels were  
04 there."

05 You yourself have gone back and have confirmed  
06 that those channels were there; is that correct?

07 A. Yes. And it was before any of this hearing  
08 business came up, because I was interested in how the  
09 bottomlands worked.

10 So I went back there actually in 1990 and in 1991,  
11 and we looked at all those channels. I walked every

12 single one of those channels then, and I've done so  
13 since.

14 Q. Now, in 1990 and, for that matter, today, many of  
15 the channels which you believe were occupied before  
16 1941 with water are dry.

17 Today, what gives you confidence, when you walk  
18 those channels, that they were wet before 1941?

19 A. Well, we can see on the 1940 photographs, as well  
20 as on the 1929-40 photographs that there is water in  
21 these channels.

22 Q. Let's look at the 1929 photographs, National  
23 Audubon Society Exhibit 213. Can you point out an area  
24 of the bottomlands where there are as many as five  
25 channels abreast?

0085

01 A. Yes, I can. Two channels abreast here. Right in  
02 this area, there are five channels, I would say, right  
03 here where we have a channel --

04 Q. Dr. Stine, could you approximately describe where  
05 you are in the photograph?

06 A. Yeah. We're roughly a third of the way, maybe a  
07 little bit more than a third of the way between The  
08 Narrows and the Big Meander.

09 And perhaps we can refer again to the photographs  
10 which are, indeed, the 1929 photographs in NAS and MLC  
11 122, which is Cal Trout 13.

12 Q. Yes.

13 A. Yes. There is a copy of the photograph there  
14 that's referred to as Reach B Upper. And Reach B  
15 Upper, indeed, shows one area there where there are  
16 five channels abreast. And it would be -- this is not  
17 now counting Indian Ditch.

18 Q. For the Board's benefit, can you locate that site  
19 on National Audubon Exhibit 213?

20 A. Yes. It's this area right in through here. There  
21 are many other places where there were four and three  
22 and two channels abreast.

23 Q. Thank you.

24 Let's move on now to the changes in the Rush Creek  
25 channel that have occurred since 1985. Let me show you

0086

01 now a frame, in Los Angeles Exhibit 139, the December  
02 16th, 1993, videotape of Lower Rush Creek.

03 (The videotape was viewed at this time.)

04 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: This is counter 309 on  
05 this tape. I will note for the record that the tape  
06 actually used by Dr. Beschta during his rebuttal  
07 testimony appears to have a longer leader on it, and  
08 therefore, this same frame was a different counter  
09 number on his tape. But it is the same frame that I  
10 previously discussed with Dr. Beschta on his rebuttal  
11 testimony.

12 Dr. Stine, let me summarize for you what I  
13 understood Dr. Beschta's testimony to be and ask you if  
14 you agree with that testimony as I understand it.

15 Dr. Beschta first said that the line of orange  
16 vegetation appearing to the right of the channel was  
17 or, rather, is the result of a deposit of seeds during  
18 a prior high-flow event.

19 He then testified that the channel between that

20 line of vegetation and the current channel -- excuse  
21 me.

22 He then testified that the channel had narrowed  
23 from that line of vegetation to its current location  
24 following that high-flow event.

25 Now, let's assume that my understanding of

0087

01 Dr. Beschta's testimony is correct.

02 Do you agree with that opinion with respect to  
03 that site?

04 A. BY DR. STINE: No, I don't agree with the  
05 opinion. And it was something that Dr. Kondolf and, I  
06 believe, Dr. Li, as well as Mr. Smith and I, discussed  
07 immediately after the video was first shown.

08 I agree that this line right here may very well  
09 represent a deposit of seeds from when the river flow  
10 through here was higher. But --

11 Q. So you agree with Dr. Beschta's first opinion, as  
12 I recounted it, regarding the --

13 A. Yes, I agree with that. I would not, however,  
14 agree with the sediment that lies to, as we're facing  
15 it here, the left of that vegetation line having  
16 accreted since the vegetation itself was seeded.

17 Q. Why not?

18 A. Not at all.

19 Well, first of all, we have data. We don't have  
20 to go out there and guess. We have Dr. Li's  
21 cross-sections that don't show anywhere near this much  
22 accretion of sediment in this short amount of time.

23 I would say probably the width of stream through  
24 here has changed relatively little based upon having  
25 looked at the data collected by Stacy Li. I see no

0088

01 reason why this has to have accreted here. After all,  
02 if we had more water in the channel, as we did in 1983,  
03 which is apparently one of the sets of aerial  
04 photographs that Dr. Beschta used in concluding that  
05 the stream had narrowed down, there was over 400 cfs in  
06 the stream at that time. And that probably would put  
07 the stream up to about that point.

08 We don't have -- the sediment could very well have  
09 been there at that time. There's no reason to believe  
10 that it has accreted and good data to indicate that it  
11 has not accreted over time.

12 Q. Are you saying that Dr. Li has transect data for  
13 the site depicted on counter frame 309?

14 A. I do not know if he has transect data from exactly  
15 this site. He has transect data from a great deal of  
16 the bottomlands, a number of different, maybe a couple  
17 of dozen or more spots through the bottomlands. And we  
18 see accretion like this occurring nowhere since 1987,  
19 when he first established those cross-sections.

20 Q. Now, in my questioning of Dr. Beschta regarding  
21 this video -- excuse me, not during my questioning.  
22 During his direct testimony regarding this videotape,  
23 he stated that in many locations, Rush Creek has  
24 narrowed by as much as 50 percent since 1985.

25 Do you agree with that opinion?

0089

01 A. I don't remember him saying 1985. All I



02 remember -- with all due respect to you, maybe you're  
03 remembering better than I -- for a while he was saying  
04 the last three years, and then he went back to 1983,  
05 which is basically the last ten years. And I was left  
06 confused as to exactly what time period he was talking  
07 about.

08 Now, you're mentioning 1985. I don't recall  
09 1985. But certainly, since 1987, we have good data  
10 from 1987. Since 1987, there has been very, very  
11 little narrowing of the stream.

12 Q. And what's the basis for that opinion?

13 A. Data that was established first in 1987,  
14 cross-sections established first in 1987 for the  
15 express purpose of monitoring widening and narrowing of  
16 Rush Creek.

17 Dr. Li has now gone back and revisited those  
18 sites, and we can see there has been relatively little  
19 change in the stream, some widening, some narrowing.  
20 In most cases, a minor amount of widening or a minor  
21 amount of narrowing since 1987.

22 MR. BIRMINGHAM: May I ask the reporter to mark  
23 that, please?

24 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: In your examination by  
25 Mr. Dodge this afternoon and also by Mr. Birmingham,

0090

01 you repeatedly used the phrase "old vegetation."

02 What is old vegetation in terms of decades?

03 A. BY DR. STINE: In terms of decades?

04 Q. More than ten years?

05 A. Oh, yes. Much more than ten years. Many of the  
06 sites we were looking at there, I believe I actually  
07 pointed out as we were going down the stream in our  
08 vicarious helicopter trip here, I said we can find this  
09 very patch of vegetation on the 1964 photographs.

10 And I believe Mr. Messick will be able to testify  
11 to the age of some of this material as well, at least  
12 in an approximate sense. It certainly is stuff that  
13 has been there longer than three years and longer than  
14 ten years by several times, at least.

15 Q. So ten years plus, depending on the site?

16 A. Yes. I would say much more than ten years plus.

17 Q. I just want to clarify the term as you use it.

18 A. I'm talking about vegetation that is at least  
19 several decades and perhaps many decades old.

20 Q. Now, Cal Trout Exhibit 13 describes the  
21 destruction of much riparian vegetation below The  
22 Narrows as a result of the City of Los Angeles'  
23 diversions and other events.

24 How did this old vegetation survive the diversions  
25 and those other events?

0091

01 A. The vegetation that survived exists in sort of a  
02 spotty way through the bottomlands. There are  
03 widespread areas where the vegetation died due to the  
04 incision of channels, widespread areas where the  
05 vegetation died due to the dewatering of channels.

06 And I would, by the way, point to NAS/MLC Exhibit  
07 248 as an example of one of those channels that has  
08 been dewatered and that today has a huge amount of old,  
09 very large, dead wood associated with it.

10           There are, even today, persistent springs in the  
11 Rush Creek bottomlands. And very often, it is in these  
12 areas of the spring flow where we find vegetation  
13 persisting.

14           We have also, on and off, since the early 1970s,  
15 had flow going down through the Rush Creek bottomlands.  
16 And I asked Mr. Messick about this. He would be the  
17 one to address it better than I. But his opinion  
18 seemed to be, I don't want to put words in his mouth,  
19 but his opinion seemed to be that a lot of this  
20 vegetation had root systems that could have held on for  
21 a long period of time. Maybe the vegetation didn't do  
22 well, but it has sprung back to life with the recent  
23 watering basically since 1980.

24           Since 1980, most of the years, the Rush Creek  
25 bottomlands has had water in it.

0092

01 Q.   Let's look at National Audubon Society 250, the  
02 photograph that was just distributed by Mr. Dodge.  
03 That photograph in the foreground shows what appear to  
04 be dead willows; is that correct?

05 A.   That's correct. In the central part of the photo  
06 as well.

07 Q.   And in this background, that photograph shows what  
08 appeared to be old trees; is that correct?

09 A.   Yes. Willows as well as cottonwoods as well as  
10 some pines. And I would point out that that is a  
11 spring area right there and, in fact, it's at that  
12 point where you encounter the big, old wood there where  
13 you first encounter water in this channel, standing  
14 water, not flowing water, but just stagnant water  
15 there.

16           So this is one of the areas where spring flows  
17 persist and therefore the vegetation has persisted.

18 Q.   Let's assume this Board orders that this  
19 particular channel be rewatered. Would you expect a  
20 narrow channel comparable to the pre-1941 channel at  
21 that location in the background where the old trees  
22 still stand?

23 A.   Yes, I would. Absolutely, because the channel is  
24 still there. It's still narrow, and it's armored  
25 enough by vegetation today at least in that reach where

0093

01 there's no reason to think that it would widen. It  
02 exists today in its pre-41 condition, and if it were  
03 watered, it would continue to persist in its pre-41  
04 condition.

05 Q.   And what would you expect in the foreground?

06 A.   Depending upon how it was rewatered, I would not  
07 recommend in any way, shape, or form, that 300 cfs be  
08 put down this channel, because without the protection  
09 of the riparian vegetation, we'd create quite a mess  
10 there by doing it.

11           But if we watered it with a few cfs, and then  
12 upped that cfs, that flow over time, I think what we  
13 would find there is riparian vegetation coming back  
14 along the margin. And as the riparian vegetation came  
15 back, as the bank sediments became better and better  
16 bound by root systems, we would find stable banks, and  
17 we could put an increasing amount of flow down that

18 channel.

19 Q. Thank you.

20 Let me turn to a different subject; namely, Mill  
21 Creek.

22 During your rebuttal testimony, you discussed the  
23 possibility of rewatering Mill Creek. You didn't refer  
24 to an exhibit which I believe the National Audubon  
25 Society has previously introduced showing water rights  
0094 held on Mill Creek.

02 Are you familiar with that exhibit?

03 A. I am, though I'm not certain that it is, at this  
04 point, an exhibit with a number that has been  
05 introduced. I know that I have provided the Staff with  
06 a copy of that, but I'm not sure that it was ever put  
07 in. Correct me if I'm wrong.

08 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Mr. Del Piero, may I have a  
09 moment?

10 MR. DODGE: National Audubon Society 254 has been  
11 passed out to all parties.

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you.

13 MR. DODGE: Either last week or the week before  
14 last.

15 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: And does National Audubon  
16 Society Exhibit 254 comport with your understanding of  
17 the water rights held in Mill Creek?

18 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, it does. And I don't have a  
19 copy of that in front of me. Perhaps I could -- thank  
20 you.

21 Q. It does comport with your understanding of the  
22 water rights in Mill Creek?

23 A. Yes, it does. This is something that was actually  
24 prepared by the Department of Water and Power in 1977,  
25 and I would point out that there is one disparity  
0095

01 between this and what exists today out there, the  
02 disparity being the priority nine water right there  
03 which is marked as claimant LW DeChambeau. Now, my  
04 understanding is that that is now held by the Forest  
05 Service.

06 And with that exception, I'll put it this way: I  
07 know of no other difference between what is stated here  
08 and what actually exists today. I would point out, if  
09 I could on here, that Los Angeles Department of Water  
10 and Power holds the greatest number of Mill Creek water  
11 rights, and there it's under this heading Present  
12 Claimant.

13 The greatest number of Mill Creek water rights,  
14 the largest total water right, and the largest single  
15 water right are held by the Department of Water and  
16 Power.

17 Q. Dr. Stine, do you have an opinion whether Mill  
18 Creek, in geomorphic terms today, corresponds to any  
19 reach of Rush Creek prior to 1941?

20 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'm going to object on the  
21 grounds of relevance. The Department of Water and  
22 Power's rights for water in Mill Creek are not an issue  
23 in this proceeding.

24 We don't hold any license to divert water to Mill  
25 Creek and the basin. The rights that the Department of

0096

01 Water and Power holds to water for Mill Creek are  
02 pertinent to lands owned by the Department of Water and  
03 Power within the Mono Basin and simply not an issue in  
04 this proceeding.

05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge?

06 MR. DODGE: Mr. Chairman, mitigation is at issue  
07 in this proceeding. One suggested mitigation has been  
08 rewatering of Mill Creek, and in terms of remedies  
09 relative to Los Angeles who has certain waters rights  
10 on Mill Creek.

11 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Mr. Del Piero, I would --

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I'm going to overrule  
13 the objection, because the nature of the question you  
14 asked was the comparison between the two water bodies  
15 in geomorphic terms.

16 However, I'm inclined to -- well. Go ahead and  
17 proceed, Mr. Roos-Collins. I'm inclined to have some  
18 degree of sympathy in terms of Mr. Birmingham's  
19 objection even though I'm overruling it.

20 And I want to make sure this does not get too far  
21 afield.

22 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: This is my only question on  
23 Mill Creek, and then I have one last question of  
24 Dr. Stine.

25 Q. BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Dr. Stine, do you have an

0097

01 opinion whether Mill Creek today compares in geomorphic  
02 terms with any reach of Rush Creek before 1941?

03 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. Before and after 1941, and I  
04 think that's important given that Mill Creek, while  
05 water hasn't been diverted from Mill Creek, Mill Creek  
06 has been severely degraded by the City of Los Angeles  
07 having lowered Mono Lake. And as a result, Mill Creek  
08 has incised, and there is degradation on Mill Creek as  
09 a result of DWP's diversions.

10 I would also point out that DWP -- pardon me, that  
11 Mill Creek had a sinuous course, not unlike portions of  
12 the Rush Creek channel. And it had a very wide, in  
13 places, wide riparian vegetation, riparian forest,  
14 associated with it like Rush Creek did.

15 Q. Thank you.

16 Dr. Stine, my time is almost up. Let me take care  
17 of one housekeeping matter.

18 Cal Trout submitted as rebuttal Exhibit Cal Trout  
19 No. 42, which is a report by Northwest Biological  
20 Consulting entitled "Lee Vining Creek Subsegments 3-A,  
21 3-B, and 3-C, 1993 Habitat Improvement Work."

22 Were you involved in the preparation of this  
23 report?

24 A. I was not, though I was consulted when that work  
25 was being completed. I'm familiar with the report, but

0098

01 I did not prepare the report itself.

02 Q. In your opinion, does the report accurately  
03 describe the work undertaken by the restoration  
04 consultant for those stretches of Lee Vining Creek in  
05 1993?

06 A. Yes, it does.

07 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Thank you. I have no further

08 questions.

09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much,  
10 Mr. Roos-Collins.

11 Mr. Valentine?

12 MR. VALENTINE: My name is Michael Valentine, for  
13 the record.

14 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. VALENTINE

15 Q. I would like to first ask you a couple, what I  
16 think are clean-up questions, Dr. Stine.

17 You mentioned, in regard to NAS/MLC Exhibit 254,  
18 that it was prepared on behalf of the Department of  
19 Water and Power.

20 Do you recall that? 254 is the water rights on  
21 Mill Creek.

22 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. I believe I said -- I tried  
23 to say that it was prepared by the Los Angeles  
24 Department of Water and Power, yes.

25 Q. Be that as it may, it is my understanding, for the  
0099 record, that it was, in fact, prepared for Southern  
01 California Edison. I believe that's a mistake,  
02 probably not a material one, but --

03 Secondly, in regard to priority one water rights  
04 to Gladys Crosby, Pearl Silva, and R.D. Conway, those  
05 rights have been, in fact, transferred to the Conway  
06 Ranch Development Corporation, have they not?

07 A. You could be right there, yes.

08 Q. Thank you.

09 I now have a couple questions about sand tufa.

10 Dr. Stine, were you surprised that the photos that  
11 Ranger Carl previously alluded to, were you surprised  
12 those photos over a ten-year period showed little  
13 change in exposed sand tufa?

14 A. I wasn't surprised because I, too, have noted in  
15 the last ten to twelve years in the basin that there  
16 has been relatively little visible overt change in the  
17 sand tufa.

18 Q. As the DWP management plan was originally  
19 proposed, would it not, at its upper levels, have  
20 exposed -- would it not have destroyed sand tufa?

21 A. Yes, it would have destroyed sand tufa. It would  
22 have undercut sand tufa. And I believe it still will  
23 undercut a great deal of sand tufa, no matter whether  
24 the lake goes to 6383 feet or to 6386 feet.

0100 Q. Thank you.

01 You also mentioned prehistoric periods of  
02 drought. Periods of drought longer than that used by  
03 Jones and Stokes in the EIR. By "prehistoric," you're  
04 not talking about millions of years ago, are you?

05 A. Not at all. I'm talking about periods just before  
06 the Little Ice Age. I'm talking about a number of  
07 times during the last 900 to 1000 years when this  
08 occurred. In other words, between about 900 years ago  
09 and roughly 500 years ago are when these droughts  
10 occurred.

11 Q. You also mentioned that water is not flowing out  
12 of Rush Creek onto the flood plains due in part to the  
13 widening streams.

14 It's also due in part, is it not, to incision in  
15

16 addition to the widening of the stream?

17 A. Yes. And thank you for correcting me on that.  
18 Particularly in the lower half or so of the  
19 bottomlands. Particularly the lower third of the  
20 bottomlands, and then all the way down to Mono Lake  
21 there has been severe incision of Mono Lake and that  
22 has been -- pardon me, the lower third of bottomlands,  
23 and then all the way down to Mono Lake, Rush Creek has  
24 undergone severe incision, and that is the main reason  
25 down there why it can't reach its old flood plain.

0101

01 Q. There is also a reference to die off of vegetation  
02 in the '60s and '70s. You indicated that this was  
03 partly due to a stoppage of irrigation.

04 This was also due, in part, to incision. Which  
05 caused the water table to drop, was it not?

06 A. Yes, it was. And that particularly occurs after  
07 1967 and 1969 when there was a great deal of incision.

08 Q. I'd now like to ask you a few questions about  
09 restoration, if I might.

10 You have proposed some active intervention on both  
11 Lee Vining and Rush Creek. Are you proposing active  
12 intervention to restore pre-41 conditions benefiting  
13 the fisheries throughout the whole length of Rush and  
14 Lee Vining Creeks?

15 A. No. I've stated that we should do it only where  
16 it's prudent and plausible. And we should, in those  
17 areas that can't do that in a reasonable way and in a  
18 reasonable amount of time and for a reasonable amount  
19 of money be brought back to the pre-41 condition, we  
20 should look elsewhere. And I have mentioned Mill Creek  
21 as a possible mitigation site there.

22 Q. I'm going to ask you to assume that the Board  
23 will conclude that it is desirable for whatever reason  
24 to restore the abandoned channels of Rush Creek and  
25 Lee Vining Creek, restore flow in those channels.

0102

01 Will Rush Creek -- let's do it one creek at a  
02 time. Will Rush Creek reoccupy the abandoned channels,  
03 the currently abandoned channels, absent active  
04 intervention to restore them?

05 A. It will not occupy, reoccupy those abandoned  
06 channels absent active intervention. And, in fact, if  
07 the lake were brought way up, there would be -- "way  
08 up" meaning 6400 feet onto the existing delta plain,  
09 there would be a tendency over a long period of time  
10 for Rush Creek to once again build multiple channels.  
11 But the existing multiple channels would be the least  
12 likely place that the stream would build its new  
13 multiple channels, because they're currently filled  
14 with cobbles that would be very difficult for the  
15 stream to move.

16 And the idea that we have been pursuing, because  
17 it seems like the most reasonable idea to me, is to  
18 remove those cobbles from the existing now abandoned  
19 multiple channels and put water back into those  
20 channels again. We could very rapidly, then, have back  
21 the multi-channeled system that existed previously.

22 Q. At 6405, lake elevation of 6405 and above, how  
23 long would it take Rush Creek, by natural processes, to

24 develop a multi-channeled system?

25 A. My guess would be hundreds of years in addition to  
0103

01 the amount of time that it takes to get Mono Lake up to  
02 6405 feet. There would have to be an awful lot of  
03 sediment in Rush Creek to get it to start building  
04 forward. Only when it start to build forward, only  
05 when Rush Creek starts to prograde will it start to  
06 agrade and make multiple channels.

07 Q. And would a multiple channel system ever develop  
08 on Rush Creek on lake elevations below 6405, absent  
09 human intervention?

10 A. Ever? Not in the millenial scale. I'm not  
11 talking here about braids. I'm talking about deltaic  
12 processes making multiple channels.

13 Q. And are your answers to the questions you just  
14 answered on Rush Creek essentially the same for  
15 Lee Vining Creek?

16 A. Lee Vining Creek is somewhat different in that the  
17 multiple channels there are not clogged by quarry  
18 cobbles, by quarry debris from the Marzano Quarry, so  
19 they're much easier to occupy. We don't have to take a  
20 bunch of debris out of those channels to reoccupy them.  
21 From that standpoint, it's somewhat different and  
22 somewhat easier on Lee Vining Creek.

23 Q. You've testified that you don't believe that, at  
24 least in recent years, there's been any significant  
25 narrowing on Rush Creek.

0104

01 Absent intervention by humans, how long do you  
02 think it will take Rush Creek to narrow to its pre-1941  
03 widths?

04 A. I think that there will be a tendency for that  
05 stream -- for Rush Creek in the bottomlands to narrow  
06 down as we get more and more big and old vegetation  
07 with well-established root systems there. And I think  
08 that's evident from the video.

09 We have a narrow stream where we have old  
10 vegetation. I think it takes vegetation decades to  
11 build up, to grow up, to thicken, to die, to fall into  
12 the stream.

13 It's going to take many decades, half a century to  
14 century scale before we start to see an interaction  
15 between the stream and newly grown old wood.

16 Q. And would that process be appreciably sped up by  
17 planning, as opposed to waiting, for colonization?

18 A. On Rush Creek, yes, there are places there which I  
19 think it could be sped up appreciably. There are also  
20 places where vegetation is indeed coming in rapidly.  
21 Not everywhere, and I would point out as one example,  
22 that 1800 feet immediately below The Narrows where  
23 vegetation could be planted there, I think things could  
24 be speeded up appreciably there.

25 If we go over to Lee Vining Creek. I think there  
0105

01 are large areas of Lee Vining Creek where planting  
02 could go on and be very effective, because there are  
03 vast areas of Lee Vining Creek that used to be more or  
04 less continuous riparian woodland that are today not  
05 being colonized.

06 And if one were to go back through the L.A. DWP  
07 video on Lee Vining Creek, one would see that, indeed,  
08 right along the stream margin vegetation is it coming  
09 in many areas. But on the old flood plain where there  
10 used to be a gallery forest of riparian vegetation,  
11 vegetation is very, very slow to come back there except  
12 where it has been planted.

13 Q. Thank you.

14 You additionally referred to restoration of the  
15 west wall springs on Rush Creek. Could you explain how  
16 this could be done?

17 A. Yes. Prior to 1941, there were springs emanating  
18 from the west wall of Rush Creek from approximately  
19 Parker Creek, which is above The Narrows, on down  
20 through the upper third or so of the bottomlands. It  
21 was certainly tied to some extent to the irrigation  
22 that was going on on the Cain Ranch lands.

23 I believe it was also tied to the fact that all  
24 the natural distributaries of Parker and Walker Creeks  
25 were wetted during those early years. Particularly,  
0106  
01 high on the fans where those multiple channels were,  
02 where those distributary channels of Parker and Walker  
03 Creek were, the material there is very, very coarse and  
04 it provides a conduit down underneath the lake silts  
05 that exist at lower elevations on the Parker and Walker  
06 Creek fans.

07 So my sense is that an awful lot of water that was  
08 creating the west, what we call the west wall springs,  
09 was indeed due to natural processes. And I would  
10 suggest that those distributary -- if we're interested  
11 in rewatering those west wall springs, that those  
12 distributary channels be rewatered again. And I think  
13 we would see an increase in the flow of the west wall  
14 springs if we did that.

15 Q. Is there any evidence that suggests absent  
16 intervention that those springs will be restored under  
17 natural processes?

18 A. I'm not sure what you mean by "natural processes."  
19 The natural processes would be to, indeed, rewater  
20 those distributary channels. Left the way it is today,  
21 I see no reason why the springs should become any  
22 different than they are today. Today, of course, those  
23 distributary channels are not watered.

24 Q. And could you briefly state what your  
25 understanding of the benefit of those springs are?

0107  
01 A. Yes. I've testified to this before --

02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'm going to object to the  
03 question on the grounds that it's vague.

04 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I'm going to sustain  
05 the objection.

06 Be more specific, Mr. Valentine.

07 Q. BY MR. VALENTINE: Can you testify as to what the  
08 ecological benefits of those springs were to the stream  
09 system of Rush Creek?

10 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'll object to the question that  
11 it goes beyond the scope of Dr. Stine's expertise.

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I'm going to sustain  
13 that objection, too.



14 Be more focused. Dr. Stine didn't testify to the  
15 entire ecology of Rush Creek.

16 Q. BY MR. VALENTINE: Would, in your opinion, the  
17 restoration of the streams increase the channel length  
18 available to brown trout?

19 A. BY DR. STINE: I believe you're talking about the  
20 restoration of springs now.

21 Q. Yes, I'm sorry.

22 A. And, indeed, it would. And this is based upon  
23 observations documented and written by Mr. Vestal in  
24 the 1940s and early 1950s where he talked about trout  
25 actually being in the thousands of lineal feet of

0108

01 spring-fed rills associated with those springs.

02 And from that standpoint, one has to think that if  
03 those spring-fed channels, spring-fed rills were  
04 restored and a connection was made between that water  
05 coming out of the springs and present-day Rush Creek,  
06 that trout would then have access as they once had to  
07 those springs rills, thousands of feet of springs  
08 rills.

09 Q. Would restoration of the springs also provide  
10 additional cover for juvenile fish?

11 A. Again, these are things that I've written about in  
12 the auxiliary report to the DEIR, auxiliary report  
13 number one, as well as this NAS/MLC 122, Cal Trout 13.

14 There was a great deal of cover in there  
15 according to Mr. Vestal, cover for young fish, food for  
16 young fish as well, scuds as he calls the  
17 invertebrates.

18 Q. Would the restoration of these streams also tend  
19 to moderate the temperatures in Rush Creek?

20 A. Yeah, the spring water, as Mr. Vestal described  
21 it, the spring water was a fairly consistent  
22 temperature through the year, warmer than the stream in  
23 the wintertime, cooler than the stream in the  
24 summertime. So it did tend to create thermal stability  
25 that is lacking in the absence of the springs.

0109

01 Q. And finally, would spring restoration tend to  
02 increase conductivity to the benefit of brown trout in  
03 Rush Creek?

04 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'm going to object on the  
05 grounds it goes beyond the scope of Dr. Stine's  
06 expertise. Dr. Stine is not a fisheries biologist and  
07 has testified to as much.

08 (Whereupon the record was read as requested.)

09 MR. VALENTINE: I'll be happy to withdraw the  
10 question or rephrase.

11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: It's not a fisheries  
12 question. I think it deals with the chemical  
13 constituents of the water.

14 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I think at the end of it,  
15 Mr. Valentine did include the words "to the benefit of  
16 the fishery." If he withdraws or strikes that portion  
17 of question, then I think you're correct. But I  
18 believe he does include the words "to the benefit of  
19 fishery."

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Perhaps you are  
21 correct. That's why I wanted it read back.

22 Do you wish to have that last portion deleted from  
23 your question?  
24 MR. VALENTINE: That was the purpose of my  
25 request.

0110

01 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, do you  
02 understand the question?

03 DR. STINE: I do. And the answer is yes. I don't  
04 pretend that it would help the fish, but it would  
05 increase the conductivity based on conductivity  
06 measurements that were made by Dr. David Herbst of the  
07 Sierra Nevada Aquatic Research Lab. He measured  
08 conductivities of very close to 90 micromhos. I  
09 believe were the units he used, 90 micromhos in the  
10 existing spring water that's coming out of those west  
11 side springs. This is approximately twice, maybe a  
12 little less than twice the conductivity of the Rush  
13 Creek water immediately below The Narrows.

14 Q. BY MR. VALENTINE: Thank you.

15 A. BY DR. STINE: That's not to say the conductivity  
16 of Rush Creek would double, but it would add  
17 conductivity to Rush Creek.

18 Q. You have mentioned in the past, I believe, that  
19 gravels, at least, certainly on Lee Vining Creek and  
20 possibly on Rush Creek are in low supply.

21 Would you agree with that characterization?

22 A. I think that gravels along much of Lee Vining  
23 Creek and much of Rush Creek are in shorter supply than  
24 they were prior to 1941, yes.

25 Q. And the causes of this low supply?

0111

01 A. Well, for instance, on Lee Vining Creek, there has  
02 been a huge amount of sediment that was washed from the  
03 system and out into Mono Lake during 1967 particularly  
04 1969 on Lee Vining Creek. That occurred after the  
05 riparian vegetation had been destroyed through  
06 desiccation.

07 It later burned, but the destruction of the  
08 riparian vegetation occurred on desiccation, the  
09 dewatering of the stream. When these large flows came  
10 down Lee Vining Creek in 1969, a huge amount of  
11 material was washed out into Mono Lake.

12 If we look at the material that constitutes the  
13 Lee Vining Creek bed today, what we find are lots of  
14 cobbles and lots of boulders, relatively little  
15 gravels. I've talked to Mr. Vestal about this, and his  
16 opinion of what things used to be like comports to what  
17 we see in the abandoned channels today.

18 The abandoned channels on Lee Vining Creek today,  
19 gravels of the sort of thumbnail-to-thumb size are far  
20 more abundant than in the existing Lee Vining Creek  
21 channel.

22 Q. Among the solutions which have been mentioned for  
23 the gravel recruitment problem are that the streams  
24 should be pressed against the canyon walls.

25 First, could you explain what you mean by that?

0112

01 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me. I'm going to object  
02 to this whole line of questions, not on any rules of  
03 evidence, but on the Board's own regulations. The

04 Board's regulations permit the introduction of any  
05 relevant evidence which, quoting from the regulations,  
06 is not repetitive.

07 And Dr. Stine has testified on this subject and  
08 the subject of the last few questions on at least three  
09 occasions during the course of the hearing.

10 And the testimony is simply repetitive, and I  
11 would object to it on that ground.

12 MR. VALENTINE: And the response I would say is  
13 that I don't believe Dr. Stine has repetitively  
14 testified about this topic. I'd also say that the last  
15 time Dr. Beschta was here, he was scathing in his  
16 criticism of proposals to press the stream against  
17 canyon walls.

18 And third, I find this ironic that Mr. Birmingham  
19 seems to think that any question worth asking is worth  
20 asking three or four times, which makes an objection at  
21 this point --

22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Enough. Enough.  
23 Enough, please.

24 Thank you.

25 Is there a question that has been asked? Would

0113

01 you be kind enough to read it back?

02 (Whereupon the record was read as requested.)

03 HEARING OFFICER del PIERO: I'm going to overrule  
04 your objection.

05 I'm going to admonish you not to be argumentative.

06 And I'm going to ask you, Dr. Stine, to answer the  
07 question just as simply as possible.

08 DR. STINE: I will. This is listed as point C on  
09 page 11 of my rebuttal testimony. It's the first time  
10 I've used the word "pressed," and I haven't used it in  
11 any of my testimony.

12 What I was talking about there -- in fact, let me  
13 read it, if I could. "Where prudent, the streams  
14 should be," quote, "pressed," unquote, "by stream  
15 narrowing against gravel rich walls of channels and  
16 canyons. This occurred naturally prior to 1941, but is  
17 rare today due to channel widening."

18 What I'm suggesting there is that we simply, in  
19 places where it's prudent, and certainly not  
20 everywhere, put the channel, make the channel, again,  
21 narrow and make it abut the gravel sources that were  
22 supplying the gravel naturally to the channel under the  
23 relatively undisturbed condition of 1941.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Proceed,  
25 Mr. Valentine.

0114

01 Q. BY MR. VALENTINE: And on short-term, at least,  
02 can gravels be added to the streams?

03 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. And my basis for saying that  
04 is that I've been told by the fisheries people that  
05 this would be beneficial to the fish. I have no  
06 expertise there, but I can say that it would no way  
07 hurt the streams to add gravel.

08 So to the extent that it is beneficial to the  
09 fish, I would say that it would not hurt the streams,  
10 and that perhaps we should proceed with that.

11 Q. Finally, on the video, which has been labeled as

12 DWP 139, let's talk for a moment about what the video  
13 does not show.

14 The video doesn't show the abandoned channels  
15 adjacent to the existing channel of Rush Creek, does  
16 it?

17 A. That's correct. It only shows the existing main  
18 stream which has braids but not multiple channels  
19 today.

20 Q. It doesn't show the former flood plain?

21 A. Incidentally, it does, but it certainly doesn't  
22 show large areas of what was once a very, very large  
23 extensive wetland wooded marshland that was the flood  
24 plain, no.

25 Q. It doesn't show extensive former wetlands?  
0115

01 A. That's correct.

02 Q. If these were shown, the abandoned channels, the  
03 former flood plain, the former wetlands, would they be  
04 seen to be recovering at the present time?

05 A. They would be changing at the present time, but  
06 they would not be returning to the previous state, to  
07 their pre-41 condition, simply because the channels are  
08 not watered and the marshlands are not marshlands. But  
09 the vegetation is changing there somewhat.

10 MR. VALENTINE: Thank you.

11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much.

12 Mr. Dodge?

13 MR. FRINK: Mr. Del Piero.

14 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Excuse me, Mr. Frink.

15 Tomorrow I will have remedied that problem.

16 MR. FRINK: Good.

17 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE STAFF

18 Q. Dr. Stine, what is the date of the photo of the  
19 Rush Creek bottomlands that is labeled as National  
20 Academy of Science/Mono Lake Committee Exhibit 213?

21 A. BY DR. STINE: It's actually National Audubon  
22 Society/Mono Lake Committee, and it is either December  
23 1929 or January 1930.

24 Q. Okay. I believe you mentioned the flows that you  
25 believed were occurring at the time the photo was

0116  
01 shot. How did you determine those flows?

02 A. I asked Dr. Vorster to look through the record of  
03 the flows at The Narrows, which was this point right  
04 here on what I called Biggest Bend -- pardon me, not  
05 The Narrows, The Ford, excuse me.

06 And beginning in 1930, we have a record of flows  
07 at that site. I believe I'm stating this correctly.

08 In any case, Mr. Vorster looked at the record that  
09 existed there and determined that over this period of  
10 time, there was fairly consistently 35 or so cfs  
11 flowing by The Ford.

12 Q. And you mentioned a flow upstream that I believe  
13 you referred to as being 7 cfs. Did Dr. Vorster also  
14 determine that from looking at the hydrologic records?

15 A. It's actually 7 to 10 cfs, and that was determined  
16 through conversations with Mr. Vestal and, more  
17 importantly -- here's The Narrows right here -- through  
18 descriptions by a Los Angeles Department of Water and  
19 Power consultant in the early 1930s, Charles Lee, who

20 described the springs and gave us a very good and  
21 accurate description of where the springs were coming  
22 from immediately above The Narrows, where the streams  
23 were coming from immediately below The Narrows, and he  
24 estimated the stream flow through The Narrows there.  
25 And he also made very clear that that was all

0117

01 spring water at the time, that there wasn't water  
02 coming down Parker Creek or Walker Creek, stream flow  
03 coming down Parker Creek or Walker Creek, but that was  
04 the spring flow contribution coming down The Narrows.  
05 7 to 10 cfs was his estimation.

06 Q. And there wasn't any flow from the main channel of  
07 Rush Creek at that time?

08 A. Not only at the -- yes, you're correct. There was  
09 no flow at the time that Charles Lee made his  
10 observations, which I believe was 1932 and, in fact,  
11 there's no flow on the 1929-30 aerial photographs  
12 coming down the main stem of Rush Creek nor water  
13 coming down Parker and Walker Creek.

14 Q. What would be the reason for that absence of flow  
15 in the upper reaches of the mainstream of Rush Creek?

16 A. That is due to, as I've pointed out in NAS/MLC  
17 122, water was being taken out for irrigation and put  
18 on adjacent lands so that -- at least during the  
19 irrigation season, it was.

20 So DWP -- pardon me, Cain Ranch was exercising  
21 control over the flow, and they had a series of gates  
22 at A ditch and B ditch, and they could control the  
23 amount of water that was moving down the main part of  
24 Rush Creek.

25 Q. Was that water being diverted in December and

0118

01 January?

02 A. It appears actually on the aerial photographs as  
03 if there is some water that's being put out onto those  
04 lands. It doesn't look like it's a lot of water that's  
05 being put out onto the lands.

06 In other words, being put down the ditches towards  
07 the lands on both A and B ditch, but no water is  
08 getting by the B ditch diversion, which is the lowest  
09 of the irrigation diversions on Rush Creek at the time  
10 these photographs were taken.

11 MR. FRINK: Okay. Thank you. That's all the  
12 questions.

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Satkowski?

14 MR. SATKOWSKI: No questions.

15 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Smith?

16 MR. SMITH: I have a couple of questions for  
17 Dr. Stine.

18 Q. BY MR. SMITH: Did you say there were some stumps  
19 as the evidence of the prolonged drought in Mono Lake  
20 today?

21 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. Not only in Mono Lake today,  
22 but they were still in the water when the lake was  
23 three feet lower than it is today.

24 Q. Could you tell us about what period of time that  
25 was, approximately what years?

0119

01 A. Yes. It's approximately 850 years prior to 1950

02 A.D. that the stumps were killed by a rise in Mono  
03 Lake. So the drought had gone on prior to that date,  
04 850 years prior to 1950 A.D., and the reasons for that  
05 is that's how we calibrated radio carbon dates.

06 Q. And you say the drought for that period was  
07 approximately how long?

08 A. The lower most stumps have 12 rings in them. But,  
09 of course, as you go higher and higher out of Mono  
10 Lake, you encounter larger and larger stumps, the outer  
11 wood of which, the depth year all date at virtually the  
12 same as the small stumps in the lake.

13 So we know that Mono Lake has to have been very  
14 low for somewhat more than 12 years, but it has to have  
15 been moderately low and maybe very low for 60 years  
16 because those larger stumps have 50 or 60 rings in  
17 them.

18 And then if we go to these other sites, we find  
19 that we get the same depth year date on all of the  
20 stumps, some of these stumps have 140 and in the case  
21 of the West Walker River, over 200 rings in them.

22 Q. Could you give us an approximation of how low you  
23 think the lake got?

24 A. I think there's very strong evidence that the lake  
25 go to 6368 feet at the time of that drought. And in  
0120

01 rising from 6368 feet, it planed a big surface. And  
02 that's why the nickpoint today exists at 6368 feet.  
03 From 6368 feet on up, the lake has planed over the  
04 surface giving us a relatively gently sloping surface.

05 At 6368 feet, it drops off into deep water.  
06 That's why the nickpoint is there. Had the lake  
07 dropped to 6360 -- say, 6360 feet and then risen, the  
08 nickpoint today would be at 6360 feet.

09 Q. Thank you.

10 One other question. In terms of measuring  
11 groundwater, would you think it would be useful to have  
12 some groundwater testing holes, and if you think that  
13 would be useful, why?

14 A. I'm all for measurements. Sure. The more  
15 measurements we could make out there, the better. I  
16 think it would be fabulous, from a scientific point of  
17 view, to be able to monitor climatic vicissitudes on  
18 water levels, on lake levels fluctuations, on water  
19 levels, withdrawal of the water from the streams on  
20 groundwater levels. It would provide some invaluable  
21 insights into the way that whole system works.

22 I think as time goes on, we'll be modifying LAAMP,  
23 modifying the Vorster model to better approximate  
24 exactly what we see the lake doing out there, and  
25 understanding the groundwater level would go a long  
0121

01 distance in helping us explain why these changes are  
02 going on, why the lake is acting the way it is in  
03 response to certain diversions scenarios and in  
04 response to certain climatic scenarios.

05 MR. SMITH: That's all I have.

06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Herrera?

07 MR. HERRERA: Yes.

08 Q. BY MR. HERRERA: Dr. Stine, I'd like to discuss a  
09 little bit your presentation regarding rewatering the

10 various channels in Rush Creek.

11 To start with, is there somewhere in your  
12 testimony that you've presented, over the course of  
13 these proceedings, that delineate out those particular  
14 channels that you feel are prudent to be rewatered?  
15 A. BY DR. STINE: No, there isn't. We had hoped to  
16 have a report ready on the feasibility of rewatering  
17 channels. But my understanding now, I've been issued a  
18 stop-work order by Trihey and Associates in response to  
19 their having been told by the Los Angeles Department of  
20 Water and Power that no money is available to do those  
21 feasibility reports.

22 So we're well along with that. And I think I have  
23 a pretty good understanding of which ones can very  
24 easily be rewatered by removing gravels, et cetera.

25 Q. So, again, your answer here is no, that you have

0122

01 not delineated that out; is that correct?

02 A. I have not delineated it in a report that is today  
03 available. But yes, I have delineated it.

04 Q. Let me ask you --

05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge?

06 MR. DODGE: Yeah. When we started, I thought our  
07 last day was going to be tomorrow.

08 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: It is going to be  
09 tomorrow, Mr. Dodge. I'm giving up sleep for lent.

10 MR. DODGE: But that brings me back to a point  
11 that Mr. Roos-Collins was raising before. I think we  
12 somehow have to deal with how the State Board wants to  
13 address the point that there are planning team reports  
14 that are nearly done, but are not done, and won't be  
15 done by tomorrow.

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Herrera, you want  
17 to finish your question, please?

18 Q. BY MR. HERRERA: Again, what I was looking for is  
19 in these proceedings, have you presented that material,  
20 and my understanding is no?

21 A. BY DR. STINE: I'm sorry. I forgot the gist of  
22 your question, and you're correct. The answer is no.

23 Q. I'm going to ask the same question regarding  
24 Lee Vining Creek?

25 A. And once again my answer is no.

0123

01 Q. And to further that answer along, you are in the  
02 preparation of that particular endeavor on Lee Vining  
03 as well?

04 A. No. Because Lee Vining is a much simpler  
05 situation, and we've already demonstrated that on  
06 Lee Vining Creek, we can rewater channels. So we're  
07 not doing the same thing for Lee Vining Creek, only on  
08 Rush Creek.

09 Q. And again, on rewatering these channels, the same  
10 sort of information we're discussing regarding  
11 narrowing of streams, that sort of thing, is all  
12 contained in this particular element that you're  
13 proceeding with, or are you just talking about  
14 rewatering?

15 A. Simply talking about the feasibility of rewatering  
16 the abandoned channels.

17 Q. One other question. Again, in all of the

18 materials you presented, is there a delineation of the  
19 historic channels that are either presently watered or  
20 rewatered?

21 A. Yes, there is. And that is in NAS and MLC 122,  
22 Cal Trout Exhibit 13, and I have there the 19 blowups  
23 at approximately the same scale as NAS/MLC 213.

24 Q. The 1-in-17,000?

25 A. Pardon me?

0124

01 Q. The 1-to-17,000?

02 A. The 1-to-17,000, but they are blown up to a much  
03 smaller denominator. And I don't know, the  
04 denominator's in here. I don't remember what it is.

05 In any case, I have laid out in here those  
06 channels that used to exist versus those channels that  
07 exist today for the entire Rush Creek, Grant Lake, all  
08 the way to Mono Lake.

09 Q. I have one further question. Again, in these  
10 channels, just as a rough percentage, would you suggest  
11 it's prudent to rewater, say, 50 percent of those  
12 channels or a greater number or a smaller number?

13 A. Rather than talking about numbers of channels,  
14 perhaps I can talk about lineal feet of channel. And  
15 it's probably -- can I look one second here?

16 Q. Certainly.

17 A. I would say that keeping in mind that the upper  
18 third of the bottomlands is where some multiple  
19 channels are, the middle third did not have multiple  
20 channels, and the lower, roughly quarter or something  
21 like that, or that doesn't add up to one, but the  
22 bottom quarter had multiple channels. I would say that  
23 probably 60 to 70 percent of the multiple channels  
24 could be rewatered. That is, those in, roughly, the  
25 upper third of the bottomlands.

0125

01 Those in this lower quarter to a third of the  
02 bottomlands, I think would be very difficult to  
03 rewater, because there's such an elevation difference  
04 between the existing channel and the now elevationally  
05 stranded abandoned channels.

06 Q. Rewatering these channels assumes what kinds of  
07 stream flow?

08 A. Well, I think that that's yet to be determined.  
09 But I don't see any reason why we would have to put  
10 large amounts of water into those channels.

11 I think the channels are such that we can probably  
12 put anywhere from 5 to 10 to 15 cfs in some of these  
13 channels, and we would get huge benefits, riparian  
14 benefits, deep water benefits, lots of shade benefits,  
15 still water benefits, cover. All of these things, by  
16 putting relatively small amounts of water in these  
17 abandoned channels. And it would vary from channel to  
18 channel.

19 Q. You mentioned large flow. Would you tell me what  
20 a large flow is, and where would that be measured at?

21 A. I would say that there is no need to put the 80 to  
22 a hundred to a hundred and 20 cfs, that we say the  
23 80 cfs that we see in the mainstream today, the main  
24 channel today, there's no reason to have to put that  
25 anywhere in any of these abandoned channels. And I



0126

01 guess that's what I was thinking of in terms of a large  
02 flow.

03 In relatively small flows, we could go ahead and  
04 rewater some of these abandoned channels.

05 MR. HERRERA: That concludes my questions. Thank  
06 you, Dr. Stine.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Canaday?

08 DR. STINE: May I ask that we take a very brief  
09 break?

10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: And after that very  
11 brief break, Mr. Canaday, you will question, and then  
12 we'll take an hour break.

13 (A recess was taken at this time.)

14 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ladies and gentlemen,  
15 this hearing will again come to order.

16 When last we left, Mr. Canaday, questions of  
17 Dr. Stine.

18 MR. CANADAY: In the spirit of the Olympics, I  
19 thought I could provide Dr. Stine with these cards that  
20 he could hold high above him, and we could get through  
21 his answers more quickly.

22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: 40 years from now, no  
23 one is going to know what you're talking about.

24 MR. CANADAY: They don't now.

25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: We didn't want to say

0127

01 anything, Jim.

02 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Mr. Vorster is suggesting that  
03 Mr. Canaday hold the cards up to judge the attorneys'  
04 questions.

05 MS. CAHILL: You weren't here the day we were  
06 threatening if we weren't interesting, we'd lose our  
07 audience.

08 Q. BY MR. CANADAY: Dr. Stine, you've read the Draft  
09 EIR prepared by Jones and Stokes?

10 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, I have.

11 Q. And you've, in particular, read the chapter on  
12 riparian vegetation?

13 Do you recall in that chapter Jones and Stokes  
14 prepared a fairly detailed map of the historical  
15 channels for Lee Vining Creek?

16 A. I believe I recall it, but I'm having a hard time  
17 remembering whether I'm remembering my map or their  
18 map. But I remember that they did do that, and  
19 Mr. Messick and I conferred on that.

20 Q. Are you aware of a similar type map for the Rush  
21 Creek bottomlands?

22 A. I believe that they also prepared a similar map  
23 for the Rush Creek bottomlands, yes.

24 Q. So there is evidence in the record, then, that  
25 identifies various channels, historic channels of

0128

01 Lee Vining Creek and Rush Creek?

02 A. Yes, there is, there, and in my riparian report  
03 and in the NAS/MLC 122, as well.

04 And I'm sorry if I misunderstood your question. I  
05 was thinking feasibility study, Mr. Herrera.

06 MR. HERRERA: Thank you. You got it.

07 Q. BY MR. CANADAY: You discussed in your testimony

08 or identified in your rebuttal testimony, various  
09 different potential restoration treatments.

10 Now, there's two that have already occurred, and  
11 that's been the rewatering or water put into the main  
12 channels of Lee Vining and Rush Creek, and there's been  
13 the removal of livestock; is that correct?

14 A. BY DR. STINE: That is correct.

15 Q. You identified in your the various different  
16 opportunities, rewatering historic channels, riparian  
17 vegetation, planting, and localized instream treatments  
18 for Rush Creek.

19 How would you prioritize those?

20 A. I think that rewatering the channels should be  
21 highest priority. I think that the sooner we get water  
22 back into those abandoned channels, the sooner we're  
23 going to get the benefits of all that water, which is  
24 riparian vegetation, shade, and all the bugs and all  
25 the nutrients and everything that comes with it. I

0129

01 think we've got to rewater those channels as soon as  
02 possible.

03 Q. And the next in priority?

04 A. I guess the way we've been going about this, we've  
05 been always viewing this in the context of fish  
06 habitat. So I think I would probably leave the next  
07 priority up to the fish people. If, indeed, we could  
08 only do one thing at a time, I would want to confer  
09 with the fish people on that. I'm not trying to weasel  
10 out. Fish are driving this to some extent.

11 Q. Is there any reason why these could not be  
12 simultaneous treatments?

13 A. In a broad sense, no. There are certain places  
14 where you would want to do one thing before something  
15 else, but there's no reason to think many months or  
16 many years have to separate these individual  
17 treatments.

18 Q. In your testimony, you talk about the development  
19 of a multi-channel system with a rise in lake level.

20 Can you point or describe on NAS/MLC 213 where  
21 you're referring that would occur with a rise in lake  
22 level?

23 A. Yes. I think it would occur ultimately throughout  
24 the whole bottomlands if you got Rush Creek -- pardon  
25 me, Mono Lake up to a level -- it wouldn't have to be

0130

01 as high as this exhibit, the exhibit you just  
02 mentioned. If it was on the surface of the delta  
03 plain, what would happen is that the stream would start  
04 to prograde, and as it prograded, it would start to  
05 aggrade. It would start to fill its channel.

06 And as it filled its channel, the stream would  
07 tend to sweep out of its existing channel and create  
08 new channels along the side. And that's what deltas  
09 do, whether it be the Walker River into Walker Lake,  
10 Mississippi River into the Gulf of Mexico, or any other  
11 stream. That's how they create these bottomland  
12 environments that are so often multi-channeled by  
13 aggrading due to progradation.

14 In answer to your question, it would occur  
15 throughout here, but it would start at the mouth, and

16 it would proceed then upstream for a long period of  
17 time.  
18 Q. And that long period of time is multi-centuries?  
19 A. Multi-centuries, yes, once the lake is up.  
20 Q. I feel that I understand your suggestion is that  
21 the active intervention in some of the existing  
22 channels in the bottomlands is at least an interim  
23 intervention that could take place to shorten the time  
24 period for that type of activity to occur naturally?  
25 A. It would very definitely shorten the time period

0131

01 that would be required to get multiple channels out  
02 there. Basically, it would not be in a sense  
03 foretelling the future. It would be putting us back to  
04 the past 50 years. And it would be a way of getting  
05 multiple channels in a very short period of time.

06 MR. CANADAY: That's all I have. Thanks.

07 THE COURT: Thank you very much.

08 Mr. Dodge?

09 MR. DODGE: In the hopes of setting a precedent  
10 here, I'm going to be brief.

11 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DODGE

12 Q. Dr. Stine --

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Hope springs eternal,  
14 Mr. Dodge.

15 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Couple questions about Mill Creek.

16 As I under your testimony, you're proposing that  
17 below the SCE powerhouse that water be returned to the  
18 natural channel of Mill Creek and then flow into Mono  
19 Lake, correct?

20 A. BY DR. STINE: That is correct.

21 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me. I'm going to  
22 interpose the same objection that I interposed as far  
23 as relevance.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Your objecting to --

25 MR. DODGE: Relevance.

0132

01 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Relevance? From a  
02 legal standpoint? From a standpoint of water rights?  
03 From the standpoint of his expertise as a --

04 MR. BIRMINGHAM: From a legal relevance point of  
05 view. Again, we're not here debating the water rights  
06 of the City of Los Angeles to water on Mill Creek. The  
07 licenses that are the subject of this hearing are  
08 licenses that divert water from Rush, Lee Vining,  
09 Walker, and Parker Creeks.

10 MR. DODGE: Well, this particular cow is long out  
11 of the barn. We've heard for four months testimony on  
12 the possibility of one mitigation measure being the  
13 rewatering of Mill Creek, and I'm just trying to  
14 follow-up and ask a couple of follow-up questions on  
15 that possibility.

16 If it's irrelevant, I'm sure Mr. Birmingham will  
17 point that out in his closing briefs, but we've had  
18 evidence on this subject.

19 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, you've been  
20 asked questions about Mill Creek before.

21 Mr. Dodge, in terms of your questions, I want you  
22 to make sure that they don't go into the realm of the  
23 water rights that are held by the Los Angeles

24 Department of Water and Power or, for that matter,  
25 anybody.

0133

01 MR. DODGE: Fine.

02 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay.

03 MR. DODGE: Actually, I just have a couple  
04 questions.

05 Q. BY MR. DODGE: The proposal is to take the water  
06 from below Southern California Edison, return it to the  
07 Mill Creek waterway, and thence the water would go down  
08 to Mono Lake, correct, down the historical Mill Creek  
09 channel?

10 A. BY DR. STINE: Correct.

11 Q. I want you to simply -- you've indicated you  
12 walked these stretches -- take the two stretches, going  
13 from Southern California -- below Southern California  
14 Edison over to the historical Mill Creek channel, and  
15 then take the Mill Creek channel down to Mono Lake.

16 Would you tell the Hearing Board how much work  
17 would be necessary on those two channels in order to  
18 accomplish that little bit of water?

19 A. I think very little work would be required to do  
20 that simply because the diversion ditch that would be  
21 required to put water from the Southern California  
22 Edison tail race of the power plant back into Mill  
23 Creek is already in place. And it's already capable of  
24 holding perhaps 20, 25 cfs. And I think it could  
25 carry that without further modification.

0134

01 Then the water goes down that ditch and into Mill  
02 Creek, to a reach of Mill Creek that has already  
03 carried seepage water for a long period of time. So it  
04 has already been watered with a small amount of water  
05 for a long period of time. So vegetation is already in  
06 place.

07 So it would be a matter of allowing water to flow  
08 in to Mono Lake. We would probably want to redo the  
09 road crossing to allow permanent flows to go under the  
10 Mill Creek Road.

11 Other than that, I don't know of a single site  
12 that would need modification to get water from the  
13 Southern California Edison tail race to Mono Lake.

14 Q. New subject matter. In response to questions by  
15 Mr. Herrera, you talked about historical channels in  
16 the bottomlands, and you said it would be difficult to  
17 rewater historical channels in the lower one-third  
18 because of quote, elevation differences, end quote.

19 Do you recall that testimony?

20 A. I do.

21 Q. Now, does the degree of difficulty, sir, depend on  
22 the level of Mono Lake?

23 A. In the short-term, no. It's very difficult no  
24 matter where Mono Lake is.

25 In the longer term, once we do get Mono Lake up

0135

01 and over some period of time where the stream channel  
02 now incised is capable of filling itself with sediment,  
03 then this elevation difference basically disappears  
04 because Mono Lake has come up. But that's many, many  
05 decades in the future, not only to get Mono Lake up,

06 but to then get the channel filled with sediment.  
07 Q. So to what elevation does Mono Lake have to rise  
08 in order to take care of this problem of elevation  
09 differences?  
10 A. To at least 6400 feet. But if the lake was taken  
11 to higher elevations, there would be less and less time  
12 involved because it would be a narrower and smaller  
13 trench that we would need to fill with sediment. So  
14 there would be less time involved.  
15 Q. Were the lake at 6400 feet or higher, this problem  
16 of elevation differences could potentially disappear?  
17 A. Over some number of decades, yes, that's right.  
18 Q. Well, and also in terms of simply going in and  
19 physically rewatering the historical channels, if Mono  
20 Lake were at 6400 feet, that could be done, couldn't  
21 it?  
22 A. Not until the channel is filled up with sediment.  
23 Not until Rush Creek -- pardon me, not until Rush Creek  
24 agrades up to the level of those abandoned channel  
25 mouths, then they could be rewatered, yes.

0136

01 Q. You mentioned, in response to a question by  
02 Mr. Canaday, that if Mono Lake were on the delta plain,  
03 that channels would start to propagate.  
04 And I just want you to refresh the Board's  
05 recollection at what level does Mono Lake start to be  
06 on the delta plain?  
07 A. Mono Lake reaches the delta plain of Rush Creek at  
08 very close to 6400 feet. And then as the channel  
09 agrades -- as it progrades, it agrades, and it will  
10 eventually centuries scale, multi-centuries scale,  
11 start moving into a multi-channeled system.  
12 Q. Now, you talked about the amount of water you  
13 would suggest in the presently dry channels, and you  
14 said it would not need a large amount of water, 5 to  
15 15 cfs in each.  
16 Do you recall that testimony?  
17 A. Yes, I do. And 5 to 15 in each, I think that  
18 there are probably some channels out there that  
19 would -- no, I'll stick with 5 to 15. I think 5 to 15  
20 would do a great deal of good in all of those channels.  
21 Q. That would mean less water in the main channel,  
22 correct? Potentially could mean less water in the main  
23 channel?  
24 A. Yes, it could.  
25 Q. Hypothetically, if it did mean less water in the

0137

01 main channel, to what extent would rewatering  
02 historical channels interfere with the work the water  
03 is doing in the main channel in terms of affecting the  
04 stream channel?  
05 A. I think it would have a minor impact given that  
06 during the snow melt period, there still would be a  
07 large flow in the main stream, and that's when the work  
08 would actually be done.  
09 The amount of work that could be done in the  
10 low-flow months would probably be less, but that amount  
11 of work is minor. And it has so far had a very, very  
12 minor impact on the channel, as Dr. Li will be pointing  
13 out through his cross-section.

14 The work will continue to be done during those  
15 heavy snow-melt months. The amount of water that we  
16 put into the channels would not cut back those  
17 snow-melt month flows very much at all.  
18 Q. In response to questions from Mr. Birmingham, you  
19 talked about the "Little Ice Age."  
20 Did I write that down correctly?  
21 A. Yes.  
22 Q. And that was from what period of time -- this is  
23 in California, sir, or generally?  
24 A. It is both generally and in California. We have  
25 some dates on glacial advances in the Sierra Nevada

0138

01 that happen to coincide with the Little Ice Age as it  
02 has been studied in New Zealand and in the Alps and in  
03 the Pyrenees, and over large areas of the earth.  
04 And that starts at approximately 1550 A.D., and it goes  
05 through approximately 1850 A.D.  
06 Q. And I believe you testified that based on analysis  
07 relating to the Little Ice Age, that it is the  
08 Department of Water Resources that had suggested a six-  
09 to seven-year drought was appropriate?  
10 A. Not so much appropriate, but this is the drought  
11 they continued to find not only in the period of  
12 instrumental record, but going back to 1500 to 1550,  
13 something like that. They found periods in there that  
14 suggested six- to seven-year droughts occasionally.  
15 Q. And I wrote this down fairly carefully. You said  
16 that in your opinion, "We should not use the Little Ice  
17 Age as a criterion for a drought analysis."  
18 Can you tell us why?  
19 A. During that period of time, water was remarkably  
20 abundant in California. And we shouldn't be looking to  
21 that period of time as a criterion for what California  
22 can expect in the future in terms of its droughts.  
23 We should look at past dry times, not at past wet  
24 times, and that period, the Little Ice Age, was an  
25 abnormally wet time. And as I say, Mono Lake was high,

0139

01 glaciers were advancing in the Sierra Nevada.  
02 Q. And pre-1550, I take it there were dryer periods  
03 of time; is that right?  
04 A. Yes. Pre-1550, we were into a period referred to  
05 as the little optimum or medieval warm epic. And  
06 during those times, we had these severe droughts in  
07 California; likewise, severe droughts in other places  
08 in the world.  
09 Q. Last question, sir. You talked about in Rush  
10 Creek the historical channels now dry being full of  
11 cobbles.  
12 What is the source of those cobbles?  
13 A. The source of the cobbles is the Marzano Quarry  
14 that exists even today along the west side of Rush  
15 Creek very close to Parker Creek. It is not to be  
16 confused with the Parker Plug.  
17 But there's a gravel operation there. And between  
18 1960 or so and 1967, the Marzano operation had pushed  
19 huge amounts of quarry gravel out into Rush Creek, 60  
20 to 70,000 cubic yards of material, if I calculated  
21 correctly, and I think that's a gross estimate, but not

22 an unreasonable estimate. That material was carried  
23 down during the big flood of '67. And it clogged  
24 channels as it went causing Rush Creek to cut new  
25 channels and to abandon channels, et cetera.

0140

01 In a sense, it's a pain to get these things out.  
02 But on the other hand, it's exactly those cobbles that  
03 preserved the abandoned channels and prevented those  
04 abandoned channels from being blown out, so in many  
05 ways, it's a blessing.

06 Q. You talked about the Gun Barrel earlier today.  
07 Was the Gun Barrel section of the channel created in  
08 1967?

09 A. Yes, it was. The Gun Barrel was cut as a result  
10 of Rush Creek clogging its own existing channels with  
11 cobble, and with the Marzano Quarry cobble. And it  
12 lost access to its channels by clogging these channel  
13 with quarry cobble, and so it cut a new channel  
14 straight down out of The Narrows.

15 Q. And generally speaking, it's a wide and narrow  
16 channel?

17 A. Consistently wide and consistently shallow with  
18 very little complexity, to use the wildlife biologists'  
19 term.

20 MR. DODGE: No further questions.

21 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much,  
22 Mr. Dodge.

23 Mr. Birmingham?

24 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. BIRMINGHAM

25 Q. Dr. Stine, during questions put to you by

0141

01 Mr. Herrera, you made reference to a series of  
02 feasibility reports that you've been working on; is  
03 that correct?

04 A. BY DR. STINE: That's correct.

05 Q. And you said you'd been given a stop-work order by  
06 Mr. Trihey?

07 A. That's correct.

08 Q. Because the Department of Water and Power had  
09 informed him that the funding had terminated; is that  
10 right?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. That's your understanding.

13 When were you given the assignment to work on  
14 those feasibility reports?

15 A. I believe it was about the same time we started  
16 working on this hearing.

17 Q. Isn't it right that the Court, El Dorado County  
18 Superior Court, ordered that those feasibility studies  
19 be done in December of 1992?

20 A. I don't know. That's possible.

21 Q. And isn't it correct, Dr. Stine, that funding to  
22 finish those feasibility reports existed through  
23 December 31, 1993?

24 A. That could be. I don't know when this was cut  
25 off.

0142

01 Q. But in any event, Dr. Stine, there was funding  
02 available in 1993 for the completion of these  
03 feasibility reports that you were referring to to

04 Mr. Herrera?  
05 A. That's correct.  
06 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Objection. Asked and answered.  
07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Please proceed.  
08 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, throughout a lot of your  
09 testimony, you talked about -- in response to questions  
10 by Mr. Roos-Collins, you talked about the effect of old  
11 and new vegetation and the fact that, in your opinion,  
12 the vegetation is not causing Rush Creek to narrow.  
13 Do you recall that testimony?  
14 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes, I do.  
15 Q. I've put on the easel a photograph that's labeled  
16 Figure 3 from the direct testimony of Robert L.  
17 Beschta. It purports to depict the Rush Creek fish  
18 hatchery study site July 1976.  
19 You're familiar with this site, aren't you,  
20 Dr. Stine?  
21 A. I am, and I would point out it's below the area  
22 that we were talking about. It's below the Rush Creek  
23 bottomlands. It's in the area where there has been  
24 rather extreme stream incision and huge amount of  
25 volcanic material highly erodible, much, much more  
0143  
01 erodible than what we can see upstream.  
02 Q. In this particular segment of Rush Creek in July  
03 1976, would you agree with me that this is a wide  
04 stream channel?  
05 A. I would agree that it's a wide braided stream  
06 channel at a time when there was lots and lots of water  
07 in the channel, yes.  
08 Q. I'm going to put up another photograph, and this  
09 is Figure 4 from the direct testimony of Robert  
10 Beschta.  
11 And it's correct, isn't it, Dr. Stine, that Figure  
12 4 depicts the same area as Figure 3?  
13 A. That's correct.  
14 Q. In fact, if you examine the two photographs very  
15 carefully, you can see the same pieces of dead wood in  
16 Figure 3 and in Figure 4; is that correct?  
17 A. Yes, it's the same spot, definitely.  
18 Q. Now, you would agree, wouldn't you, Dr. Stine,  
19 that there's significantly more vegetation that appears  
20 in Figure 4 than in Figure 3?  
21 A. Absolutely.  
22 Q. And, Dr. Stine, isn't it correct that as fine  
23 sediments are deposited into the vegetation which is  
24 emerging, as depicted in Figure 4, that this stream  
25 channel will narrow?  
0144  
01 A. Yes. But let's be very clear on the amount of  
02 water that we have on the one photo versus the other  
03 photo.  
04 What we've done here between July of 1986 and  
05 August of 1993 is diminish the flow probably by a  
06 factor of, I'm guessing here, 3 to 5. And if that's  
07 what's required to narrow the stream, then you could  
08 probably argue that if we drop the stream down to  
09 1 cfs, we've narrowed it tremendously.  
10 Q. Dr. Stine, isn't it correct that as the stream  
11 evolves, that the channels that are cut through the



12 area depicted in Figure 4, ultimately will be able to  
13 carry a flow which is comparable to the flow depicted  
14 in Figure 3, without doing any damage to those stream  
15 channels?

16 A. I don't want to get into damage. You would  
17 certainly do less damage on your Figure 4 right here if  
18 damage is stream erosion. But if you put, today, if  
19 you put the same amount of water as is shown on Figure  
20 3 here into the conditions that exist here on channel  
21 4, you're going to have the stream in exactly the same  
22 position on Figure 4 that you have in Figure 3. You'll  
23 be drowning vegetation, but the stream itself will be  
24 occupying the same area here that it did on one photo  
25 and on the other.

0145

01 Q. Let's talk about 20 years from now, or 20 years  
02 from August 1993. Isn't it correct that if the  
03 vegetation depicted in Figure 4 continues to develop as  
04 Dr. Beschta has described it, that channels, narrow  
05 channels, will evolve that will be capable of handling  
06 the high flows that occurred in July of 1986 without  
07 the erosion that you just described?

08 A. Without the erosion? There will definitely be  
09 less erosion going on on these vegetated surfaces.  
10 That is not to say, however, that the stream won't be  
11 on those surfaces, and it doesn't speak at all to  
12 changes in stream width or numbers of channels.

13 Q. Isn't it correct, Dr. Stine, that you agree with  
14 Dr. Beschta that after a stream has evolved and is a  
15 functioning stream system that is connected to a  
16 healthy riparian corridor, that the high flows that are  
17 depicted in the photo in July of 1986 will actually be  
18 very beneficial to the stream?

19 A. I agree. And that's why I advocate high flows in  
20 the Mono Basin streams. After vegetation has become  
21 established, I think that the streams will be able to  
22 carry quite high flows, and it would be very  
23 beneficial. And I further add that the more channels  
24 we have with healthy vegetation on them, the more the  
25 system will approximate the 1940 system.

0146

01 Q. I'd like to talk about NAS/MLC Exhibit 258 and  
02 NAS/MLC 259. Do you have copies of those in front of  
03 you, Dr. Stine?

04 A. I do.

05 Q. Now, you indicated that these histograms were  
06 prepared by Mr. Vorster?

07 A. I did.

08 Q. And you said that, These histograms indicate that  
09 for the segments of Rush Creek that are depicted in the  
10 exhibits, pools with depths in excess of two feet are  
11 few and far between."

12 And I wrote down those words pretty carefully.

13 Those were your words, weren't they, Dr. Stine?

14 A. Yes. And are you referring now to Exhibit 258 or  
15 259 when I said that? I said that in relation to which  
16 one?

17 Q. You said that in relation to Exhibit 258, I  
18 believe. Is that your opinion?

19 A. Yes. I guess that's correct. I would say that

20 they are fewer and farther between on Exhibit 259,  
21 which takes the entire stream length from Narrows to  
22 Ford into consideration.  
23 Q. Now, you would agree with me, Dr. Stine, that a  
24 synonym for the words "few and far between" is the  
25 single word "scarce"?

0147

01 A. It's close, yes.

02 Q. Generally, "few and far between" connotes  
03 scarcity?

04 A. Sure, sure.

05 Q. Now, you've read Mr. Vestal's 1954 paper on Rush  
06 Creek?

07 A. I have.

08 Q. I believe it's in evidence as Cal Trout Exhibit  
09 5-T, I believe, but don't hold me to that, but it is in  
10 evidence as a Cal Trout Exhibit. I believe it's also  
11 in evidence as a DWP exhibit.

12 Now, the portion of Rush Creek that was the  
13 subject of Mr. Vestal's study was the same portion of  
14 Rush Creek or included that portion of Rush Creek that  
15 is depicted in Exhibits NAS and MLC 258 and NAS and MLC  
16 Exhibit 259; isn't that right, Dr. Stine?

17 A. Yeah. With the one proviso here that the stream  
18 isn't necessarily in the same place, and we're dealing  
19 with fewer stream channels. But in the sense that it  
20 is from The Narrows to The Ford, yes.

21 Q. Now, if Mr. Vestal's report describes different  
22 types of stream segments as follows, "Riffles  
23 containing excellent spawning gravels make up the bulk  
24 of the test stream, pools are comparatively  
25 scarce," you would agree that Mr. Vestal is saying that

0148

01 pools are comparatively few and far between; isn't that  
02 what Mr. Vestal is saying?

03 A. I think he saying that they're comparatively  
04 scarce, and you've asked me this exact question before.  
05 What I said is yes, in comparison to the riffles and  
06 runs, that is indeed the case. I think they are fewer  
07 and farther between today than they were before, and  
08 that's based upon my re-occupying the channels that  
09 used to exist out there.

10 And you can go into those channels, and you can  
11 see the kinds of conditions that existed. And they are  
12 very much different from those conditions that exist  
13 today. And I should say I've walked those channels  
14 with Mr. Vestal and he agrees.

15 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I would ask for an instruction  
16 that Dr. Stine answer my question. I won't move to  
17 strike the last response, but I would appreciate if  
18 he'd respond.

19 MR. DODGE: I think in that particular case --

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Wait a second,  
21 Mr. Dodge.

22 Dr. Stine, I want you to answer the questions that  
23 are asked. I want you to answer the questions that are  
24 asked.

25 DR. STINE: I will try.

0149

01 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: However, I need to

02 point something out. You're the one that raised the  
03 issue of Mr. Vestal.  
04 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I did. But my last question --  
05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: That's enough.  
06 Proceed.  
07 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'll have to go back and look at  
08 my question and see if it asked Mr. Vestal's opinion as  
09 opposed to --  
10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Please do.  
11 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Dr. Stine, you said Exhibits  
12 NAS and MLC 258 and 259, if we reduced the flows from  
13 the 80 cfs that was in the stream at the time of  
14 Mr. Tillemans' study was conducted to 35 cfs --  
15 A. BY DR. STINE: I believe I said 25 to 30 cfs.  
16 Q. Excuse me, 25 to 30.  
17 -- that the percentages would just shift one  
18 column to -- the histograms would shift one column to  
19 the left?  
20 A. Yes. The bars would shift one to the left in an  
21 approximate sense. Certainly.  
22 Q. What's the basis for that?  
23 A. The basis for that is my talking to Dr. Li about  
24 the IFIM data and what would happen to stream depths,  
25 all other things being equal, if flows were taken from  
0150  
01 80 down to 25 or 30 cfs.  
02 And I believe Dr. Li is in fairly close agreement  
03 with what Dr. Beschta said that it would be  
04 approximately a half a foot. And that's why I'm  
05 approximating this with one half a foot interval to the  
06 left here.  
07 Q. So that half a foot is what Dr. Li indicated to  
08 you?  
09 A. As well as Mr. Beschta, yeah, or Dr. Beschta,  
10 excuse me.  
11 Q. One question. Hypothetically, let's say a pool  
12 was exactly two feet deep. In which histogram or what  
13 bar would that appear? The bar from 1.5 to 2.0 or from  
14 2.0 to 2.5?  
15 A. You'd have to ask Mr. Vorster that. I don't  
16 know. I don't remember. It's going to the rare hole  
17 that's exactly that, and so I hope that that isn't a  
18 problem in too many places here.  
19 Q. Mr. Roos-Collins asked you some questions about  
20 this report. This is the December 16, 1993, Lee Vining  
21 Creek Segments 3-A, 3-B, 3-C, 1993 Habitat Improvements  
22 submitted by Northwest Biologic Consulting prepared for  
23 the Restoration Technical Committee. I believe that if  
24 you'll find an exhibit number, Cal Trout 42?  
25 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Yes.  
0151  
01 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Cal Trout Exhibit 42.  
02 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, you indicated that you  
03 were not involved in the preparation of Cal Trout  
04 Exhibit 42?  
05 A. BY DR. STINE: That's right. That was prepared by  
06 Mr. Scott English and Ms. Charlotte English.  
07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, you want  
08 some water?  
09 DR. STINE: I'm fine, thanks. It's too much

10 water.

11 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, have you reviewed the  
12 report, Dr. Stine?

13 A. BY DR. STINE: I've briefly -- I've gone through  
14 it. I have not read it, but I've thumbed through it to  
15 see what was covered in it.

16 Q. There's a memorandum that is attached that is part  
17 of an appendix to the report. It's a memorandum from  
18 Woody Trihey to the RTC members. Have you reviewed  
19 that memorandum?

20 A. I have not reviewed it.

21 Q. Would you take a moment and review it, please?

22 MR. DODGE: Objection. Beyond the scope of any  
23 questions that's been asked to date. I think we need  
24 to confine ourselves to rules here.

25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: How much longer do you  
0152

01 have?

02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I can cut to the chase on this  
03 one.

04 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Dr. Stine, it's correct, isn't  
05 it, that the work that was proposed by Mr. Trihey in  
06 1993, not all of the work was carried out. Isn't that  
07 right?

08 A. BY DR. STINE: That's correct. I don't have a  
09 copy, but that's correct.

10 Q. So just because Mr. Trihey's report suggests that  
11 he was recommending work in 1993, it doesn't mean that  
12 that work was done?

13 A. The work recommended for 1993 was not necessarily  
14 done in 1993. That's absolutely correct.

15 Q. The RTC rejected some of Mr. Trihey's suggestions  
16 that he wanted done?

17 A. That may be. I don't attend the RTC meetings  
18 anymore.

19 Q. Now, let's talk about Mill Creek for a minute. I  
20 hesitate to do this, since I objected to it, but there  
21 were some questions, and I'd like to follow-up on them.  
22 Mill Creek, the water that is diverted from Mill  
23 Creek ultimately makes its way to Mono Lake; is that  
24 right, Dr. Stine?

25 A. I would say most of it makes its way to Mono Lake.  
0153

01 There's probably -- there's undoubtedly some water  
02 that's lost to evapo-transpiration and root because  
03 it's spread out on lands for irrigation. The rest of  
04 it, though, goes down into the ground and presumably  
05 gets into the Mono Lake.

06 Q. What's the name of the channel that takes water  
07 from the diversion of Mill Creek and ultimately conveys  
08 that water to Mono Lake? Is it DeChambeau Creek?

09 A. By surface flow?

10 Q. Yes.

11 A. Well, there's DeChambeau Creek, and there's also  
12 Wilson Creek.

13 Q. Wilson Creek. Wilson Creek. Wilson Creek is a  
14 man-made channel, isn't it, Dr. Stine?

15 A. No, it's not. It was a natural, though ephemeral,  
16 channel under natural conditions that has been widened  
17 and deepened at the expense of Mill Creek.

18 Q. The current condition of Wilson Creek is an  
19 artifact of the diversions out of Mill Creek?

20 A. That's correct, yes.

21 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me, one moment.

22 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Dr. Stine, I'm showing you a  
23 memorandum that's dated February 21, 1993, and I'd ask  
24 you to just review that memo for a moment.

25 After you've had a chance to review it, would you  
0154

01 please tell me if your recollection as to when you were  
02 asked to start working on the feasibility reports is  
03 refreshed?

04 A. BY DR. STINE: Okay. I wrote this, indeed, on  
05 February 21, 1993, and I guess at this point, we were  
06 starting to discuss the feasibility report. This was  
07 in winter, and I think it was generally agreed that it  
08 would be non-winter conditions before we got out there  
09 and were able to reoccupy the channels and what not.  
10 But we were talking about it at the beginning of 1993.

11 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you. I have no further  
12 questions.

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much.  
14 Miss Cahill?

15 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. CAHILL

16 Q. Dr. Stine, with regard to the question of the  
17 pools in The Narrows back in Mr. Vestal's time, were  
18 there pools at that time in the side channels that were  
19 deeper than three feet?

20 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. The pools below The Narrows,  
21 I think you're talking about.

22 Q. Yes.

23 A. And, yes, in those sides channels, there were,  
24 indeed, pools that were deep, three feet -- two and a  
25 half to three and a half feet deep.

0155  
01 Q. Were there, at that time, pools below what is now  
02 The Ford?

03 A. Yes, certainly there were. And, in fact, we have  
04 shown photographs as exhibits of some of those pools in  
05 standing water areas.

06 Q. And they're beyond the thalweg profile that was  
07 submitted by L.A. DWP?

08 A. That's correct. The thalweg profile only goes to  
09 The Ford, and there were deep areas down below The  
10 Ford, between The Ford and the Clover Ranch.

11 Q. And you indicated that pools were comparatively  
12 scarce. I've lost the exhibit number. On the NAS/MLC  
13 Exhibit -- was it 258?

14 This would show that in that area, pools of three  
15 feet deep or greater constituted approximately 5  
16 percent of the measurements; is that right?

17 A. Yes. Thalweg measurements of greater than three  
18 feet you're asking?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. Yes. Perhaps 5 to perhaps 6 percent of the  
21 thalweg measurements.

22 Q. And you would consider that to be relatively  
23 scarce?

24 A. I would, yes.

25 Q. Compared to the other depths?

0156

01 A. Compared to the pre-41 depth, yes, definitely.  
02 MS. CAHILL: Thank you.  
03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you very much.  
04 Mr. Roos-Collins?

05 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS

06 Q. Good evening, Dr. Stine.

07 A. BY DR. STINE: Good evening.

08 Q. Let's return briefly to Cal Trout Exhibit 42, the  
09 December 1993 report by Northwest Biologic Consulting  
10 regarding the 1993 habitat improvement work in  
11 Lee Vining Creek.

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Do you recall Mr. Birmingham's questions to you on  
14 his recross examination?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. His questions concerned a memorandum by Mr. Trihey  
17 regarding recommended follow-up work after 1993 high  
18 flows.

19 A. They may have. I think the question that he asked  
20 me was whether or not all the work recommended for 1993  
21 had been done in 1993, and I agreed with him that it  
22 hadn't.

23 Q. Let me ask you to look at the table of contents in  
24 this exhibit focusing on pages 6 through 32, beginning  
25 with, quote, summary of work, and then proceeding

0157

01 through descriptions of individual treatments 1 through  
02 36-B, and ask you if that portion of this report  
03 describes work actually done in Lee Vining Creek in  
04 1993?

05 A. My recollection is that that's, indeed, what's  
06 described there, and if I could look for just a second.

07 Q. Please take your time.

08 A. Yes. I remember looking at this and, indeed, this  
09 was the work that was done, pages 6 through 32.

10 Q. And then following the pages we just discussed  
11 appears an appendix which is Mr. Trihey's recommended  
12 follow-up to the work actually done; is that correct?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. Thank you.

15 Let's return now to Mr. Vestal's 1954 article.

16 You don't have that article in front of you, do you?

17 A. I don't, no.

18 Q. This is Cal Trout Exhibit 5-T, as Mr. Birmingham  
19 suggested.

20 He read you part of a paragraph from page 92 of  
21 the article. Let me read you a preceding paragraph on  
22 the same page.

23 Quote, Lower Rush Creek formally averaged 20 feet  
24 in the width during the trout season with the depth of  
25 some seven inches on the riffles and four or five feet

0158

01 in the long delta pools. By 1951, however, these  
02 dimensions had been reduced by more than two-thirds,  
03 unquote.

04 Is that description of Lee Vining Creek -- excuse  
05 me, Rush Creek, prior to the commencement of L.A.'s  
06 diversions consistent with your understanding of Rush  
07 Creek?

08 A. Yes, it is. Of course, my understanding of Rush  
09 Creek comes, in part, from long conversations,  
10 including field trips, with Mr. Vestal, too.  
11 Q. And do you agree with Mr. Vestal's opinion  
12 regarding the impact of L.A.'s diversions from 1951 on  
13 the depths of riffles and on the depths of the pools?  
14 A. Yes, I do agree. And I should say this is not due  
15 to some channel change. It's simply due to a drop in  
16 the quantity of water moving down the channel.  
17 Q. Thank you.  
18 Now, in answer to a question by Mr. Dodge on his  
19 redirect, you referred to the biologist term, "habitat  
20 complexity."  
21 Let's assume this Board determines that habitat  
22 complexity comparable to what existed before 1941 is a  
23 desirable goal for its order. Let's discuss two  
24 scenarios.  
25 Under scenario one, the existing channel is  
0159  
01 watered with whatever flow regime the Board  
02 establishes.  
03 Under scenario two, same flow regime, historical  
04 channels are reopened. Under which scenario would the  
05 resulting habitat complexity be most comparable with  
06 what existed before 1941 on Rush Creek?  
07 A. By a large factor, scenario two.  
08 Q. Please explain why.  
09 A. There's already a great deal of habitat complexity  
10 waiting in these abandoned channels. Once they're  
11 reopened, immediately that habitat complexity in lots  
12 of places returns.  
13 Over the period of time that it takes vegetation  
14 to recolonize those portions of the abandoned channels  
15 where the vegetation has been destroyed by dewatering,  
16 that amount of habitat complexity will increase.  
17 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Thank you.  
18 Mr. Herrera, how many minutes did I take?  
19 MR. HERRERA: Five minutes and 25 seconds.  
20 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: And how many minutes did  
21 Mr. Dodge take?  
22 MR. HERRERA: 15.  
23 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Thank you. No further  
24 questions.  
25 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Mr. Herrera, how many minutes did  
0160  
01 I take?  
02 MR. HERRERA: I don't know.  
03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Valentine?  
04 MR. DODGE: You know what President Eisenhower  
05 said about that.  
06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: No, I don't.  
07 MR. DODGE: One swallow doesn't make a summer.  
08 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. VALENTINE  
09 Q. Dr. Stine, I have just a couple questions on one  
10 relatively minor point.  
11 You were asked a little while ago about lake  
12 depths to which -- let me start over.  
13 You were asked a little while ago about elevations  
14 to which Mono Lake descended in droughts in the  
15 prehistoric period, and your answer, I believe, was

16 6368, was the low stand?  
17 A. BY DR. STINE: That's correct and, in fact, that's  
18 the lowest stand that I can document in the last 35,000  
19 years.  
20 Q. The 6368 stand was how long ago?  
21 A. It ended approximately 850 years prior to 1950  
22 A.D.  
23 Q. That would have been there previous to the  
24 appearance of Paoha Island in the lake?  
25 A. Yes. Paoha Island, I believe it would date Paoha

0161

01 Island based on a number of different lines of  
02 evidence. Paoha Island emerged somewhere between 1650  
03 A.D. and about 1695 A.D.  
04 Q. Therefore, a drought brings the lake to a  
05 prehistoric level to 6368. The volume of water would  
06 have been much, much greater than with the same lake  
07 elevation today?  
08 A. Yeah. I don't know what you mean by "much, much  
09 greater," but the lake held more water per given lake  
10 level and was therefore less saline prior to Paoha  
11 being in the lake than after Paoha emerged in the lake.  
12 In other words, while we've seen lower lakes  
13 prehistorically than we've seen in historic times, we  
14 have not seen as low a volume of water in Mono Lake in  
15 prehistoric times as we have seen in historic times.  
16 This is as low a volume of lake -- water in Mono Lake  
17 as we've seen, I think, any time in the last 35,000  
18 years.

19 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Mr. Valentine, this is how  
20 Mr. Dodge responds to Mr. Vorster's questions.

21 MR. VALENTINE: It wasn't Mr. Vorster's question.  
22 He's off the hook, whatever faults there may have been.

23 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Mr. Del Piero, Mr. Birmingham  
24 has previously indulged in that joke. I wish that my  
25 response to his prior indulgence is repeated in the

0162

01 record; namely, that Mr. Vorster's records are pearls.

02 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: The shape of a pearl.  
03 Okay. Mr. Frink?

04 MR. FRINK: I have no questions.

05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Satkowski?

06 MR. SATKOWSKI: No questions.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Smith?

08 MR. SMITH: One brief question. I think I can  
09 make it loud enough.

10 RE-CROSS EXAMINATION BY THE STAFF

11 Q. BY MR. SMITH: If we put 20 cfs in this Mill  
12 Creek, as has been suggested, what does that do  
13 generally to the flows in Wilson and DeChambeau?

14 A. BY DR. STINE: I don't think it would do too much  
15 to DeChambeau Creek because DeChambeau water is taken  
16 out above the Southern California Edison power plant,  
17 so it would have very little effect on there.

18 What it would do on Wilson Creek is lessen the  
19 flow in Wilson Creek, which I don't think would have  
20 much of an ecological impact at all, because there's so  
21 little riparian vegetation associated with Mill Creek.

22 Mill Creek is an on-again-off-again stream at the  
23 whims of irrigators. And there hasn't been a chance



24 there for Wilson Creek to really develop any riparian  
25 system or any geomorphic integrity in the sense that

0163

01 the stream is interacting with riparian vegetation.

02 MR. SMITH: That's all the questions I have.

03 Thank you.

04 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Herrera?

05 Q. BY MR. HERRERA: Dr. Stine, I have just a few  
06 brief questions. One of them relates to the high-flow  
07 discussions we had earlier, and we were discussing  
08 80 cfs as being a high flow in regards to rewatering  
09 various channels.

10 And then further on in various cross-examinations,  
11 there was a discussion about high flows being  
12 detrimental in some cases to channel maintenance, or in  
13 some cases, necessary to deposit fines for vegetation  
14 to re-establish itself.

15 The question I'm getting at is: These high flows,  
16 if we were allowed to put these high flows in there,  
17 will they be detrimental in some cases to prudent  
18 rewatering of these channels?

19 A. BY DR. STINE: I would not suggest that we put a  
20 large amount of water down presently abandoned  
21 channels. I would like to see it kept at, say, 10 to  
22 15 cfs, something like that, down these channels at  
23 least initially, during the first 5 years to 10 years,  
24 something like that.

25 As these channels toughen up with riparian

0164

01 vegetation, as their banks become better bound with  
02 riparian root systems, I think we can walk away from  
03 the system and just let it be itself, and I don't think  
04 we're going to get any erosion at all. But initially,  
05 I think that we should limit the flow down these  
06 streams until they're allowed to get back to some  
07 semblance of strength and integrity.

08 Q. In essence, then, you're saying that the high  
09 flows initially are not appropriate to be released into  
10 Rush Creek for whatever reason, because they would be  
11 detrimental to certain rewatering characteristics. On  
12 the other hand, they may not be necessary for  
13 deposition of sediments or fines?

14 I'm trying to get -- the point here is whether or  
15 not you need high flows. You need high flows to do  
16 certainly things, but you don't know high flows to do  
17 others.

18 And initially, are you suggesting that we limit  
19 these flows irregardless?

20 MR. DODGE: Objection. Vague as to, quote, "high  
21 flows."

22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Herrera, I counted  
23 three questions, so I'm going to sustain Mr. Dodge's  
24 objection. You need to be specific as to which  
25 question you want to ask him first.

0165

01 Q. BY MR. HERRERA: First of all, I'll ask you again,  
02 high flows being, as you suggested earlier, is 80 cfs  
03 and above; is that correct?

04 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. Insofar as it relates to the  
05 now abandoned channels. That's not a high amount for

06 the existing channel of Rush Creek, but I wouldn't want  
07 to see 80 cfs put down the abandoned channels.

08 Q. And you suggested 5 to 15 for the abandoned  
09 channels?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And no more than that?

12 A. I would say no more than that until the riparian  
13 vegetation in those channels, all the way along those  
14 channels become re-established.

15 Q. Do you have a suggestion as to how to limit flows  
16 to 5 to 15 cfs on these channels if, indeed, the flows  
17 in the main stem of Rush Creek exceed the 80 cfs we've  
18 discussed or maybe it's higher?

19 A. Yes. And I don't pretend to be an expert here,  
20 but limiter logs, as they're called, are often used for  
21 this purpose, to allow only a certain amount of water  
22 into a particular channel. And there are people who do  
23 this for a living and are quite good at it.

24 Q. So subsequently, it's your suggestion, then, that  
25 the high flows are necessary for the main channel but  
0166

01 are to be limited for the rewatering of these adjacent  
02 channels?

03 A. I would say that they should be limited in the  
04 abandoned channels.

05 Then you had another part of the question which  
06 related to the flows in the main channel. What was  
07 that, I'm sorry?

08 Q. Let me maybe get to the quick, as they were  
09 saying.

10 What I'm looking at is if we had a high flow,  
11 hypothetical, in Rush Creek of, say, 300 cfs --

12 A. Okay.

13 Q. -- and that has some characteristics that are  
14 appropriate for the re-establishment of various things  
15 in the main stem, but they could be, if allowed to  
16 flow, as you said, naturally, into the side channels,  
17 detrimental to those channels.

18 A. I would agree for the first some number of years  
19 until those banks become bound.

20 And I hope I've made myself clear that in lots of  
21 those reaches, vegetation is already in place, but  
22 there are other reaches of the abandoned channels which  
23 will require some time to get the vegetation back.

24 Q. So essentially, for the first -- until the  
25 vegetation does get established, then the high flows  
0167

01 should be limited to those channels?  
02 A. I would agree with that, yes.

03 MR. HERRERA: That concludes my questions. Thank  
04 you.

05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Canaday?

06 Q. BY MR. CANADAY: Dr. Stine, you discussed some of  
07 these prehistoric drought occurrences. Is that the  
08 word you used, "prehistoric"?

09 A. BY DR. STINE: Yes. With "historic" being defined  
10 as the first written record, European written record  
11 from a particular area. Historic in Mono Basin is  
12 pre-1854.

13 Q. Have you analyzed the statistical probability of

14 the occurrence of that drought period?  
15 A. No, I haven't. Because to do something  
16 statistical, I would need more droughts. And we only  
17 really have three droughts, so it's difficult to deal  
18 with statistics on these droughts.  
19 Where we have a tree-ring record or an  
20 instrumental record, then we've got lots of data. But  
21 for these droughts, we really don't have -- we've got  
22 lots of data that the droughts occurred, but there were  
23 only three droughts in this period of time that we're  
24 dealing with. So it's difficult to deal with it  
25 statistically.

0168

01 Q. So it would be difficult for us to determine the  
02 likelihood of occurrence of a drought of 20 years plus,  
03 then?

04 A. Yes, it would be very difficult, yes.

05 MR. CANADAY: Thank you.

06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Brown, do you have  
07 any questions?

08 MR. BROWN: No, sir.

09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I'm going to bite,  
10 Mr. Valentine.

11 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE BOARD

12 Q. BY HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Stine, with the  
13 appearance of Paoha Islands, what year approximately?

14 A. BY DR. STINE: Somewhere between 1650 and about  
15 1690.

16 Q. Black Point?

17 A. 13,500.

18 Q. Is Black Point a lava flow?

19 A. Black Point is a big cinder cone called a Guyot,  
20 G-U-Y-O-T. And it's a cinder cone that formed under  
21 Mono Lake when Mono Lake was about 700 feet above where  
22 it is today during the last ice age.

23 Q. Any magma come out of there?

24 A. Not so much magma, cinder. Cinder that's today  
25 quarried and spread on roads in Mono County.

0169

01 Q. Paoha Island, any magma appear at the time?

02 A. Paoha Island, a little bit of a lava flow on the  
03 northeast corner, a plugged dome on the southeast  
04 corner where there are today femorals.

05 Q. Was the magnitude of the lava flow on the  
06 northeast corner significant?

07 A. If you were standing there, it sure would have  
08 been. It's about a couple thousand feet long.

09 Q. Significant from the standpoint of impacting the  
10 lake?

11 A. Oh, it probably created some steam. I think it  
12 probably did impact the lake in that there was probably  
13 a lot of sulfur injected in the lake, maybe some  
14 chlorides as well at the time of that subla cluster  
15 interruption, sure.

16 Q. Increase the salinity of the lake?

17 A. Probably did.

18 Q. Okay. What year was that?

19 A. Somewhere between 1650 and 1690. It doesn't have  
20 the 300-year-old shoreline on it, but it does have a  
21 tree on it that was established in 1690.

22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Thank you. You're  
23 excused, sir.  
24 MR. DODGE: Dr. Stine, if you would just stay  
25 there.

0170  
01 DR. STINE: Higher authority?  
02 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I tried to let you go,  
03 Scott.  
04 DR. STINE: Thank you, I appreciate it.  
05 MR. DODGE: Dr. Li, if you would join Dr. Stine.  
06 DR. LI: Marc, do I look the same as these guys?  
07 If I am, they're in trouble.  
08 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Do you know how many  
09 days I've been here? You're starting to look like  
10 F. Bruce Dodge.  
11 MR. DODGE: I want to make it clear to everyone  
12 that I'm calling Dr. Li on one subject in surrebuttal  
13 and that is the recent changes, if any, in the width  
14 and depth of Rush Creek.  
15 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DODGE  
16 Q. Now, Dr. Li, let's try to get through this fairly  
17 quickly.  
18 Did Dr. Stine ask you to take certain  
19 measurements?  
20 A. BY DR. LI: Yes, he did.  
21 Q. And what measurements did he ask to you take?  
22 A. He asked me -- Dr. Stine asked me to resurvey the  
23 transects that were first established in 1987 in  
24 relation to the Rush Creek instream flow studies.  
25 Q. And the transects were set up in 1987; is that  
0171  
01 right?  
02 A. Yes, they were.  
03 Q. And they still exist?  
04 A. Yes, they do.  
05 Q. And did you do this resurveying?  
06 A. Yes, I did.  
07 Q. Tell us what you did, exactly.  
08 A. Using standard surveying techniques, I measured  
09 relative elevations at 20 of the 22 transects that are  
10 located in Rush Creek between The Narrows and The  
11 Ford. These 22 -- these 20 transects represent 13 of  
12 the 14 sites that were established in 1987, and they  
13 represent 4 different habitat types, 4 pools, 3 runs, 3  
14 rock gardens, and 3 riffles.  
15 Q. Now, you say 20 of 22. So I assume that you did  
16 not remeasure 2. Can you tell the Board which ones you  
17 did not remeasure and why?  
18 A. There was one transect in a pool that was not  
19 remeasured because I could not relocate one of the pins  
20 and ascertain the alignment of that transect.  
21 The other transect was located in the armored  
22 bend, the infamous armored bend, and the reason I did  
23 not measure that one is that that thing looked like a  
24 porcupine with rebar quills in it. I could not figure  
25 out which pins were mine. So after a period of an hour  
0172  
01 and a half, I gave up.  
02 Q. When did you do this work?  
03 A. I measured three transects on Columbus Day 1993,

04 and the remainder between January 25th and January  
05 27th.

06 Q. Of what year?

07 A. 1994.

08 Q. Did you get hardship pay for that?

09 A. I like going out there.

10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Nope, you don't look  
11 anything like F. Bruce Dodge.

12 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Can you explain to the Board,  
13 physically, how you went about getting depth and water  
14 elevations?

15 A. BY DR. LI: The relative elevations, we  
16 established the known elevation of the scope that you  
17 use to survey, and that's done by measuring a known  
18 location. In the case of these transects, it is  
19 either the benchmark that was established or one of the  
20 four rebar pins that were used to establish a  
21 transect.

22 We measured all the tops of those pins and the  
23 bases of those pins to -- and compared those elevations  
24 with the historical data.

25 Q. Now --

0173

01 A. Then --

02 Q. Do you go across the stream and measure depth; is  
03 that what you do?

04 A. Yes. You connect a measuring tape to the pins  
05 first confirming that the pin distances are identical  
06 to the original survey. And then you simply, using the  
07 stadia rod and the auto level, measure the relative  
08 elevation.

09 Q. At what intervals?

10 A. In these surveys, they were generally one-foot  
11 intervals.

12 Q. Okay. How about wetted width? How did you go  
13 about measuring that?

14 A. Wetted width is simply the widest extent of the  
15 stream channel that is wet, and you simply look down  
16 perpendicular from the tape that you've strung across  
17 the transect and mark those locations.

18 MR. DODGE: Before we go on, Mr. Del Piero, I have  
19 this tendency to forget. I would offer Dr. Stine's  
20 rebuttal testimony, National Audubon Society and Mono  
21 Lake Committee Exhibit 1-A-F and the exhibits related  
22 thereto, National Audubon Society Exhibit 246 to 254,  
23 258, 259, and 265.

24 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Subject only to my prior  
25 objection that rebuttal testimony ought to be rebuttal

0174

01 testimony, I have no objection.

02 MS. CAHILL: Since we're on the subject --

03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ms. Cahill, you want  
04 to object, too?

05 MS. CAHILL: No. But since Mr. Dodge did it, I  
06 would, at this time, move admission of DFG 164.

07 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Those that have been  
08 offered by Mr. Dodge will be entered into the record.  
09 That which was offered by Ms. Cahill will be entered  
10 into the record.

11 Do you have any?

12 MS. SCOONOVER: No.  
13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Roos-Collins?  
14 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: No objections.  
15 (NAS/MLC Exhibits Nos. 1-A-F,  
16 246 to 254, 258, 259, 265 were  
17 admitted into evidence.  
18 DFG Exhibit No. 164 was  
19 admitted into evidence.)  
20 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Now, Dr. Li, is National Audubon  
21 Society and Mono Lake Committee Exhibit 264 a summary  
22 of the result of your measurements that you've  
23 testified to?  
24 A. BY DR. LI: Yes, they are.  
25 Q. Briefly, can you take us through Exhibit 254?  
0175  
01 A. First, I would like to establish a couple things.  
02 These sites were initially randomly selected based on  
03 the initial habitat map that was made. The locations  
04 within these randomly selected sites were also randomly  
05 selected in this way. This was the only way that we  
06 could make samples of the stream and not inject  
07 personal bias so that these sites would be  
08 representative of the Rush Creek bottomlands.  
09 Before you are a set of 20 pictures. They reflect  
10 the relative water -- relative elevations of -- that  
11 were made in 1987, which is the dotted line, and the  
12 survey that was made in 1993, slash '94, which is the  
13 solid line.  
14 I've also put on these figures the measured water  
15 surface elevation for the 1994 survey, and I put on the  
16 water surface elevation estimated from the IFG4  
17 hydraulic model so that you can see the relationship of  
18 80 cfs in relation to the 1987 profile and the 1994  
19 profile.  
20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: The water surface  
21 elevation in 1987 corresponds with the 1987 level; is  
22 that correct?  
23 DR. LI: Yes. So, for instance, if we take the  
24 first one, which is labeled Transect 49 Riffle --  
25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay.  
0176  
01 DR. LI: -- the water surface elevation that is  
02 higher is the water surface elevation for 1987. The  
03 dotted line below that one is the measured water  
04 surface elevation of 1994.  
05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay.  
06 DR. LI: This transect, we are going from upstream  
07 to downstream. I will be brief on some of these in  
08 that the pools generally had three transects placed in  
09 them, and the other habitats had one transect placed in  
10 them. And since the transects for the pools were  
11 placed in close proximity, it would be unfair to  
12 characterize them equally with the other transects.  
13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay.  
14 DR. LI: Transect 49 is in what Dr. Stine calls  
15 the Gun Barrel, approximately a hundred meters  
16 downstream of The Narrows. The 1994 survey reveals a  
17 stream channel that's slightly wider than the 1987  
18 survey.  
19 Transect 50 is about 300 meters downstream of

20 transect 49. It is a rock garden, and I see no  
21 discernible differences in terms of channel width in  
22 between the two surveys. However, the 1994 channel is  
23 slightly deeper. It's slightly deeper by about an  
24 inch.

25 Dr. Stine is pointing out to me something that you  
0177

01 should be aware of. There is a vertical exaggeration  
02 in these figures in that, for instance, in transect 51,  
03 the abscissa, or the X axis, is a hundred feet wide,  
04 whereas you're only talking about the five feet of  
05 difference on the ordinate, or Y axis.

06 Transect 51 is about 800 feet downstream of  
07 transect 50. It is narrower by about three inches at  
08 the water surface elevation, but it is about the same  
09 below that point.

10 The narrowing in width I attribute to the dry  
11 banks being sloughed off into the channel as the high  
12 flows came up.

13 Riffle 52 is about 500 feet downstream, and there  
14 is this -- the differences between the surveys are  
15 negligible, and I call it a wash.

16 Transect 53 is a run. We are looking upstream at  
17 these transects, so the right-hand bank is actually on  
18 the left-hand side. There is a narrowing of this  
19 channel of about five feet in the top six inches in the  
20 channel. There is no differences in the remainder of  
21 this channel.

22 The cause for this narrowing is material that came  
23 out of Parker plug, and that can be discerned in that  
24 the rock material from the plug was crushed rock, and  
25 no riparian vegetation was involved in this narrowing.

0178

01 Transect 54 was a rock garden and the stream  
02 channel is slightly wider.

03 Q. BY MR. DODGE: Today, you mean?

04 A. BY DR. LI: Slightly wider in 1994.

05 Transect 55 is a run. There has been significant  
06 scour on the left-hand side of about two feet  
07 throughout the profile. On the right-hand side, as you  
08 can see, the channel profile is approximately the same.

09 Dr. Stine points out that it's two to four feet  
10 wider.

11 Q. When?

12 A. With the present -- with the recent survey.

13 Transect 56 is a riffle. It is narrower by about  
14 a foot in the top three to four inches, otherwise, it  
15 is approximately the same. It may be slightly deeper,  
16 but the differences that are seen in this depth may be  
17 due to being on or off a rock. So I'm calling it a  
18 wash.

19 There is a series for the first pool, transect 57,  
20 58, and 59. And for illustrative purposes, I'm simply  
21 going to be discussing transect 57.

22 There is four channels that are watered in this  
23 figure, and the only thing that's significant is the  
24 left-hand facing channel has migrated approximately  
25 four feet and has widened by about approximately a

0179

01 foot.

02           If we go to the next series of transects,  
03 transects 60, 61, and 62, these represent a series in  
04 the pool, the first one being the head of the pool. It  
05 is slightly narrower in transect 62. It is about two  
06 feet narrower within the top six inches and not much  
07 difference thereafter. And in 62, it's slightly  
08 narrower.

09 Q. Today?

10 A. Today.

11           All the narrowing, with the exceptions of that  
12 transect that I mentioned, the Parker plug materials,  
13 the narrowing is not due to riparian vegetation, but it  
14 is due to dry-bank material that has sloughed down  
15 causing the slight narrowing in the upper six inches or  
16 so of the transects.

17           Transect 64 has that phenomenon, and otherwise the  
18 surveys are identical.

19           Transects 65 and 67 represent the same pool. I  
20 could not get the 66. That's the one where I lost the  
21 monument markers, so I could not align the tape across  
22 the transect. But these show a widening of the channel  
23 below the first six inches or so, and it is significant  
24 in the tail end of the pool, which is transect 67,  
25 where the channel is both deeper and wider.

0180

01           And the last set, transects 68 through 70,  
02 represent a single pool. The head of the pool,  
03 transect 68, there's really not significant changes  
04 here. It may be slightly wider in the present survey  
05 rather than the 87.

06           HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: What happened to 69?

07           DR. LI: In 69 and in 70, there is a slug of  
08 sediment that is passing through the pool. It happens  
09 to be a long, wide bench.

10           It also -- there has been scour that has moved the  
11 pool more to the right.

12           HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Is that why 70's got  
13 that deep spot?

14           DR. LI: Yes. And transect 69 is significantly  
15 wider than the earliest survey.

16 Q. BY MR. DODGE: You've taken us through them all,  
17 Dr. Li, and you've talked about some widening and some  
18 narrowing.

19           I take it, again, the time frame we're talking  
20 about is 1987 to early 1994; is that right?

21 A. BY DR. LI: That's correct.

22 Q. In terms of widening and narrowing, did you notice  
23 any trend as you went through this material?

24 A. No. I should add that I was assisted in this  
25 surveying project by Mr. Doug Parkinson who assisted me

0181

01 also in 1987, and upon getting out of the field, we  
02 asked each other on the way home whether -- what our  
03 impressions were. And we both agreed that for all  
04 intents and purposes, the cross-sections that were  
05 there in 1987 are essentially the same in 1994.

06           There are some changes, but those changes are more  
07 reflective that the stream channel is active and some  
08 change is to be expected.

09           And if anything else, the remarkable appearance of



10 the stream in the video should be attributed that there  
11 it's approximately four times the flow in that video  
12 than was there in 1987.

13 MR. DODGE: No further questions. Thank you.

14 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, how  
15 long are you going to be?

16 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Oh, I'm going to be at least 20  
17 minutes.

18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Let's take a  
19 ten-minute break, then.

20 (A recess was taken at this time.)

21 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: The hearing will again  
22 come to order.

23 Mr. Birmingham?

24 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. BIRMINGHAM

25 Q. Dr. Li, are you a fluvial geomorphologist?  
0182

01 A. BY DR. LI: No, but I am Chinese.

02 Q. The answer to the question is no, you're not an  
03 fluvial geomorphologist?

04 A. That's correct.

05 Q. Now, you said that from your review of the data  
06 collected in 1977 and compared to the data you  
07 collected in 1993 and 1994, that there has been no  
08 change in terms of channel width and channel depth at  
09 the transects measured; is that correct?

10 A. That's correct.

11 MR. DODGE: I believe counsel meant to say 1987  
12 instead of 1977.

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Yes.

14 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Yes. I did mean to say it.  
15 Thank you, Mr. Dodge.

16 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: And you said that any change  
17 could be attributed to the fact that a stream channel  
18 changes over time?

19 A. BY DR. LI: Yes.

20 Q. It's a dynamic system?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. Now, you do have a lot of experience with respect  
23 to fisheries biology; is that correct, Dr. Li?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. I'd like to go back to the pool that is  
0183

01 represented by transects 65 and 67.

02 A. Yes.

03 Q. Now, I believe it was your testimony that at an  
04 elevation below approximately two feet, this pool has  
05 gotten deeper and wider; is that correct?

06 A. In 65, it is clearly wider but not deeper. But in  
07 67, it is clearly deeper and wider.

08 Q. Now, as I understand your testimony, transect 65  
09 and transect 67 are transects of the same pool?

10 A. They represent the head and the tail of the pool.

11 Q. Now, in terms of fishery biology, fish habitat,  
12 this deepening and widening of this pool at a depth  
13 below approximately two feet, that's a good thing for  
14 fish?

15 A. Depending -- you know, it depends on other  
16 attributes such as cover and other things, yes. But in  
17 general, it's better.

18 Q. Now, we have 22 transects; is that right?  
19 A. You have 20 of 22.  
20 Q. Excuse me. Now, these 20 transects, 20 of the 22,  
21 they only represent what has occurred at these specific  
22 locations between 1987 and 1994; isn't that correct?  
23 A. They only represent those locations.  
24 Q. And the stream at other locations may have  
25 changed?

0184

01 A. May have.  
02 Q. And that change wouldn't be represented by this  
03 data?  
04 A. That's correct.  
05 Q. Excuse me, these data.  
06 Now, just thumbing through the individual pages  
07 that make up Exhibit 264, there are a number where the  
08 transect appears to have gotten deeper, for instance,  
09 transect 56?  
10 A. I believe I said this one may have been deeper.  
11 Q. Well, from the survey data, it appears that it's  
12 about a foot deeper; is that correct, the thalweg?  
13 A. No. The main difference is about almost 2/10ths,  
14 2.4 inches, something like that.  
15 Q. Now, the thalweg, as I understand, the thalweg is  
16 the deepest part of the stream; is that correct?  
17 A. That's correct.  
18 Q. And the thalweg in 1987 was in the area slightly  
19 to the right of the 30-foot mark; is that correct?  
20 A. That's correct.  
21 Q. And the thalweg in 1994 is about that same spot;  
22 is that correct?  
23 A. That's correct.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Excuse me. Am I  
25 looking at the right one? Are we looking at

0185

01 cross-section 56?  
02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Yes.  
03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: The thalweg is on the  
04 left-hand side of 30, not on the right? For 1987? Am  
05 I reading this wrong?  
06 DR. LI: Tom, I would also point out that --  
07 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me, Dr. Li. I think  
08 Mr. Del Piero is confused.  
09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Is that not correct?  
10 DR. LI: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.  
11 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: The deepest portion of  
12 the stream in 1987 is to the left of the 30 on the  
13 horizontal axis.  
14 DR. LI: It's about 28 foot.  
15 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Yes.  
16 DR. LI: And it's about at 31 feet in 1994.  
17 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, I  
18 think you misspoke.  
19 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I did misspeak. I beg your  
20 pardon. Thank you.  
21 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, the difference in depth  
22 between those two points is how much, Dr. Li?  
23 A. BY DR. LI: The trick to this is if you want to  
24 talk about depth, we also have to take into  
25 consideration the differences between the two different

0186

01 origins.

02 Q. All right. Just one of the few non-leading  
03 questions I've asked.

04 A. It appears to be slightly deeper at the thalweg in  
05 1994.

06 Q. Can you tell us approximately how much deeper?

07 A. Four inches or so.

08 Q. Now, the water surface elevation represented for  
09 1987 is an estimated surface elevation; is that  
10 correct?

11 A. That's correct.

12 Q. In 1987 when you measured the transects, what was  
13 the flow in the stream?

14 A. 1987 was between 13 and 100 cfs.

15 Q. Did you take three measurements at three different  
16 flows?

17 A. There were four different flows, two different  
18 measurements. In terms of the measurements that you're  
19 interested in, we took four different measurements.

20 Q. And what were the flows during those four  
21 different measurements?

22 A. 13, 19, 60 and 100.

23 The reason why I feel relatively comfortable with  
24 the estimated water surface elevation is it's between  
25 the 60 cfs measurement and the 100 cfs measurement.

0187

01 Q. Now, Dr. Li, were you involved -- Mr. Smith was  
02 here last week, Mr. Smith of the Department of Fish and  
03 Game, and he presented testimony in response to  
04 testimony submitted by Dr. Hardy.

05 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: It's starting to look  
06 like a forest with all the people standing up behind  
07 you Mr. Birmingham, I feel it.

08 MR. DODGE: Mr. Del Piero, we have called Dr. Li  
09 in surrebuttal to Dr. Beschta to talk specifically  
10 about depths and widths of Rush Creek between 1987 and  
11 1993.

12 What Mr. Birmingham wants to do now is to talk to  
13 Dr. Li about whether or not segment three should have  
14 been included in the Lee Vining Creek IFIM. And I  
15 think that is beyond the bounds of surrebuttal. He's  
16 had his opportunity to talk to Dr. Li on that subject.  
17 He has done so, and we ought to stop.

18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ms. Cahill?

19 MS. CAHILL: Mr. Del Piero, yes. I would point  
20 out that Dr. Li is here as a surrebuttal witness on  
21 surrebuttal, the agreement of the parties, as  
22 memorialized in my letter to you in December, was  
23 written testimony need not be filed for such witnesses,  
24 but their testimony will be limited to the subject  
25 matters covered by the testimony to which they are

0188

01 called to respond.

02 Dr. Li was on our Rush Creek panel. He was here  
03 parts of three days. Mr. Birmingham, in fact, has  
04 already quizzed Dr. Li on the Lee Vining Creek report  
05 including Rush Creek. I can cite the transcript, if  
06 necessary, and I believe it would be improper to allow  
07 that line of questioning when Dr. Li is called by

08 another party on another subject in surrebuttal.  
09 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham?  
10 MR. BIRMINGHAM: We had testimony -- the sole  
11 subject of Mr. Smith's testimony here last week was why  
12 Dr. Li changed his mind between the draft IFIM report  
13 on Lee Vining Creek, and the final IFIM report. That  
14 was the sum and substance of Mr. Smith's testimony.  
15 I asked Mr. Smith questions that established that  
16 the reason that information was contained in the final  
17 report that wasn't contained in the draft report, why  
18 the Reach Three data were included, was because Dr. Li  
19 changed his mind.  
20 Now, the Hearing Officer has many times correctly  
21 pointed out that hearsay is certainly admissible in  
22 this proceeding, and Dr. Smith's testimony amounted  
23 principally of hearsay testimony: Why Dr. Li changed  
24 his mind.  
25 Dr. Li is here today, and I think it would be most  
0189  
01 enlightening if we could ask Dr. Li questions about why  
02 he changed his mind.  
03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ms. Cahill?  
04 MS. CAHILL: Mr. Del Piero, I would point out that  
05 in the transcript of this hearing, Volume 19, December  
06 7th, 1993, Dr. Li testified, "Reach three is the  
07 steepest reach on Lee Vining Creek. And at the time I  
08 wrote that, I was putting greater credence in the  
09 amount of entrained air in the creek at different  
10 flows. And based on that, and knowing that very steep  
11 reaches are difficult to simulate; i.e., for a lack of  
12 discipline, I removed that data. Upon rethinking that,  
13 I felt it was more responsive by those data and final  
14 report."  
15 Mr. Birmingham has already quizzed Dr. Li on this.  
16 We already had his direct testimony on this. It would  
17 corroborate any hearsay of Mr. Smith, but most  
18 basically, this is not a proper subject when he was  
19 provided as a surrebuttal witness by Mr. Dodge to  
20 respond to Dr. Beschta. We will never have an end of  
21 it.  
22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge?  
23 MR. DODGE: I just want to point out that  
24 Mr. Birmingham, in all of his justification for this  
25 line of questioning, never once suggested as to why  
0190  
01 this was proper cross-examination on surrebuttal. All  
02 he did was say, "I'd like to ask these questions."  
03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, last  
04 comment.  
05 MR. BIRMINGHAM: To date, no party has been  
06 restricted on the areas of examination on  
07 cross-examination of a witness.  
08 HEARING OFFICER del PIERO: Actually, that's not  
09 true, Mr. Birmingham, but I can cite you at least two  
10 occasions that's happened.  
11 MR. BIRMINGHAM: With only two exceptions of which  
12 I'm now aware, no party has been limited.  
13 Again, if Dr. Li adequately explained why he  
14 changed his mind when I examined him, there was  
15 absolutely no reason for the Department of Fish and

16 Game to waste all of our time in bringing Dr. Smith  
17 here -- or Mr. Smith here to explain why Dr. Li changed  
18 his mind.

19 Dr. Li is here today, and I've got some specific  
20 questions of Dr. Li about why he changed his mind and  
21 whether or not his original opinion was, as a matter of  
22 fact, the appropriate opinion. And I think that is  
23 entirely proper.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Frink? Mr. Frink,  
25 there was a reason for you to be here for the last

0191

01 40-odd days.

02 MR. FRINK: I appreciate that.

03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I have an opinion, but  
04 I'd like to know yours.

05 MR. FRINK: In theory, I agree with Mr. Dodge's  
06 objection, and I would hope that the cross-examination  
07 on all the witnesses at this point in the hearing would  
08 be restricted.

09 But the problem that I have is that it has been  
10 very, very broad up until now and in most instances.

11 If you do allow questions of Dr. Li in this area,  
12 I would hope that they could be relatively few and  
13 quick and that everybody in the future could try to  
14 restrict their cross-examination to the subject of the  
15 rebuttal or surrebuttal.

16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: How many questions do  
17 you have of this nature?

18 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I can do it in ten minutes.

19 MS. CAHILL: Mr. Del Piero, can I make one last  
20 comment?

21 Although, on the original direct, to examine on  
22 any topic, although Dr. Stine was here today on regular  
23 rebuttal as well as surrebuttal, the parties, by their  
24 own agreement, have indicated that on surrebuttal, the  
25 witness would be strictly limited to the subject on

0192

01 which he was called. That's why this case is  
02 different.

03 Dr. Li is the first purely surrebuttal witness, to  
04 my knowledge, that this has come up on, and that's the  
05 difference. The difference is this was a surrebuttal  
06 person. We had limited what we were going to ask  
07 surrebuttal people.

08 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, you  
09 want to respond to that issue specifically to the  
10 letter?

11 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I don't have a copy of the letter  
12 here. May I?

13 HEARING OFFICER del PIERO: As some of you will  
14 recall, I had hoped to not have to deal with this  
15 issue.

16 MS. CAHILL: I would point out --

17 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I think, actually, Mr. Del Piero,  
18 what this agreement relates to is that the party  
19 calling the witness will be limited to asking questions  
20 on the subject designated in the notice to the Board  
21 that that party will be calling the witness.

22 The letter says that, "Written testimony -- that  
23 by 5:00 p.m. on Monday, January 10, the names of

24 witnesses who will testify on subjects listed by any  
25 other party. Written testimony need not be filed for

0193

01 such witnesses, but their testimony will be limited to  
02 the subject matters covered by the testimony to which  
03 they are called to respond."

04 And I believe that was intended to limit the  
05 ability of the party calling that witness as a  
06 surrebuttal witness, not the ability of other parties  
07 to examine that witness.

08 HEARING OFFICER del PIERO: Mr. Frink, was that  
09 your understanding?

10 MR. FRINK: I didn't write the letter. Ms. Cahill  
11 wrote the letter.

12 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I didn't ask you if  
13 you wrote the letter, Mr. Frink. The letter is a  
14 summary of a consensus among the individual --

15 MR. FRINK: I don't believe that the question of  
16 what would be the scope of cross-examination of a  
17 surrebuttal witness was ever addressed.

18 I think what the letter went to is what would be  
19 the scope of the direct examination of a surrebuttal  
20 witness.

21 So the question is open. I'm not sure that  
22 there's a big difference between what the Board should  
23 rule regarding the scope of cross-examination of  
24 rebuttal witnesses, and scope of cross-examination of  
25 surrebuttal witnesses.

0194

01 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: You have ten minutes,  
02 Mr. Birmingham.

03 Mr. Herrera, Mr. Birmingham has ten minutes.

04 Proceed.

05 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you very much.

06 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Do you have a copy of the  
07 draft report which is in evidence as State Board  
08 Exhibit 2?

09 A. BY DR. LI: I believe you placed it before me.

10 Q. Dr. Li, I'd ask you to look at page 24 of the  
11 draft report, and for the record, we're referring to  
12 the draft report on Lee Vining Creek.

13 Now, is there a reference to Reach Three on page  
14 27 -- I'm sorry, page 24 of the draft report?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. It states, doesn't it, that in Reach Three, four  
17 habitat types were sampled: pool, riffle, run, and  
18 cascade; is that correct?

19 A. I don't see that on page 24, counsel.

20 Q. I'm sorry, you have a different draft report.

21 Excuse me, Mr. Del Piero, may I ask for a time  
22 out?

23 MS. CAHILL: No. Really, no time out.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: We established at the  
25 beginning of this process that Mr. Herrera keeps time,

0195

01 Mr. Birmingham.

02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you very much.

03 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'm showing you my copy of  
04 the draft report that is dated August -- I'm sorry,  
05 July 1992; is that correct?

06 A. BY DR. LI: Yes.  
07 Q. And there's a reference, Dr. Li, to Reach Three,  
08 and it states, "In Reach Three, four habitat types were  
09 sampled." Is that correct?  
10 A. That's correct.  
11 Q. Pool, riffles, runs, and cascades; is that  
12 correct?  
13 A. That's correct.  
14 Q. You state further that sampling the cascades was  
15 limited to portions with the lowest gradient?  
16 A. That's correct.  
17 Q. Does that mean you put the transect in which you  
18 were sampling the cascades actually in the tail pool?  
19 A. Tom, do you know what a cascade is?  
20 Q. Yes, I do.  
21 A. Tell me what it is.  
22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Wait a second,  
23 Dr. Li. Dr. Li, if you believe by the nature of the  
24 question Mr. Birmingham has a misunderstanding of what  
25 a cascade is, you need to define it so we can move this  
0196  
01 along.  
02 DR. LI: The reason why they were placed there is  
03 in terms of IFG4, you're wasting money by putting it  
04 anyplace else.  
05 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: So the answer to my question  
06 is yes, in the cascade --  
07 A. BY DR. LI: Cascade has significant vertical  
08 components to it.  
09 Q. And when you placed the transects in the cascade  
10 reaches, you actually placed them in the tail out pool  
11 of the cascade reach; isn't that correct?  
12 A. No.  
13 Q. I'd like you to look at page 32 of the draft  
14 report, my copy of the draft report.  
15 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Birmingham, in  
16 order to facilitate this, pull a chair up, grab the  
17 microphone, and then we don't have to loose time with  
18 you moving back and forth. Okay?  
19 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Now, Dr. Li, looking at this,  
20 it states that -- I'm looking at page 32 of the draft  
21 report. It states, "We believe the overestimation of  
22 habitat is due to the inability of IFG4 habitat model  
23 to recognize the turbulent super critical flow and air  
24 entrainment as not suitable for trout habitat."  
25 "Another factor which may have affected habitat  
0197  
01 estimation was the location of transects within  
02 cascades. They were placed in the plunge pools, the  
03 only place where the IFG4 hydraulic programming could  
04 perform."  
05 Is that what you did?  
06 A. BY DR. LI: Then you misspoke earlier.  
07 Q. Did you place the transect in the plunge pools?  
08 A. I placed the transect in the plunge pool portion  
09 of cascade.  
10 Q. So, in reality, rather than sampling pools,  
11 riffles, runs, and cascades, as reported on page 24,  
12 you sampled pools, riffles, runs and plunge pools; is  
13 that correct?

14 A. Plunge pool is a portion of cascade. So I'm still  
15 sampling a cascade.

16 Q. Isn't it correct, Dr. Li, that generally in the  
17 top of a cascade, there will be water which trout will  
18 avoid because of entrained air?

19 A. I can't speak to that directly. I've dove in many  
20 plunge pools, but I have not observed fish there.

21 Q. Now, on page 28 of the report you say, "However,"  
22 and again, we're referring to Reach Three; is that  
23 correct, Dr. Li?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Let me start at the second to the last paragraph  
0198  
01 on page 28. It says, "For Reach Three, weighted usable  
02 area stream discharge relationships were similar to  
03 Reach Two except the estimated amount of habitat  
04 exceeds Reach Two, Figure 12."  
05 That surprised you, didn't it, Dr. Li?

06 A. And that's the reason why I went off on this wild  
07 tangent.

08 Q. You say, "However," further in the next paragraph  
09 you say, "This habitat model of Reach Three is  
10 unrealistic based upon our experience delineating  
11 habitat on the creek and collecting physical data for  
12 PHABSIN?

13 A. But upon reflection, I felt that was incorrect.

14 Q. Isn't it correct, Dr. Li, that the IFG4 model  
15 cannot accurately determine weighted usable area in the  
16 head of a cascade?

17 A. I don't know what you mean by a "head of a  
18 cascade."

19 Q. Excuse me.

20 Now, would you agree, Dr. Li, that the plunge pool  
21 where you placed the transects is not the main feature  
22 of a cascade?

23 A. It depends. Plunge pool cascades are a  
24 combination of high-gradient riffle and plunge pools.  
25 And so it depends on the proportion of plunge pool to  
0199  
01 high-gradient riffle.

02 Q. I'm going to draw a stream channel which is  
03 exaggerated, and I'll represent this is the bottom of a  
04 stream, Dr. Li, the bed of a stream channel, and water  
05 is flowing this direction.

06 Now, as water flows down here, if there is a lot  
07 of turbulent water where I'm indicating, this would  
08 represent a cascade; is that correct?

09 A. It would be in a location such as that.

10 Q. Now, when you measured the weighted usable area of  
11 these cascades, you measured it in the area that you  
12 referred to as a plunge pool, which would be in this  
13 location, approximately, or further down stream; is  
14 that correct?

15 A. No. It depends on the configuration of any  
16 particular cascade. It could be located on the  
17 upstream, and it could be in the middle. It could be  
18 at the bottom, depending on where the hydraulic  
19 control's on.

20 Q. But it's at that point where the water calms down  
21 out of the cascade; isn't that right?



22 A. It's where there is less vertical component than  
23 the other portion.

24 Q. Now, is it right, Dr. Li, that if all of the  
25 measurements of weighted usable area that you have for  
0200 cascades are in this plunge pool area, the estimated  
01 weighted usable area for the entire cascade is going to  
02 be overestimated?  
03

04 A. Depends on what the depth and velocities are in  
05 the other portions. All we can say is those areas are  
06 unaddressed.

07 Q. Are -- excuse me?

08 A. Are unaddressed.

09 Q. And, in fact, the IFG4 model is inaccurate in  
10 these areas; isn't that right?

11 A. It's very difficult to get those calibrated.

12 Q. So the answer to my question is yes, as you report  
13 in the draft report, the IFG4 model will not accurately  
14 predict weighted usable area in that portion of cascade  
15 with a large vertical element?

16 A. Yes.

17 Are you really interested in why I put it back in  
18 rather than keeping it out, rather than prolonging this  
19 thing?

20 Q. Well, Dr. Li, I will ask you, despite my rule:  
21 Why did you decide to put this back in?

22 A. It happens to be the basic rule that when you have  
23 data, you don't throw it out, because when you throw it  
24 out, you're subject to the criticism that you're being  
25 arbitrary and capricious.

0201

01 Now, in reviewing the data that I had, I took a  
02 look at the hydraulic calibrations, every detail, and  
03 everything else other than my own personal bias, led me  
04 to believe that it was unrealistic. I could not  
05 technically throw it out for reasons of model  
06 performance.

07 Therefore, rather than throw away all the  
08 information, I preferred to include that information,  
09 however flawed I might have thought it was.

10 MR. HERRERA: Your ten minutes has expired.

11 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you.

12 Q. BY MR. BIRMINGHAM: Dr. Li, what was your  
13 experience -- and this will be the last question I  
14 have.

15 When you wrote "this habitat model of Reach Three  
16 is unrealistic based upon our experience in delineating  
17 habitat on the creek," what experience were you  
18 referring to?

19 A. BY DR. LI: In my mind's eye, simply looking at  
20 the difference in weighted usable area between Reach  
21 Two and Reach Three is largely due to the fact that  
22 Reach Three is longer than Reach Two. I did not take  
23 that into consideration.

24 It simply surprised me that the weighted usable  
25 area peaked at a higher flow in Reach Two than in Reach  
0202

01 Three.

02 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Thank you.

03 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ms. Cahill?

04 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I didn't realize all my time was  
05 up.  
06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Oh?  
07 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Actually, I have no more  
08 questions.  
09 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MS. CAHILL  
10 Q. Good afternoon, Dr. Li.  
11 A. BY DR. LI: Good evening, Ginny.  
12 MR. FRINK: Mr. Birmingham --  
13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Actually,  
14 Mr. Birmingham, did you want that marked?  
15 MR. BIRMINGHAM: We'll mark that next in order.  
16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Next in order.  
17 MR. SMITH: Okay. It's 166.  
18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: You need to have  
19 Mr. Birmingham sign that and appropriate copies made  
20 for all parties.  
21 (L.A. DWP 166 was marked for  
22 identification.)  
23 MR. DODGE: Mr. Del Piero, can we put on the rest  
24 of our witnesses tomorrow?  
25 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I'll have very few questions for  
0203  
01 Mr. Messick.  
02 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Yes, sir. 8:30  
03 tomorrow morning.  
04 Q. BY MS. CAHILL: Dr. Li, can you tell us again what  
05 the habitat types were in Reach Three?  
06 A. BY DR. LI: Pool, riffle, run, and cascade.  
07 Q. And there's no doubt that there is habitat in pool  
08 areas?  
09 A. That's correct.  
10 Q. And there is habitat in riffle areas?  
11 A. Yes, there is.  
12 Q. There is habitat in run areas?  
13 A. Yes, there are.  
14 Q. And there is habitat, at least in plunge pool  
15 areas of the cascade habitat type?  
16 A. Yes, there is.  
17 Q. It's fair to say there is habitat on Reach Three  
18 in Lee Vining Creek?  
19 A. Yes, there is.  
20 Q. When you did your electrofishing, did you, in  
21 fact, find some fish in Reach Three on Lee Vining  
22 Creek?  
23 A. Yes, I did.  
24 Q. With regard to the --  
25 MR. DODGE: Mr. Del Piero, do we have a running  
0204  
01 understanding that these questions beyond surrebuttal  
02 are limited to ten minutes for all parties?  
03 MS. CAHILL: It will be.  
04 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Fine. We now have  
05 that understanding.  
06 MR. DODGE: And could I send the bill to these  
07 people who are going beyond the rules for Dr. Li's  
08 time? They're wasting my client's money.  
09 MR. BIRMINGHAM: I suspect that they will be sent  
10 to the Department of Water and Power, in any event.  
11 Q. BY MS. CAHILL: With regard to the fact that WUA

12 seemed to be increasing with discharge, was it true  
13 that it was increasing with discharge more in Reach  
14 Three than in Reach Two? This was something that was  
15 in the draft.

16 Let me -- don't bother to look, Dr. Li.

17 Whether the weighted usable area was increasing  
18 faster in Reach Two or in Reach Three, it wouldn't mean  
19 that either one was necessarily inaccurate, would it?

20 A. BY DR. LI: That's correct.

21 Q. And at the time you wrote your draft report, you  
22 had -- well, let me withdraw that.

23 It was your decision by the time you issued the  
24 final report in the Lee Vining Creek study, that it was  
25 preferable scientifically to include the Reach Three  
0205

01 data than to exclude it?

02 A. After detailed discussions with some of my subs  
03 and with my client, I came to realize that what I was  
04 doing was indefensible in removing Reach Three.

05 In reviewing that data, all the data appeared to  
06 be reasonable, and I was not considering that the  
07 state's discharge relationships that I based the  
08 hydraulic model on were under conditions where air  
09 entrainment, which was one of my greater concerns, was  
10 not a factor.

11 Therefore, the estimate of flow above the highest  
12 flow would not have been affected by those sorts of  
13 considerations.

14 Q. Okay. So in the end, it was your decision, as  
15 Mr. Smith stated the other day, that it was better to  
16 include that data?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Have you, in fact, reviewed the transcript of  
19 Mr. Smith's testimony?

20 A. Yes, I have.

21 Q. And do you disagree with anything that he said  
22 about the Rush -- about the Lee Vining Creek study?

23 A. No, I don't.

24 MS. CAHILL: Thank you.

25 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Roos-Collins?  
0206

01 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. ROOS-COLLINS

02 Q. Good evening, Dr. Li.

03 A. BY DR. LI: Good evening, sir.

04 Q. I have no questions about the IFIM on Lee Vining  
05 Creek.

06 A. Thank you.

07 Q. Instead, let's turn to your transect, specifically  
08 transect 56, in National Audubon Society Exhibit 264.

09 Do you have that transect in front of you?

10 A. Yes, I do.

11 Q. Now, during his cross-examination, Mr. Birmingham  
12 asked you several questions about this transect. One  
13 of the questions went to whether changes elsewhere  
14 would be reflected in the transect data, and you said  
15 no.

16 Was that your answer to that question?

17 A. Yes, it was.

18 Q. Let's explore that a little bit. Let's assume  
19 that the channel immediately upstream of transect 56

20 had substantially narrowed and deepened between 1987  
21 and 1994. Are you with me so far?  
22 A. Yes.  
23 Q. Would that narrowing and deepening of the channel  
24 immediately upstream of transect 56 change the  
25 hydraulic force entering transect 56?

0207

01 A. Yes.  
02 Q. Would you expect the change in hydraulic force  
03 entering the transect to work a change on the transect  
04 itself?  
05 A. Yes.  
06 Q. So if this transect in 1994 is comparable to the  
07 transect in 1987, wouldn't that suggest that the  
08 hydraulic force entering the transect does  
09 substantially change during that period?  
10 A. It would.

11 MR. ROOS-COLLINS: Thank you, no further  
12 questions.

13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Valentine?

14 MR. VALENTINE: No questions.

15 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge?

16 MR. DODGE: No questions. I offer Exhibit 264.

17 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Frink?

18 MR. FRINK: I have no questions, but I believe  
19 some of the other Staff does.

20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Satkowski?

21 MR. SATKOWSKI: No questions.

22 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Smith?

23 MR. SMITH: No questions.

24 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Herrera?

25 MR. HERRERA: I have one question.

0208

01 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE STAFF

02 Q. BY MR. HERRERA: In Mr. Birmingham's  
03 cross-examination, he indicated that the version of the  
04 draft Lee Vining report was different than the one he  
05 had. Was there more than one draft?

06 A. BY DR. LI: Yes, there was.

07 Q. So, apparently, I've got a different draft because  
08 Mr. Birmingham was utilizing my draft report, so  
09 essentially there was one more than one Lee Vining  
10 draft report?

11 A. Yes, there was.

12 Q. Was there different dates or different notations?

13 A. There were different dates on the front, and I  
14 would have to go back to my help to determine which  
15 ones you had.

16 Q. Do you know if both of these drafts were submitted  
17 to the Water Board?

18 A. I --

19 Q. Or do you need to discuss that with Fish and Game?

20 A. I don't know, Steve. What started this stuff was  
21 the draft that you apparently received was intended for  
22 internal review and not meant to be released as a  
23 review at that time.

24 Q. What was the date on your draft that you were  
25 referring to this evening?

0209

01 A. July 1992 -- yeah, July 1992.

02 Q. And the version I have is dated December 1992?  
03 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Excuse me, Mr. Del Piero. The  
04 version you gave me last week, Mr. Herrera, is the same  
05 version that I have here. So apparently you have both  
06 versions.  
07 MR. FRINK: And both of those versions would be  
08 included in the Staff files on this matter, which if  
09 they weren't otherwise identified, were included as  
10 SWRCB Exhibit 2.  
11 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Let me state the basis for my  
12 saying that. Last week when I was asking questions  
13 about this report, I referred to the statements that  
14 are contained on page 28 of the draft report that I  
15 currently have, and those statements do not appear on  
16 page 28 of the report that Mr. Herrera has today. So  
17 apparently he has both reports.  
18 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Further questions,  
19 Mr. Herrera?  
20 MR. HERRERA: I have no further questions.  
21 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Canaday?  
22 MR. CANADAY: None.  
23 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: I have one question,  
24 Mr. Dodge.  
25 ///

0210

01 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY THE BOARD  
02 Q. BY HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Dr. Li, is it  
03 common when preparing a report for drafts to be  
04 circulated for comment by one's peers and colleagues?  
05 A. BY DR. LI: Yes, it is.  
06 Q. It is common for comments to be made based on  
07 those comments?  
08 A. Yes, it is.  
09 Q. Have you ever written a draft report or changed  
10 one based on comments?  
11 A. I don't think I've written anything that I haven't  
12 changed.  
13 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Mr. Dodge?  
14 MR. DODGE: I want to know whether Exhibit 264 has  
15 been received.  
16 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: If it has not, it is  
17 now.  
18 (NAS/MLC Exhibit No. 264 was  
19 admitted into evidence.)  
20 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Ladies and gentlemen,  
21 we will see you at 8:30 tomorrow morning.  
22 Mr. Canaday, do you have any comment, sir?  
23 MR. CANADAY: Just to make sure we understand who  
24 the witnesses tomorrow will be.  
25 Mr. Dodge, you will call in the morning --

0211

01 MR. DODGE: We'll start with Tim Messick. We'll  
02 go to Peter Vorster, and Patrick Flinn has a person  
03 he's going to call. His name I've forgotten Bahman, or  
04 something like that, and I think in terms of our  
05 witnesses, that will wrap it up.  
06 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay. Mr. Birmingham,  
07 Dr. Beschta and Mr. Hasencamp?  
08 MR. BIRMINGHAM: Mr. Hasencamp will instruct me in  
09 the morning.

10 HEARING OFFICER DEL PIERO: Okay. We are  
11 scheduled into the evening tomorrow evening in the  
12 event it takes longer than I hope.

13 (Whereupon the proceedings were  
14 adjourned at 7:55 p.m.)

15 ---o0o---

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

0212

01 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

01  
02 ---o0o---

02  
03 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
03 ) ss.  
04 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO )  
04

05 I, KIMBERLEY R. MUELLER, certify that I was the  
06 official court reporter for the proceedings named  
07 herein; and that as such reporter, I reported, in  
08 verbatim shorthand writing, those proceedings, that I  
09 thereafter caused my shorthand writing to be reduced to  
10 typewriting, and the pages numbered 1 through 209  
11 herein constitute a complete, true and correct record  
12 of the proceedings:

13  
14 PRESIDING OFFICER: Marc Del Piero  
15 JURISDICTION: State Water Resources Control Board  
16 CAUSE: Mono Lake Diversions  
17 DATE OF PROCEEDINGS: February 17, 1994  
18

19 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed this  
20 certificate at Sacramento, California, on this 1st day  
21 of March, 1994.

22  
23  
23  
24  
25  
25

---

Kimberley R. Mueller  
CSR No. 10060