



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION

1125 TENTH STREET
SACRAMENTO 14, CALIFORNIA
Telephone: Hickory 5-4711, Extension 4377

JAN 23 1962

Board of Directors
Eastern Kern County Soil
Conservation District
445 West Ridgcrest Boulevard
Ridgcrest, California

Attention: Mr. Joe Fox, Secretary

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to receipt of your request to the Division of Soil Conservation, dated January 13, 1961, for an investigation and report on a proposal to include a 1st (California City) Addition in the Eastern Kern County Soil Conservation District and recommend boundaries for such an addition, an investigation has been made, and the following report is submitted to your Board:

1. Within the area recommended, soil and water conservation problems and related land use problems appear adequate and of a type suitable for the practical and feasible extension of the District's program. Adjustment of the District program to embrace the concept of District wide comprehensive soil and water conservation planning based on locally associated watershed units is emphasized with this addition. Watershed protection for flood control and the establishment of wind erosion control measures are principal related problems with this proposed annexation.
2. The area recommended for inclusion as referenced in the attached Description of Recommended Boundary lies within the existing external boundaries of the district and comprises portions of contiguous lands located in the central southeastern part of the district originally excluded during the formation period. A total of 36 ownerships, involving 54 parcels and 31,952 acres more or less comprising portions of T 30S, R 39E; T 30S, R 40E; T 31S, R 39E; T 31S, R 40E; T 32S, R 38E and T 32S, R 39E are recommended for inclusion. An appended list of the ownerships and parcels for inclusion is appended hereto for your information.

3. Processing of this addition may be completed under Sections 9317 et. seq. of the Soil Conservation District Act (Statutes 1961) covering contiguous additions providing the separate ~~separate~~ ownerships involved are properly identified by execution of appropriate ownership documentation of the existing proposal-petition.
4. Following the validation of the proposal-petition as set forth above, the proposal should be forwarded to the Kern County Boundary Commission with a request for their consideration and report to your Board, in accordance with instructions of Section IV of the Handbook for Addition Procedures. Subsequent steps are also outlined in that section.

Yours very truly,

DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION

Sam Henderson

for Arthur L. Darsey
Chief

ALD:pf

Enclosures: Description of Recommended Boundary
Map
Ownership list

cc: Mr. John S. Barnes
Mr. George K. Gibbs
Mr. C. G. Ullman
Work Unit Conservationist ✓

DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION
 DESCRIPTION OF RECOMMENDED BOUNDARY
 OF THE PROPOSED
 1ST (CALIFORNIA CITY) ADDITION TO THE
 EASTERN KERN COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
 Kern County

All that portion of the unincorporated lands of Kern County, lying within the exclusion boundaries of land excluded from the Eastern Kern County Soil Conservation District, as the same was organized on the 1st day of June 1953, as per recording in the official minutes of the Board of Supervisors of Kern County at Page 482 of Book 91 of the Official Minutes of said Board, said lands being contained within T 32S, R 38E; T 32S, R 39E; T 31S, R 39E; T 31S, R 40E; T 30S, R 39E and T 30S, R 40E, MDB&M, more particularly described as follows:

1. All of Fractional Section 1, T 32S, R 38E
2. All of Fractional Section 3, T 32S, R 38E
3. All of Fractional Section 5, T 32S, R 38E
4. All of Section 9, T 32S, R 38E
5. All of Section 11, T 32S, R 38E
6. All of Section 15, T 32S, R 38E
7. All of Fractional Section 1, T 32S, R 39E
8. All of Fractional Section 3, T 32S, R 39E
9. All of Fractional Section 5, T 32S, R 39E
10. All of Fractional Section 7, T 32S, R 39E
11. All of Section 9, T 32S, R 39E
12. All of Section 11, T 32S, R 39E
13. All of Section 13, T 32S, R 39E
14. All of Section 15, T 32S, R 39E
15. All of Section 17, T 32S, R 39E
16. All of Fractional Section 19, T 32S, R 39E
17. All of Section 23, T 32S, R 39E
18. $S\frac{1}{2}$ Exc. Road 7.78 Acres of Fractional Section 1, T 31S, R 39E
19. $N\frac{1}{2}$ Fractional Section 1, T 31S, R 39E
20. All of Fractional Section 3, T 31S, R 39E
21. $NE\frac{1}{4}$ of $NE\frac{1}{4}$; $S\frac{1}{2}$ of $NE\frac{1}{4}$; $SE\frac{1}{4}$ of $NW\frac{1}{4}$; $S\frac{1}{2}$ of Section 5, T 31S, R 39E
22. All of Fractional Section 7, T 31S, R 39E
23. All of Section 9, T 31S, R 39E
24. All of Section 13, T 31S, R 39E
25. All of Section 15, T 31S, R 39E
26. All of Section 16, T 31S, R 39E
27. All of Section 17, T 31S, R 39E
28. All of Fractional Section 19, T 31S, R 39E
29. All of Section 21, T 31S, R 39E
30. All of Section 23, T 31S, R 39E
31. All of Section 25, T 31S, R 39E
32. All of Section 27, T 31S, R 39E
33. All of Section 29, T 31S, R 39E
34. All of Fractional Section 31, T 31S, R 39E
35. All of Section 33, T 31S, R 39E
36. All of Section 35, T 31S, R 39E
37. All of Fractional Section 3, T 31S, R 40E
38. All of Fractional Section 5, T 31S, R 40E

REPORT ON PROPOSED NEW SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
EASTERN KERN COUNTYINTRODUCTION

A request for an investigation and report on a proposed soil conservation district in the eastern part of Kern County was forwarded to the State Soil Conservation Commission on February 9, 1951, by the County Counsel of Kern County for the Board of Supervisors. The proposal for the formation of this proposed soil conservation district came from a group of farmers in the Cantil, Mojave, and Willow Springs areas of eastern Kern County and was received by the Supervisors on December 26, 1950.

The proposal for the formation of this district came as an outgrowth of the investigations being made of proposed additions to the Tehachapi and Antelope Valley Soil Conservation Districts in the vicinity of Cantil and Willow Springs. On December 15, 1950, the proponents of these additions and other landowners of the same general areas met and decided to consolidate their proposals with a request for the formation of a new district including all the eastern part of the County adjacent to the areas they represented. This action was consummated by formation of a committee for organization of a district and by election of Mr. W. F. Reynolds of Mojave as Chairman of the Committee.

INVESTIGATION

The Cantil area which requested addition to the Tehachapi District, and the Willow Springs area which requested addition to the Antelope Valley District are about thirty miles apart, with Cantil being north of Mojave and Willow Springs southwest of Mojave. Requests for inclusion of these areas into the adjacent Districts

were received by the respective Boards of Directors at about the same time. The investigation of these two proposals for additions were made together by the Commission's staff. These additions were discussed with the proponents and with others in the same area, whose interest in soil conservation districts might have a bearing on selection of boundaries for these additions. These discussions led to further contacts in determining the sphere of influence each District had in the area of eastern Kern County represented by the groups making requests for these additions.

The result of these investigation was not conclusive, and it appeared best that all persons who might be concerned and interested in these matters meet and discuss their desires in relation to the possibilities for joining either or both of the Districts. The directors of the Tehachapi and Antelope Valley Soil Conservation Districts together with Mr. O. J. Backus of Mojave called a meeting on December 15, 1930, for this purpose. At that time, Mr. Hopper explained the possibilities of participation in district activities by addition to the Tehachapi District, by addition to the Antelope Valley District, or by formation of a new district. The group's decision was to proceed with the formation of a new district and organized a committee to carry out the necessary steps.

Following the request for an investigation of this proposed district, an investigation was made to determine the practicability and feasibility of formation of the district and to determine boundaries to recommend for the district. The Organising Committee, representatives of public agencies owning lands in the area, representatives of private owners of lands in the area, public organisations, county officials, and representatives of agricultural

agencies were contacted and consulted as is reported hereafter.

On December 20, 1950, Secretary Anderson received a communication from the Bakersfield Law Firm of Borton, Petrini, and Conron, asking that they be notified of the formation of any soil conservation districts in Kern County or adjacent counties where Kern County lands might be included. Following the receipt of the proposal from the Kern County Board of Supervisors and on February 14, 1951, Secretary Anderson met with Mr. Conron of this law firm and discussed with him the formation of the proposed district in eastern Kern County. It developed that the law firm represented the M & R Sheep Company, Gregorio Mandiburu, and Joe Mandiburu, who together own approximately 80,000 acres in eastern Kern County. On February 22, Secretary Anderson was informed by the law firm that their clients desired to have their lands excluded from the proposed district.

The Pacific Coast Berax Company, a division of Berax Consolidated, Ltd., operates a large refining plant at Boron, California, near the eastern edge of Kern County. They own and control the mineral rights on 8,472 acres of land. On March 1, 1951, they were contacted regarding the formation of this proposed district. On March 9, 1951, a letter was received from the Company asking that their lands be excluded from the proposed district.

The investigation continued throughout the period from February 9 to May 2, 1951. Frequent calls were made at the Kern County Court House to determine land status in the proposed district. Mr. Hopper contacted public and private agencies that had control of large blocks of land in the area. The Southern Pacific Land Company was contacted on February 26 regarding their lands of

approximately 66,000 acres. They indicated they would not oppose the formation of this district or ask that their lands be excluded. On February 26, the Bureau of Land Management endorsed the formation of the district and the inclusion of its lands of approximately 486,000 acres. The Indian Service reported on February 27 they had no land in the area of the proposed district. The U. S. Air Force was contacted on March 1, 1951, to explain to them the proposed district and the inclusion of Edwards Air Force Base at Muroc, California. There was no indication of disapproval of the Air Force on inclusion of their lands. The U. S. Forest Service contacted on February 28 indicated they approved of the inclusion of a small portion of the Sequoia National Forest (the Seodie Unit - 5,120 acres) that lies within the boundaries of the proposed district. During the course of the investigation, frequent contacts were made with members of the Organizing Committee. Contacts were also made with the Agricultural Extension Service and the Production and Marketing Administration on March 28, the Naval Ordnance Testing Station at Inyokern on April 10, and the Ridgecrest Chamber of Commerce on April 10 and May 2.

As proposed by the Organizing Committee, the first concept of the possible area of this proposed district was all of eastern Kern County that could profitably benefit by district formation and where there was interest in district formation. At the start of the investigation, it appeared all of the County east of the San Joaquin River drainage area not now a part of any district should be included. As the investigation continued and it became apparent that some lands would be excluded, it became more difficult to determine where the boundaries of this district should be.

By March 26, the requests for exclusion were beginning to congeal. Mr. Hopper met with the Organizing Committee at that time to seek their counsel in the selection of a boundary. The Committee regretted the requests for exclusion by the M & R Sheep Company, the Mendiburus, and the Pacific Botax Company, but were not deterred from their purposes by these developments. They suggested that the area around the town of Beren should be left out, that the area around Randsburg and Johannesburg should be left out, that the City of Mojave should be included, and that the north boundary should be drawn north of Cantil excluding the area around Inyokern. In conclusion, however, they left the final selection of the boundary to the Commission's staff.

Following this meeting, the County Assessor, Mr. J. H. Hanks, was consulted on March 28, in regard to drawing boundaries, and he was asked to indicate his preference in how to handle the requested exclusions in the boundary description. Mr. Hanks prefers that a complete description of the exterior boundaries of the district be made and that requested exclusions be listed as exceptions from within the external boundaries. The description of the recommended boundaries is prepared in accordance with Mr. Hanks' suggestion.

Also, on March 28, representatives of the Agricultural Extension Service and the Production and Marketing Administration were interviewed to learn their opinions on the formation of this district and the location of its boundaries. Both interviews resulted in endorsement of the proposed district and the suggestion that the area around Inyokern be included in the district. Both said there is more agricultural development under way, better

development possible, and better water in this section of the proposed district than in any other section.

Pending further contacts in the Inyokern area, completion of the investigation was delayed, and on April 10 a contact was made with the Public Works Department of the Naval Ordnance Testing Station at China Lake. Commander S. K. Wilson, Public Works Officer, and Mr. M. C. Lipp, Planning Superintendent of the Public Works Department, were in accord with the proposed district and suggested the boundaries be extended to include the Station's lands in San Bernardino County. The Station also owns land extending many miles north into Inyo County, but since this is primarily a testing range and no developmental work is contemplated on this land, they did not think it desirable to have it included in the district at this time. The Public Works Department at the Station has undertaken a large program for control of wind by establishing wind break and other types of work. For the past several years, they have carried on a research program to select planting materials that are adapted to the desert conditions. The results of this work will be available to the district. Water for the base comes from a number of wells, and their daily consumption is from two to five million gallons per day. They are now interested in utilizing treated sewage water for irrigation purposes to reduce their total daily consumption of water.

On the advice of a landowner in the Inyokern area, the Ridgecrest Chamber of Commerce was consulted regarding this proposal on April 19 and May 2. It is the only organized group that would be in a position to consider the inclusion of this area in the proposed district and advise on this determination. At the meeting of the

Chamber of Commerce on May 2, Mr. Hopper appeared before them and sought their guidance on this matter. Several of the members of the Chamber who are interested in the agricultural possibilities of the Ridgecrest area recommended that it be included in the proposed district.

The largest population in all of eastern Kern County is in the Inyokern area at China Lake and at Ridgecrest. They are dependent primarily on the Naval Ordnance Testing Station for a livelihood. Agriculture has been practiced near Ridgecrest for many years. At first, fruit was produced, but high production costs forced abandonment. Alfalfa and irrigated pastures in small amounts continued. Now there is a revised interest in expanding the cultivation of the land. Cotton has been successfully grown, but most interest seems to be in family sized farms for fruit and hay production. In parts of the area, adequate water close to the surface seems to be available. Besides the Naval Station, industry in the Searles Lake area is drawing water from the Inyokern basin, and so far, only slight declines in the water table have been noted. Recently, the Bureau of Land Management has opened 2,200 acres just west of Ridgecrest for homesteading in five acre parcels, and there are many applicants for their land. The district will be able to assist these people in land development and irrigation layouts, and assist those already farming in better utilization of their water on the one thousand or so acres of land now being irrigated. As in Mojave, the district may wish to assist the townspeople of Ridgecrest in their problems of planting for wind protection and water utilization.

Both the Agricultural Extension Service and the Production and

Marketing administration pointed out the need for an office in the eastern part of the County where residents can secure information and assistance without traveling to Bakersfield. It may be that an office maintained by the district will be able to assist both of these agencies in carrying out their programs.

During the course of the Commission's investigation, the Organizing Committee attempted to contact Mr. Mendiburu directly and to explain their purposes to him. They have been unable to do so; though as they proceed toward district formation, they will continue in their efforts to make this contact. On May 2, Mr. Hopper contacted Mr. Conron, of the Law Firm of Bor ton, Petrini, and Conron and reviewed his findings of the investigation with him. Mr. Conron appreciated the attitude of the Commission's representatives in working with him for exclusion of the M & R Sheep Company's lands and the Mendiburu's lands, and stated that it may be that Mr. Mendiburu will change his mind in the future. Mr. Conron indicated Mr. Mendiburu's decision to exclude his lands was based on the poor reputation of soil conservation districts in Kern County, generated principally through the "dust problem" episodes of the southern San Joaquin Valley. Mr. Mendiburu's opinion appears to be that of his attorneys, which in general is a distrust of district laws, due to the possibilities of their being changed.

DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA

On the east, the proposed district is bounded by the Kern County-San Bernardino County line except on the northeast corner where it extends into San Bernardino County to include the lands of the Naval Ordnance Testing Station. On the south, it is bounded by the Antelope Valley District. On the north, it is bounded by the

Kern County-Inyo County line. On the west, it is bounded by existing school district lines, and the east boundary of the proposed addition number one to the Tehachapi Soil Conservation District. In general the west boundary follows the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains as closely as is possible where school district lines are followed. The major exception to this is just north of the Tehachapi District where the drainage of Jaw Bone Canyon extends ten miles or so west of the recommended boundary. However, the agriculture of this area is primarily grazing and the land types are mountainous rather than desert as is the rest of the proposed district.

Excluded from within the exterior boundaries are the properties of the M & R Sheep Company, the Mendiburu lands, the properties of the Pacific Coast Borax Company, the area in and about the town of Beron, and several sections of land near Randsburg and Johannesburg where the interests are primarily mining and not agricultural.

The following listings show the approximate size of the area and the approximate size of the major parcels of land:

TOTAL ACREAGE WITHIN EXTERIOR BOUNDARIES

Kern County	1,194,000
San Bernardino County	<u>58,880</u>
	1,252,880
Exclusions - (Kern County)	
M & R Sheep Company	80,000
Mendiburu	2,000
Borax Company	8,472
Other	<u>7,600</u>
	98,072
Balance - Total Acreage of District	
Kern County	1,095,928
San Bernardino County	<u>58,880</u>
	1,154,808

LAND OWNERSHIP IN DISTRICT AREA

2173

Private Lands
 Southern Pacific Company
 Other

65,900
385,000

450,900

Public Lands
 Sequoia National Forest
 (Scodic Unit)
 Naval Ordnance Testing Station
 Edwards Field
 Bureau of Land Management

5,120
 126,080
 86,000
486,708

TOTAL

703,908

1,154,808

The topography of the proposed district is featured by the east face of the Tehachapi Mountains along its western edge; the Fremont Valley heading near Cantil and extending in a southwesterly direction through Mojave and joining with the Antelope Valley near Rosamond; the basin wherein is located Inyokern and Ridgecrest in the northeastern corner of Kern County; the lesser mountains on the desert extending from north of Cantil through Randsburg and Johannesburg; and the desert plateau lying east of Mojave. Except for the mountainous areas, the land surface is rolling with ridges and basins wherein lie dry lakes. The land is covered with desert type vegetation. During years of adequate rainfall, sufficient forage is produced to support grazing.

Each basin like area has a potential for intensive development with adequate water. The dry lakes are alkali, but the adjacent slopes appear to have ideal productive soils. Agricultural development has taken place at several different places in eastern Kern County. Recently, several wells of about 1,000 foot depth have been successful north of Willow Springs and produce large quantities of water. These lands in this area are being developed for potato

production. It is reported that more wells are to be developed in the same general region. In the area north of Rosamond and south of Mojave, there has been considerable exploration for water with some good results. Some of this land has been subdivided, and small wells have been developed that produce sufficient water for domestic purposes and for use on small acreages.

In the Cantil area, adequate water is present for expansive development of agriculture. Other factors such as the extreme winds and distance to markets had held back its full development. In and around Inyokern, agricultural development is going forward rapidly. In some respects, this area seems to have the best potentials for future development of any area in eastern Kern County. Water and good soils are in abundance, plus the presence of the Naval Ordnance Testing Station that provides a place of supplemental employment and a close by market.

In the vicinity of Boron, there is little agricultural activity, and it is reported that the presence of Boron dust from the processing plant of the Pacific Coast Borax Company makes it difficult for plant life to exist.

CONSERVATION PROBLEMS

Long time residents of the area say there are two things needed on the desert to make life more enjoyable and provide a productive agriculture. The Organizing Committee for this proposed district believe that a district can assist them in working on these problems. The first is protection from the winds which blow steady and strong, and the second is a plan for the maximum utilization of developed water resources. It appears that it will be possible for the proposed district to work on both of these problems.

The proponents of this district have in mind for the district to take the leadership in seeking a complete study of water resources, both immediate available supplies and possible future supplies, by the various state and federal agencies qualified to undertake these studies. Based on the reports that will be available to the proponents, they plan to make recommendations for development and use of the land in their work with private landowners.

The Antelope Valley Soil Conservation District has pointed the way in planning for protecting land from wind in the desert area. The Organizing Committee of this proposed district has followed their plans with interest and feel that similar plans would work well in their area. The basis of the plan is essentially the assembling of information relating to most desirable species of trees for wind breaks, the best possible means of planning land use for wind erosion control, and other wind damage control measures, and making these available to the local farmers. It also includes the establishment of a local nursery sponsored by the district for economical production of planting materials fitted to the special needs of the area.

There are other conservation problems in the area. Several years ago, Ross Rogers of Cantil made his first investigations of soil conservation districts following a damaging flash flood in the Cantil area from Jaw Bone Canyon. He was concerned with two things: control of the flood waters and better utilization of these waters than permitting them to evaporate in Salt Lake. Flash flood controls are a conservation need of the area. Water development and range management are needed for the grazing lands. For several years, the Bureau of Land Management has had a soil and

moisture conservation area in eastern Kern County; wherein special funds are allocated for use in water development. They have not done a great deal due to lack of money and personnel, but the need is there. Through cooperation with a soil conservation district, this effort may be advanced.

The cultivated land, or land that is suitable for cultivation, needs the basic conservation practices used in land development, maintenance of productive capacity, irrigation engineering, and crop selection and adaptation. Complete plans for development of the agricultural possibilities of the area are needed. These can be made available through the proposed district.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The formation of this district will consolidate the proposals for additions to the Tehachapi and Antelope Valley Districts from the people in Cantil and Willow Springs areas. It is recommended that these proposals now be rejected. These people and others from around Mojave and Ridgecrest expressed their desire for the formation of this district and feel that it can serve their needs better than can either of the adjacent districts. Conservation as practiced through this proposed district can serve the lands within the proposed area by assisting the landowners in protection from flash floods and wind damage, and assist through studies of water development possibilities, and apply conservation practices consistent with land development; such as irrigation engineering, maintenance of productive capacity, and by crop selection and adaptation. Both the Agricultural Extension Service and the Production and Marketing Administration of Kern County have indicated they believe this district could be beneficial to the

lands it proposes to include.

The recommended boundaries follow the general lines as submitted in the proposal. Lands belonging to the M & R Sheep Company, Gregorio Mendiburu, and the Pacific Coast Borax Company have been excluded on request of these landowners. All public agencies owning land in the proposed district as well as the Southern Pacific Land Company have either endorsed the formation of this district or stated they would not oppose it nor request the exclusion of their lands. The description of recommended boundaries that accompanies the report to the Board of Supervisors was prepared as recommended by the Kern County Assessor.

Favorable action is recommended on the proposal to form a soil conservation district in eastern Kern County.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Sven G. Anderson

Sven G. Anderson
Secretary

Prepared by:
Herbert A. Hopper

Berkeley, California

May 11, 1951

STATE SOIL CONSERVATION COMMISSION

REPORT ON PROPOSAL FOR A
SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
EASTERN KERN COUNTY

Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Kern
Court House
Bakersfield, California

Pursuant to request of the County Council of Kern County dated February 9, 1951, requesting an investigation by the State Soil Conservation Commission on the proposal to form a soil conservation district in eastern Kern County, an investigation has been made and report prepared as follows:

1. The soil and water and land use problems of the area recommended herein appear to be adequate to justify the formation of and operation of a soil conservation district for a considerable period of time. An outline of a suggested district program, exclusive of matters that require direct decisions by the directors is attached hereto.
2. The area recommended for inclusion in this proposed soil conservation district is all of eastern Kern County, not now a part of or approved part of either the Tehachapi or Antelope Valley Soil Conservation Districts exclusive of the exclusions listed hereafter, and including the China Lake School District in San Bernardino County. A description of the recommended boundary, exclusions and map are attached hereto.
3. The M & R Sheep Company and Gregorio Mendibara have requested through their attorneys, Bertlett, Petrini, and Conron, the exclusion of their lands from this proposed district. The Pacific Coast Borax Company likewise has asked the exclusion of their lands in the vicinity of Boron. Exclusion of these lands is recommended in the attached boundary description as well as the lands adjacent to the town of Boron and the towns of Johannesburg and Randburg.
4. The Southern Pacific Land Company, the U. S. Bureau of Land Management, the U. S. Forest Service, the U. S. Air Force, and the U. S. Navy, all of whom own large areas of land in the proposed district have been contacted and either endorse the proposed district or have stated they

will not oppose the formation of the district or ask for the exclusion of their lands from it.

5. The proponents of formation of this district and representatives of the Chamber of Commerce of Mojave and Ridgecrest have endorsed the inclusion of the towns of Mojave and Ridgecrest. China Lake School District in San Bernardino County is recommended for inclusion on the request of representatives of the Public Works Department, Naval Ordnance Testing Station, China Lake.
6. The approximate size of the district, the principle exclusions therefrom, and the approximate size of the major land holdings are as follows:

TOTAL ACREAGE WITHIN EXTERIOR BOUNDARIES		
Kern County	1,194,000	
San Bernardino County	58,880	
	<u>1,252,880</u>	
Exclusions - (Kern County)		
M & R Sheep Company	80,000	
Mendibura	2,000	
Borax Company	8,472	
Other	7,500	
	<u>98,072</u>	
Balance - Total Acreage of District		
Kern County	1,095,928	
San Bernardino County	<u>58,880</u>	
		1,154,808
LAND OWNERSHIP IN DISTRICT AREA		
Private Lands		
Southern Pacific Company	65,900	
Other	<u>385,000</u>	
		450,900
Public Lands		
Sequoia Nation Forest (scodic Unit)	5,120	
Naval Ordnance Testing Station	126,080	
Edwards Field	86,000	
Bureau of Land Management	<u>486,708</u>	
		703,908
TOTAL		<u>1,154,808</u>

7. Problems of development of water resources and studies pertaining thereto, control of wind and wind damage to crops, flash flood damage control, land development, irrigation engineering, and other soil and water conservation measures basic to maintenance of land productivity are problems of the area with which the proposed soil conservation district will be able to assist individual farmers and groups of farmers.

8. Agricultural development is taking place on lands in the vicinity of Willow Springs, Cantil, and Ridgecrest. Additional acreages of land are being made available for

DESCRIPTION OF RECOMMENDED BOUNDARIES
PROPOSED SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
EASTERN KERN

Beginning at the most northeasterly corner of Kern County and the most northwesterly corner of San Bernardino County; thence east along the boundary common to Inyo and San Bernardino Counties to its intersection with the range line common to ranges 42 and 43 east, M. D. B. & M., which point is on the east boundary of China Lake School District; thence southwesterly along said east boundary of China Lake School District to the north east corner of Section 3, T 26 S, R 42 E, M. D. B. & M.; thence continuing along said school district boundary south to the south east corner of Section 15, said T and R; thence continuing along said school district boundary west to the southwest corner of said Section 15; thence continuing along said school district boundary, south to the south-east corner of Section 21, said T and R; thence continuing along said school district boundary west to the southwest corner of said Section 21; thence continuing along said school district boundary, south to the county road that runs east and west through Sections 29 and 30, said T and R, and Sections 25 and 26 of T 26 S, R 41 E; thence continuing along said school district boundary, west along said county road to the point in section 26, T 26 S, R 41 E where said school district boundary bears southwesterly; thence southwesterly along said school district to the point in Section 5, T 27 S, R 41 E where said school district boundary bears west along the eastward extension of the south boundary of Section 36, T 26 S, R 40 E; thence continuing along said school district boundary, west to the southwest corner of said Section 36, T 26 S, R 40 E, which point is on the boundary common to San Bernardino and Kern Counties; thence south along the boundary common to Kern and San Bernardino Counties to the boundary common to Section 8 and 17, T 9 N, R 7 W, S. B. B. & M.; thence west to the range line common to ranges 13 and 14 west, S. B. B. & M.; thence north to the township line common to townships 10 and 11 north S. B. B. & M.; thence west to the southwest corner of Section 35, T 11 N, R 15 W; thence north to the northwest corner of Section 23 said township and range; thence east to the southwest corner of Section 16, T 11 N, R 14 W; thence north to the northwest corner of Section 9 said T and R; thence east to the northeast corner Section 10 said T and R; thence south to the southeast corner said Section 10; thence east to the southwest corner of Section 9, T 11 N, R 13 W; thence north to the northwest corner said Section 9; thence east to the northeast corner said Section 9; thence north to the northwest corner of Section 3 said T and R; thence east to the Northeast corner said Section 3; thence north the township line common to township 12 N S. B. B. & M. and township 32 S M. D. B. & M; thence east to the southwest corner of Section 35, T 32 S, R 35 E; thence north to the township line common to townships 31 and 32 south M. D. B. & M; thence east to the range line common to ranges 35 and 36 east M. D. B. & M.; thence north along said range line to the northwest corner of the southwest one quarter of the southwest one quarter of Section 6, T 29 S, R 36 E; thence east to the center of said southwest one quarter Section 6; thence north to the north boundary of said Section 6; thence north along the range line common to

D. B. & M. to the township line common to
& M; thence east to the range line
, M.D. B. & M; thence north to the
Inyo Counties; thence east to the point
Ranges 35 and 36
townships 27 and
common to range
boundary commencing therefrom;
of beginning

lands in the vicinity of the towns of Ransburg and
Ransburg being Sections 25, 35, 36, T 29 S, R 40 E,
1. sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12 T 30 S, R 40 E, M. D. B.

These lands in the vicinity of the town of Boron being the
East one half of Section 30, and all of Sections 31 and
32, T 11 N, R 7 W, S. B. B. & M., and subdivision Tract
No. 1049 in Section 6, T 10 N, R 7 W, S. B. B. & M.

3. The lands owned or controlled by Borax Consolidated, Ltd.,
and Pacific Coast Borax Company, being,

Description	Acres
All of Section 17, T 11 N, R 7 W, S. B. B. & M.	640
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 20, T 11 N, R 7 W, S. B. B. & M.	160
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ - S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ - S $\frac{1}{2}$ of S $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$	
W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 18, T 11 N, R 7 W	277
All Frl. Section 19, T 11 N, R 7 W	632
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 2, T 11 N, R 8 W	160
All Frl. Section 3, T 11 N, R 8 W	610
N $\frac{1}{2}$ - SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 11, T 11 N, R 8 W	400
All except W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ and W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$	
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 27, T 11 N, R 8 W	600
All of Section 13, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
All of Section 15, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
All of Section 16, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
All of Section 21, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
All of Section 23, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ - W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 22, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
All except SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Frl., Section 24, T 11 N, R 8 W	240
All of Section 14, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
N $\frac{1}{2}$ of N $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 25, T 11 N, R 8 W	640
	156

4. The lands owned by the M & R Sheep Company, being,

S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ & SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ lying S. of S.P.R.R.	85
Section 23, T 30, R 37	
N $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of N $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$	
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 25,	
T 30, R 37	
W 2068.8 ft. of N $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ lying S. of S.P.R.R.	260
R/W, Section 26, T 30, R 37	
S $\frac{1}{2}$ of N $\frac{1}{2}$ exc E 20 a Section 26, T 30, R 37	39
N $\frac{1}{2}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 35, T 30, R 37	140
All exc W 567 ft. of N 467, Section 36, T 30, R 37	640
	635

	Acres
W $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 29, T 30, R 30	320
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ FRL, Section 30, T 30, R 38	146
All FRL, Section 31, T 30, R 38	624
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ -SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ exc N 121 ft. of W $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 32	294
S $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 33, T 30, R 38	360
S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 25, T 30, R 39	80
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 33, T 30, R 39	120
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 35, T 30, R 39	560
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 27, T 30, R 40	160
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 27, T 30, R 40	160
S $\frac{1}{2}$ of S $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 29, T 30, R 40	160
N $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 31, T 30, R 40	320
W $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 31, T 30, R 40	332
All Section 33, T 30, R 40	640
All Section 35, T 30, R 40	640
N $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 1, T 31, R 37	326
S $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 1, T 31, R 37	320
N $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 2, T 31, R 37	334
S $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 2, T 31, R 37	320
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ FRL, Section 4, T 31, R 37	171
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of S $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ - SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 7, T 31, R 37	744
All Section 12, T 31, R 37	640
N $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 15, T 31, R 37	320
All Section 17, T 31, R 37	640
S $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 20, T 31, R 37	320
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 21, T 31, R 37	40
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 21, T 31, R 37	140
All Section 32, T 31, R 37	640
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ exc pc 150 ft. x 250 ft. in SE corner, Section 30, T 31, R 37	159
W $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 31, T 31, R 37	335
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 33, T 31, R 37	200
W $\frac{1}{2}$ Section 36, T 31, R 37	320
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Section 6, T 31, R 38	160
All FRL, Section 7, T 31, R 38	621
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 15, T 31, R 38	480
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 16, T 31, R 38	140
All Section 17, T 31, R 38	640
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ FRL exc S 467 ft. of W 467 ft., Section 18 T 31, R 38	148
NE $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 23, T 31, R 38	480

	Acres
$\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 35, T 31, R 38	200
W $\frac{1}{2}$ -NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 36, T 31, R 38	560
S $\frac{1}{2}$ exc road 7.78A, Section 1, T 31, R 39	312
N $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 1, T 31, R 39	325
N $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 3, T 31, R 39	331
S $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 3, T 31, R 39	320
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -S $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 5, T 31, R 39	481
N $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 7, T 31, R 39	320
W $\frac{1}{2}$ FRL, Section 7, T 31, R 39	328
All Section 9, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 13, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 15, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 16, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 17, T 31, R 39	640
All FRL, Section 19, T 31, R 39	653
All Section 21, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 23, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 25, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 27, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 29, T 31, R 39	640
All FRL, Section 31, T 31, R 39	656
All Section 33, T 31, R 39	640
All Section 35, T 31, R 39	640
All FRL, Section 1, T 31, R 40	641
All FRL, Section 3, T 31, R 40	641
All FRL, Section 5, T 31, R 40	641
All FRL, Section 7, T 31, R 40	653
All Section 9, T 31, R 40	640
All Section 11, T 31, R 40	640
All Section 15, T 31, R 40	640
All Section 17, T 31, R 40	640
All FRL, Section 19, T 31, R 40	654
All Section 21, T 31, R 40	640
All Section 35, T 31, R 40	640
$\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ - $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 15, T 32, R 36	120
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -N $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of W $\frac{1}{2}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ -N $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 16, T 32, R 36	260
NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 24, T 32, R 36	160
SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 26, T 32, R 36	160
S $\frac{1}{2}$ -W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 34, T 32, R 36	400
All FRL, Section 1, T 32, R 37	644
W $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 3, T 32, R 37	80
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ FRL, Section 4, T 32, R 37	166
N $\frac{1}{2}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 4, T 32, R 37	80
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 4, T 32, R 37	40
SW $\frac{1}{4}$ exc rd 1.82A, Section 22, T 32, R 37	158
All exc rd 3.64A, Section 23, T 32, R 37	636
N $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 24, T 32, R 37	320
S $\frac{1}{2}$, Section 25, T 32, R 37	320
NW $\frac{1}{4}$ exc rds 1.82A, Section 25, T 32, R 37	158
S $\frac{1}{2}$ exc W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$ -N 15 ft. of W $\frac{1}{2}$ of NW $\frac{1}{4}$ of SW $\frac{1}{4}$, Section 26, T 32, R 37	300

SUGGESTED OUTLINE FOR A DISTRICT PROGRAM
FOR THE PROPOSED
EASTERN KERN COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT

CHAPTER I - THE DISTRICT

(To be developed by district directors when organized)

History, physical characteristics, climate, natural vegetation, wildlife, land ownership, crops, population, public facilities, problems, agricultural advantages, and crop values.

CHAPTER II - LAND USE

(To be developed by district directors when organized)

Description of land groups of irrigated, dry-farmed, and range.

CHAPTER III - DISTRICT PROGRAM

A. Its Objectives

A soil conservation district is a local unit of state government voluntarily organized by the people under the provisions of Division IX of the Public Resources Code of the State of California. Through such an organization, it is possible for communities, individual farmers, and ranchers to conserve soil and water resources by prevention and control of runoff, soil erosion and soil deterioration by organized effort. Improved farm irrigation, land drainage, land clearing, land levelling, diversion of runoff, construction of stock water ponds and reservoirs, gully control, channel alignment and bank protection, and encouragement of land use in accordance with its recognized capabilities are some of the items included in district activities.

Through the efforts of its Board of Directors who are land-owners in the district, a comprehensive soil conservation program will be administered which, when carried out by the individual farmers or groups as they are able, will conserve the soil and water resources of the area and fully utilize those resources in the performance of any agricultural operations.

B. Its Purpose

The Directors of the District will coordinate the advice and assistance that is available from all the Federal, State, County, and local agricultural agencies and organizations and will provide the farmers in the district who want help, such advice and assistance that the district can secure for them.

The Directors will assist groups of farmers on inter-property problems to develop mutually agreeable solutions and plans for controls, and will assist in the execution of such plans.

The Directors will encourage district farmers to participate in the District Program, and will carry out to the best of their

ability, the requests and suggestions of the district farmers.

The Directors will initiate studies and investigations of any problem that may be significant in the general welfare or possible improvement of the agricultural interests in the district, and will solicit the cooperation of district farmers in the development and execution of any plans that appear feasible for community improvement.

G. Its Benefits

The adoption and use by the farmers of the services the district will provide will result in the following benefits:

Soil Surveys - With a physical inventory of the soil, its capabilities for maximum production and its limitations will be known and available to all district farmers. Lands suitable for certain crops and unsuitable for others will be shown, as well as conservation farming practices that should be employed to overcome any limitations such as shallow soil, high water table, alkali, etc.

Levelling - Conservation engineering surveys and designs will permit more efficient use of irrigation water as well as promote greater efficiency in the application of water. *also irrg. systems*

Farm Runoff Control - Recommendations and designs for diversion ditches, check dams, and improvement of water ways will control runoff and reduce erosion and silting damage.

Water Conservation - Conservation designs and construction supervision of small dams, diversions and percolating systems will detain flood waters and help *replenish* the underground water resources.

Flood Control - Cooperative work with public agencies and districts on flood control, if and when such a program is authorized, will protect the interests of local people and accomplish vast community improvement.

Drainage - Conservation designs and recommendations for sub-surface drainage will remove underground waters in areas needing such work, to depths where root zones for crops will be increased as well as improving the condition of surface wet spots in fields and other areas.

Range and Pasture Improvement - Encouragement of establishment of better range grasses, water development, and improvement of range conditions will increase beef production, control erosion, and reduce runoff.

Cropland and Orchards - Recommendations for cover crops on sloping lands, rotations where possible and practicable, and improved land management will increase production, control runoff

and reduce erosion.

Cooperation - Contacts and negotiations with other agencies will accelerate proposed long-time projects for community betterment. Cooperation between farmers on our own problems will make for better and more prosperous living and result in the establishment of a permanent agriculture with maximum production.

Water Resource Studies - Compilation of available data and encouragement of qualified public agencies in obtaining additional data, as a basis of determining the potential of agricultural development within the resources of the area. Based on the results of such studies, the district can encourage or discourage agricultural development through contacts with local landowners, recommendations being based on accurate knowledge of water potentialities.

Wind Control - By seeking adapted plant species, by recommending cultural practices in handling the land, by providing an economical source of planting materials, control of destructive winds can be beneficial to home and land.

CHAPTER IV - POLICIES OF THE DISTRICT

(To be established by the district directors when organized)

Application forms for farmers requesting assistance, priorities for serving farmer requests, Farmer-District Cooperative Agreement forms, procedure for cooperating with groups, agencies from whom assistance will be requested, membership of advisory committee, fiscal policies, equipment and district construction policies, records, and reports.

CONSERVATION PROGRAM
of the
EAST KERN SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
Kern County, California

CHAPTER I

THE DISTRICT

FORMATION OF THE DISTRICT:

The East Kern Soil Conservation District was organized in accordance with Division IX, Public Resources Code for the State of California. The Resolution and Notice of Hearing was approved by the County Board of Supervisors of Kern County, March 2, 1953. The Public Hearing was held March 24, 1953. The election was held May 22, 1953. Of the 291 ballots cast, 235 or 80.8% were favorable. The resolution creating the District was passed by the Board of Supervisors for Kern County on June 1, 1953. Directors elected were: O. J. Backus, Joe Fox, Sr., Harry M. Levy, Julio Lombardi, Joe Sprott.

The organization meeting of the Directors was held July 1, 1953 in the Elementary School building in Mojave, California. Mr. O. J. Backus was designated as President of the Board and Mrs. Faye Allersmeyer as Secretary. Regular meetings are held at the Elementary School in Mojave on the third Wednesday of each month.

LOCATION AND BOUNDARIES:

The District is located in eastern Kern County, California. On the east it is bounded by the Kern County--San Bernardino County line. On the south, it is bounded by the Antelope Valley Soil Conservation District. On the north, it is bounded by the Kern County--Inyo County line. On the west, it is bounded by existing school district lines and the east boundary of the Tehachapi Soil Conservation District. In general, the west boundary follows the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains as closely as is possible where school district lines are followed. A map showing the legal boundaries is included in this program. The approximate area of the District is 1,221,460 acres. The total number of acres owned by the United States, this state, any public district, or any city and county is 682,137 acres. The total number of persons who are owners of land in the District are 4,493.

DESCRIPTION:

The topography of the District is featured by the east face of the Tehachapi and Sierra Nevada Mountains along its western edge; the Fremont Valley heading near Cantil and extending in a southwesterly direction through Mojave and joining with the Antelope Valley near Rosamond; the basin wherein is located Inyokern and Ridgecrest in the northeastern corner of Kern County; the lesser mountains on the desert extending from north of Cantil through Handsburg and Johannesburg; and the desert plateau lying east of Mojave. Except for the mountainous areas, the land surface is rolling with ridges and basins wherein lie dry lakes. The land is covered with desert type vegetation. During years of adequate rainfall, sufficient forage is produced to support ^{2,000} grazing. There are two general land types: mountainous and desert.

Long time residents of the area say there are two things needed on the desert to make life more enjoyable and provide a productive agriculture. The first is protection from the winds which blow intermittent and strong, and the second is a plan for the maximum utilization of developed water resources.

RAINFALL DATA:

The climate of the East Kern Soil Conservation District is characterized by low annual precipitation, low humidity, comparatively high temperatures in both summer and winter, great daily range in temperature, and strong winds at certain seasons of the year.

Although the annual precipitation is generally low, single storms may be very intense and may do great damage. Topography and altitude cause local differences in climate. The following figures are from the weather station at Backus Ranch and illustrate the type of climate at that location:

UPDATE

ADD

WIND STUDIES

Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Mean Annual
<u>Average Precipitation (Precipitation season 37/38 to 50/51)</u>												
1.19	2.17	2.00	.36	.13	.03	.00	.15	.39	.40	.33	1.97	7.10
<u>Highest Temperature Recorded</u>												
79	78	83	97	100	107	109	109	108	99	99	77	
<u>Lowest Temperature Recorded</u>												
7	15	21	26	36	35	50	46	31	28	16	15	
<u>Average Relative Humidity (%)</u>												
55.3	56.5	55.0	45.0	34.8	58.3	24.4	27.6	33.5	43.0	45.5	58.6	
<u>Evaporation (inches)</u>												<u>Ann. Av.</u>
2.75	3.56	5.38	9.27	13.61	16.93	19.31	18.31	12.66	7.74	4.50	3.14	118.0

PRESENT LAND USE:

A. Dryland

Dryland farming is almost prohibitive due to low rainfall. Perhaps the only area that can safely produce a crop of wheat or barley is near the Willow Springs Area.

B. Irrigated

About 1900 acres are now used for irrigated crops. This is just a small fraction of the land that can be developed for irrigation. In the past year alfalfa has been the leading crop. Truck crops, cotton, and corn has been grown successfully.

UPDATE

ADD

SUGAR BEETS

TREAT GOVT. INSTALLATIONS ETC. RECREATIONAL AREAS

The soils are deep, coarse to light textured in the area now developed. Surface and internal drainage is good. The soil should not be left exposed over large areas because of wind erosion. Most of the soils are subject to wind erosion because of the lack of organic matter.

Water for irrigation is pumped from deep wells. The depth of the wells varies from a few to 1100 feet. The water lift is from artesian to 315 feet. In local areas there has been some concern over a possible drop in water table with the increasing development of land.

UPDATE
Irrigation for the most part is by sprinkler systems. There are some flood and furrow irrigation in the Willow Springs Area.

Problem:

1. Wind erosion on bare fields
2. Control of rodents
3. Lowering of water tables
4. Proper irrigation methods
5. Type of rotation to use
6. Fences

Conditions Which Cause Problems:

1. Extent of bare fields
2. Lack of organic matter in the soil
3. Increase of rodents
4. Length of irrigation runs
5. Open range

Corrective Measures:

1. Plant good wind breaks
2. Use of green manure crops
3. Proper methods of irrigation
4. Close range
5. Effective control of rodents
6. Trial plots for types of rotation
7. Detailed Soil Surveys on developed land and land expected to be developed

C. RANGE

The range area in this district is found in the floor of the Valley and along the foothills and in the mountains. Much of the land in the Valley floor is forced into range due to low rainfall. For the same reason carrying capacity is low. A small portion located along the northwest boundary near Walker Pass offers a somewhat higher capacity due to higher rainfall. For the most part the soil is deep in the Valley and in the mountains it is shallow and rocky. Most of the valley is covered with creosote brush and thin cover of grass.

Problems:

1. Wind erosion
2. Proper range management
3. Lack of sufficient watering places for stock
4. Determine grasses adapted to area for seeding on better sites
5. Selection of areas for range seeding.

Conditions Which Cause Problems:

1. Lack of rainfall resulting in lack of vegetation
2. Open range

Corrective Measures Needed

1. Proper range management
2. Development of stock water
3. Trials of adapted grasses on suitable sites

WILD LIFE AREAS

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

CHAPTER II

LAND USE CAPABILITIES

In a recent reconnaissance soil survey a few Land Use Capability Classes were established (See attached map). A Land Use Capability Class indicates to the rancher the suitability of land for the different practices. As an example, Classes I, II, III and IV can be used for production of crops but with increasing difficulties or restrictions with increase in number. Classes VI and VII are not suitable for range. Class VIII is suitable for watershed and wildlife. There is a possibility that what is mapped as a Class VII may in some instances be reclassified as Class II or III with the introduction of water.

Land Capability Classes established are: Land Class VIIIe1, VIIIe7, VIIIe3, VIIIe6, VIIIs7 and VIe6. Descriptions of the above classes are presented below and on the following page.

The total acreage is broken down as follows:

VIIIe1	165,399	Acres
VIIIe7	29,220	"
VIIIe3	24,689	"
VIIIe1	525,727	"
VIIIe6	16,400	"
VIIIs7	23,000	"
VIe6	17,649	"

About 526,400 Acres is tillable if water is available.

DESCRIPTION OF LAND CAPABILITIES

- VIIIe1 Steep, rocky mountain slopes, not suitable for any productive agricultural use. Such sites are important as watershed and for wildlife use. Protection from fire is most important.
- VIIIe7 This land is alkali and lake bed flats. It has no productive use except for salt mining, etc. It is non-productive for agricultural uses.
- VIIIe3 The soil is rather shallow and the surface texture is light to medium. Slopes are moderate to steep. Rainfall is less than 8" per year.
- VIIIe1 This site is located in the valley floor. The surface soils vary from heavy to light texture. Some subsoils are heavy. Rainfall is less than 8 inches per year. Vegetation is principally creosote bush, wild buckwheat, and scattered Joshua trees and rabbit brush.

Under irrigation the capability may be changed to Class II or III.

- VIIe6 This is mountain browse range. The soil is rather shallow and the surface texture is light to medium. Slopes are moderate to steep. Annual rainfall varies from about 8 - 12 inches.
- VIIIs7 This site is located in the valley floor. The soils range in texture from light to heavy. This land has a high concentration of alkali present, resulting in poor soil structure and poor water penetration. Reclamation of this land is economically prohibitive.
- VIe6 The surface soils are light to medium textures moderately deep, with some subsoil development. Slopes are moderate () - 15%. Annual rainfall varies from 8 - 12 inches. Vegetation consists of grass-brush.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT PROGRAM

A. Its Objectives

A soil conservation district is a local unit of state government voluntarily organized by the people under the provisions of Division 11 of the Public Resources Code of the State of California. Through such an organization, it is possible for communities, individual farmers, and ranchers to conserve soil and water resources by prevention and control of runoff, soil erosion and soil deterioration by organized effort. Improved farm irrigation, land drainage, land clearing, land levelling, diversion of runoff, construction of stock water ponds and reservoirs, gully control, channel alignment and bank protection, and encouragement of land use in accordance with its recognized capabilities are some of the items included in district activities.

Through the efforts of its Board of Directors who are land-owners in the district, a comprehensive soil conservation program will be administered which, when carried out by the individual farmers or groups as they are able, will conserve the soil and water resources of the area and fully utilize those resources in the performance of any agricultural operations.

B. Its Purpose

The Directors of the District will coordinate the advice and assistance that is available from all the Federal, State, County, and local agricultural agencies and organizations and will provide the farmers in the district who want help, such advice and assistance that the district can secure for them.

The Directors will assist groups of farmers on inter-property problems to develop mutually agreeable solutions and plans for controls, and will assist in the execution of such plans.

The Directors will encourage district farmers to participate in the District Program, and will carry out to the best of their ability, the requests and suggestions of the district farmers.

The Directors will initiate studies and investigations of any problem that may be significant in the general welfare or possible improvement of the agricultural interests in the district, and will solicit the cooperation of district farmers in the development and execution of any plans that appear feasible for community improvement.

C. Its Benefits

The adoption and use by the farmers of the services the district will provide will result in the following benefits:

Soil Surveys - With a physical inventory of the soil, its capabilities for maximum production and its limitations will be known and available to all district farmers. Lands suitable for certain crops and unsuitable for others will be shown, as well as conservation farming practices that should be employed to overcome any limitations such as shallow soil, high water table, alkali, etc.

Levelling - Conservation engineering surveys and designs will permit more efficient use of irrigation water as well as promote greater efficiency in the application of water.

Farm Runoff Control - Recommendations and designs for diversion ditches, check dams, and improvement of water ways will control runoff and reduce erosion and silting damage.

Water Conservation - Conservation designs and construction supervision of small dams, diversions and percolating systems will detain flood waters and help build up the underground water resources.

Flood Control - Cooperative work with public agencies and districts on flood control, if and when such a program is authorized, will protect the interests of local people and accomplish vast community improvement.

Drainage - Conservation designs and recommendations for sub-surface drainage will remove underground waters in areas needing such work, to depths where root zones for crops will be increased as well as improving the condition of surface wet spots in fields and other areas.

Range and Pasture Improvement - Encouragement of establishment of better range grasses, water development, and improvement of range conditions will increase beef production, control erosion, and reduce runoff.

Cropland and Orchards - Recommendations for cover crops on sloping lands, rotations where possible and practicable, and improved land management will increase production, control runoff and reduce erosion.

Cooperation - Contacts and negotiations with other agencies will accelerate proposed long-time projects for community betterment. Cooperation between farmers on our own problems will make for better and more prosperous living and result in the establishment of a permanent agriculture with maximum production.

Water Resource Studies - Compilation of available data and encouragement of qualified public agencies in obtaining additional data, as a basis of determining the potential of agricultural development within the resources of the area. Based on the results of such studies, the district can encourage or discourage agricultural development through contacts with local landowners, recommendations being based on accurate knowledge of water potentialities.

Wind Control - By seeking adapted plant species, by recommending cultural practices in handling the land, by providing an economical course of planting materials, control of destructive winds can be beneficial to home and land.

CHAPTER IV

REVISION

This program will be revised when deemed necessary by the Directors or the majority of the people in the District.

East Kern Soil Conservation District

By *U. J. Macius*
U. J. Macius
President, District Directors

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
EAST KERN SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
RESOLUTION NO. 3

BE IT RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

WHEREAS, a program outlining in general the soil and water conditions and the long time objectives which the District hopes to obtain in the solution of such problems of soil and water conservation, including the improvement of farm irrigation within the East Kern Soil Conservation District, has been prepared and considered by this body;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this program be, and the same is, hereby adopted as the official soil conservation program of the District; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the President affix his signature to the District Program, and that a copy of this Resolution No. 3 be made a part of the minutes of this meeting, and that a certified copy be attached to each copy of the District Program.

• • • • •

I, the undersigned, being secretary of the Board of Directors of the East Kern Soil Conservation District, do hereby certify that the above is a true and exact copy of Resolution No. 3, which was adopted by the Directors of the District at a meeting held on the 20th day of January, 1954.

Faye Allersmeyer
Faye Allersmeyer, Secretary

Formation of District

#1 A request for ~~an~~ an investigation and report on a proposed Soil Conservation District in the eastern part of Kern County was forwarded to the State Soil Conservation Commission on February 9 1951 by the County Counsel of Kern Co. for the Board of Supervisors. The proposal for the formation of the proposed Soil Conservation District came ~~from~~ from a group of farmers in the Cantil, Mojave and Willow Springs areas of Kern County and was received by the Supervisors on December 26 1950

#2 On March 24 1953, a public hearing on a petition to ~~form the E.K.S.C.D was held in the office~~
FORM
form the East Kern Soil Conservation District, was held in the office of the Board of Supervisors of Kern County, Calif.

Opportunity was given for any one to speak in favor of or against the petition. A number of persons spoke in support of it. Also the privilege was given for any landowner in the proposed district to ask that his land be excluded. Two requests for exclusions were presented. When every one who desired to speak had been given an opportunity to do so, the hearing was closed

3 On the 31st. day of March 1953, the County Board of ~~of~~ Supervisors adopted a resolution granting the petition for the formation of the District and calling an election to be held on the 22nd. day of May 1953

4 As a result of that election, the County ^{BOARD} Board of Supervisors passed a resolution declaring, A majority of all votes cast at the election were in favor of the election. formation of the district and declaring the election of the following directors O.J. Backus, Joe Fox, Sr. Harry Levy, Julio

Lombardi and Joe Sprott.

Physical Features

The District is located in Eastern Kern Co. California. On the East it is bounded by The Kern County San Bernardino County Line. On the South, it is bounded by Antelope Valley Soil Conservation District. On the North, it is bounded by The Kern County Inyo County Line. On the West, it is bounded by existing School District Line and the East Boundry of the Tehachapi Soil Conservation District. In general, the East Boundry follows the crest of the Tehachapi Mountains as closely as is possible for a School District Line to follow. The approximate area of the District is 1,221,460 acres. The total number of persons who are owners of land in the District are 4,493.

The District includes the towns Boron, Cantil, Edwards, Inyokern, Johannesburg, Mojave, Randsburg and Ridgecrest. and Willow Springs.

Accomplishments

The organization meeting of the Directors was held July 1 1953 in the Elementary School Building in Mojave Calif. O.J. Backus was designated as President of the Board and Mrs. Faye Allersmeyer as Secretary.

A District work program outlining in general the Soil and water conditions and the long time objectives which the District hopes to obtain in the solution of such problems of soil and water conservation was adopted by thr Directors of the District at a meeting hald on the 20th. day of Jan. 1954

A District work plan, designed to provide a well rounded and coordinated plan for the conservation of soil and water resources in the District was adopted by the Board of Directors at a meeting held on the 17th day of February 1954

To facilitate the establishments of soil and water conservation measures in the District, the Board of Directors at a meeting held Feb, 17 1954 adopted Resolution # 4 entering into a Memorandum of Understanding with the United States Department of Agriculture. This Memoranda was signed in the Secretary's office March 22 1954

At the meeting held Feb 17 1954 the Board, also, adopted Resolution # 6 thereby entering into a Supplemental Memorandum of Understanding with the Soil Conservation Service. This memorandum was signed by the State Conservationist March 26 26 1954.

Other accomplishments include a Reconnaissance Conservation Survey of the entire District, the receipt and approval of applications for assistance in solving conservation problems, from 15 farmers, the preparation of four farmer District Agreements, and the district agreements, and the distribution of several hundred trees to be planted as windbreaks.

Complying with the aims set forth in the Districts work plan, every effort will be made to attain certain goals in the future. Some of which are, complete detailed conservation survey's on areas for farming operations are being developed. Assist ranchers in planning and establishing conservation programs on their individual ranches.

Encouraging wind break planting by supplying information on the selection of desirable species, and providing planting stock. Other conservation problems will be attacked as they arise.

Summary of Grants Related to Groundwater Management Awarded to Eastern Kern County
(EKCRCD) – Partial Listing
Prepared May 16, 2016

Coordinated Resource Management Planning (CRMP) for flood management in the Indian Wells Valley – Grant application by EKCRCD to the Department of Conservation (Grant # 3097-302). Funding awarded in May, 1, 1998 - \$11,000. (PRC 9084; PRC 9408(b)) “Districts may cooperate with counties and cities on resource issues of local concern. It is the intent of the Legislature to encourage districts to facilitate cooperation among agencies of government to address resource issues of local concern.”

AB 303 Local Groundwater Assistance Program for Indian Wells Valley. Grant application by EKCRCD on behalf of the Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group. Funding awarded in June, 29, 2001 - \$207,000 by Department of Water Resources (Agreement # 4600001829). (PRC 9001 (2); PRC 9408(b))...”It is the intent of the Legislature to encourage districts to facilitate cooperation among agencies of government to address resource issues of local concern.”

Watershed Coordinator Grant for Indian Wells Valley-Searles Valley Watersheds – Grant application by EKCRCD. Funding awarded for three-year grant in 2010 - \$229,688.00 by Department of Conservation (Grant # 3010-208). (PRC 9408; PRC 9001(b) (3); 9408(b)) “Facilitate coordinated resource management efforts for watershed restoration and enhancement”

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Grant to remove invasive weeds, including salt cedar, which impacts water quantity and quality – Grant application by EKCRCD in collaboration with Kern Valley Resource Conservation District and California Audubon Kern River Preserve. Funding awarded in June 1, 2010 - \$49,999.00 by Department of Food and Agriculture (Agreement # 09-0562). (PRC 9417; PRC 9417.5) “It is the intent of the Legislature that concerned state agencies, in cooperation with resource conservation districts and other appropriate local entities, work with agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, and other federal agencies to maximize cooperative opportunities for federal, state, and private funding for competitive grants and contracts for watershed protection, restoration, and enhancement programs of resource conservation districts.”

Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District (EKCRCD) Participation in other collaborative efforts on resource issues of local concern.

EKCRCD is a signatory to the MOU for the Indian Wells Valley Cooperative Groundwater Management Group (IWVCGMG). The Board designates a Director to attend meetings and prepare a report for the members of the EKCRCD Board. The EKCRCD designated representative is currently serving as Chair for the IWVCGMG.

EKCRCD is a signatory member of the Inyo-Mono Integrated Regional Water Management Group (Inyo-Mono IRWM). The Board designates a Director to attend meetings and prepare a report for the members of the EKCRCD Board.

EKCRCD is a participating member of the Fremont Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Group (Fremont Valley IRWM). The Board designates an Associate Member to attend organizational meetings for the IRWM and prepare a report for the members of the EKCRCD Board.

EKCRCD is a participating member of the Kern Weed Management Area. The Board designates a Director to attend meetings and EKCRCD Administrative Assistant provides clerical assistance for the KWMA for its quarterly meetings held in Tehachapi, California.

EKCRCD is a participating member of the Department of the Navy's Restoration Advisory Board. The Board designates a Director to attend meetings, review documents, and prepare a report for the members of the EKCRCD Board.

EKCRCD is a participating member of the Public Lands Roundtable of Ridgecrest with meetings held at the Ridgecrest Office of the Bureau of Land Management. The Board designates a Director to attend meetings and prepare a report for the members of the EKCRCD Board.

References Sponsored by Eastern Kern Co. RCD

- 01 Austin, Ward H., 1990, Remote Sensing and Geophysical Studies Demonstrate the Indian Wells Valley and Rose Valley are Open Basins, Kern, Inyo, and San Bernardino Counties, California, Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District, 35 pages.
- 71 Erskine, M.C., June 29, 1989, Review of the Geohydrology of the Indian Wells Valley Region, Kern, Inyo, and San Bernardino Counties, California, Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District, 47 pages.
- 120 Lofgren, Ben, 1989, Effects of Agricultural Pumping North of Inyokern, Indian Wells Valley, Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District, 6 pages. (With #71).
- 132 Muir, Mark P., and Birman, J. H., 1986, "Investigations of Ground Water Flow Directions in the Southwestern Extension of the Indian Wells Valley, California," GSI/Water Geothermal Surveys, Inc., Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District, 26 pages.
- 135 O'Brien, D.P., 1989, Compilation and Interpretation of Gravity and Magnetic Data in the Indian Wells Valley, Including Portions of Bakersfield and Trona 1:250,000 Quadrangles, California, ICON Resources, Ltd., Prepared by Comap Explorations Services, Inc. for Eastern Kern County Resource Conservation District, 35 pages.
- 185 Whelan, James A., September 1990, "A Water Geochemistry Study of Indian Wells Valley, Inyo and Kern Counties, California, Supplement, Isotope Geochemistry and Appendix H, NWC TP 7019 Supplement, 52 pages.

Soil Survey Publications

- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2007. Soil survey of Kern County, northeastern part, and southeastern part of Tulare County, California.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1988. Soil survey of Kern County, California, northwestern part.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1973. Soil survey of Kern County, California, southeastern part.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1995. Soil survey of northeastern Kern Area, California, Ridgecrest part.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1984. Soil survey of NE Kern area, California, China Lake Naval Weapons Center part.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 1989. Soil survey of portions of the China Lake Naval Weapons Center, California, including parts of Inyo, Kern and San Bernardino counties.