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Sometimes, it takes a second glance to see what’s right in front of you. When I first came to Southern California, I landed in Long Beach. On our plane’s descent, my mother and I marveled at a group of dolphins splashing about in the Pacific. The weather was a comfortable 75 degrees and the sun glinted off of the airport’s vintage art deco control tower. Then our cousin picked us up and drove us into the Inland Empire. Long Beach’s picturesque boulevards yielded to a slow-motion tour of the channelized San Gabriel River, which was in turn lost to endless warehouses punctured only by an occasional strip mall-lined boulevard. The San Gabriel Mountains were blanketed by a smoggy film that also fully obscured the hills to the south and east of Claremont. Having grown up in Washington State, I was used to Seattle’s lush parks and the state’s endless stretches of evergreen forests. Despite our proximity to the mountains—they are only a five-minute car ride from the campuses—Los Angeles seemed a wholly unnatural place.

The prospect of moving away to college loomed, and the Inland Empire, which stretched beyond this hazy edge of my vision, intimidated me. As it turns out, I found Claremont a charming and entirely manageable place to live. The Inland Empire seemed manageable as well, as it was over there—outside of the trees. I saw Los Angeles, to the west, as the capitol of the metropolis, and San Bernardino, to the east, as the hinterlands. As I dug into the Environmental Analysis major, I became interested in the context of Los Angeles as case study of environmental problems, how they are understood from a popular perspective, and in turn what solutions are proposed. Los Angeles, it seemed, had sustainability wrong on nearly every count.

Seeking an answer to Los Angeles’ sprawling, freeway-centric culture, I spent a semester studying Danish approaches to sustainability through urban design. I learned the principles of
walkability and livability—how designers and city officials create a neighborhood comfortable for walking, biking, and spending time in public space. When I returned, I noticed some of these strategies put to use in Claremont and certain neighborhoods in Los Angeles. Downtown and the Arts District, especially, have made moves toward creating “complete streets,” which include safe bike lanes and sidewalks that expand viable transportation modes and prioritize a vibrant pedestrian experience. These small pockets of Los Angeles follow traditional principles of the “sustainable village” that promotes local businesses, reduces automobile use, and builds community. Los Angeles as a whole, however, is an entirely different story. The city’s underlying logic resists such a concentric approach to sustainability, even if we alter such a model to account for multiple centers of organization. Upon returning to Los Angeles, I discovered an avant-garde architectural and urban design scene, drawing more on Los Angeles’ role in speculative architecture and the modern planning project of the 20th century than from advocates of the sustainable village. This is not to say that the sustainable village model does not have its place, but that Los Angeles, and indeed many other sprawling cities in the United States, begs for a different approach to sustainability.

**Gravel Pit/Construction Site**

I first thought about the gravel pit that sits east of the Colleges at the beginning of my second year at Pomona. After a summer at home in eastern Washington, my return to Pomona promised another year at school and the 24/7 access to friends and optimism that come with being in Claremont. As I drove my Zipcar to my storage unit in Upland, I could not help but appreciate how Claremont’s leafy trees gave way to the vast expanse of the wash and the towering, sunlit mountains in the distance. This, I thought, is a truly beautiful place to live.
The gravel pit, in many ways, tells the story of development in Claremont. The insularity and the privilege of Claremont’s trees reveal its city planners’ intentions, certainly reflected in James D. Blaisdell’s plan for “a college of the New England type in southern California.”¹ This 80 acre gash in the region’s landscape is, in a sense, the negative space to Claremont and Upland’s radial development. This cavernous pit, obscured on its Claremont sides by high burns, hints at the stunning openness of Claremont’s position in the vast San Antonio alluvial fan. It also lends a visual representation to understand the scale at which planners, engineers, and hydro-geologists have gone to battle with the natural ecologies of the foothills in order to make Claremont and Upland habitable in the modern sense. Finally, and perhaps most relevant to the development of this thesis, beginning to understand how the land east of CMC came to its current condition requires some background information on the wider processes of development in the area and, indeed, the wider context of Los Angeles and Southern California.

Like many curiously underdeveloped sites, the gravel pit also implies possibility for future site conditions and programs. Fenced off like a construction site, the pit has always inspired casual speculation as to what might be done with the space. It seems only natural that Pitzer and Claremont Mckenna Colleges, which border the pit, have plans to expand their campuses into its western edge. The Claremont University Consortium, which has owned the 80-acre property since 1988, and refers to the site as “East Campus,” has proposed to use a majority of the block to expand the campuses of those two colleges.² The design process that determines this expansion has important implications for the future of the Colleges, as well as the towns of Claremont, Upland, and Montclair that abut it. The pit is part of a stretch of “left over” wash that planners in Claremont and Upland couldn’t—or didn’t care to—address. As Montclair grows

north from the area around the I-10 freeway, there is an opportunity to redefine the relationship between these cities and contribute to quality of life in the surrounding area.

These plans also have important implications for the institutional legacy of the Consortium. Aside from discussions and plans surrounding the Bernard Field Station, projects on East Campus represent the most significant planning initiatives taken on by the colleges since the addition of Pitzer College in 1963 and Keck Graduate Institute in 1997. The consortium’s developments in the gravel pit will set key precedents for what the institution’s dedication to sustainability looks like in practice. The project, like any intervention in the built environment, will also define possibilities for expansion in the future and will permanently alter the definition of that space. As I see it, design interventions in the site can either augment future possibilities by recognizing the site’s dynamic position in the area’s urban and social ecologies, or it can preempt this potential by building spaces that do little more than expand the campus eastward.

Throughout the EA major, I’ve grappled with the tension between a critical and rigorous view of sustainability and the power of architectural speculation to envision and enact a sustainable society. As it turns out, architecture and design’s complicity with environmentally and socially destructive forces of capitalism are large roadblocks for anyone attempting to pursue a sustainable vision for architecture and design. This thesis is an inquiry into the role and possibilities of historical narrative in design of the built environment rather than a specific proposal for an East campus of CUC. In short, it is an investigation of sustainable processes rather than a recommendation of specific outcomes. By taking the opportunity to explore the history of this area in conjunction with sustainability

Designers are categorically optimistic. In my introductory design education, which so far has taken place at the University of Washington, at the Danish Institute of Study Abroad, and
here in Claremont in visual and design studios with Environmental Analysis professors Lance Neckar and John Bohn, the focus is always on the innovative power of design. Naturally, pragmatic concerns enter into critiques of certain projects, but the focus is always on the seemingly limitless power of design to reimagine the built environment.

A designer’s job is essentially to translate abstract possibilities and potentials into concrete infrastructures and spaces. In other words, the speculative designer aims to augment the “place-ness” of a site. This thesis takes the gravel pit as an opportunity to investigate the history and current condition of the land (and by proxy, the cultural relationship) between Claremont, Upland, and Montclair and speculate about its future. In the words of my studio professor at the Danish Institute of Study Abroad, this is a chance to “dream into” the future of the gravel pit that straddles Los Angeles and San Bernardino counties.

My thesis draws on an historical review of development in the Claremont area with a goal of developing a historically-informed and novel approach to sustainability in the built environment. It attempts to situate the gravel pit and the within the history of this area and draw connections between historical narratives, sustainability theories, both ecological and social, and the specific institutional context of the gravel pit in CUC’s land-use planning processes.
How did we get here?

Los Angeles and Southern California have always been a little bit different. The city is considered the historic and cultural capital of urban sprawl in the United States, but it is also by some measures the nation’s most densely populated urban area. As the city that inspired and was shaped by the rise of the modern American entertainment industry, it has dealt more explicitly with contemporary representations of modern and urban life than perhaps any other city in the United States. While some areas of Los Angeles have—or represent—a solidly “urban” character, Claremont and the Inland Empire are undeniably suburban—though this carries slightly different implications in a weak-centered metropolis. In the interest of brevity and clarity, I will use three key themes that attempt to explain how the gravel pit came to its current condition in the context of the history of growth Los Angeles and Southern California. These themes, I hope, also highlight key issues that greater Los Angeles must address to become a more just and sustainable urban system. Planning and design that is mindful of historical processes can address more sustainably the social and environmental problems we face.

Transportation: Railroads, the Mother Road, and LA’s Freeways

Los Angeles had little geographical reason to grow as large as it has. While most other great American cities grew up around a port, sea, or riparian trade network, Los Angeles’ founders needed to build these infrastructures themselves. As Robert Fishman notes in the forward to Robert Fogelson’s *The Fragmented Metropolis*, “the Los Angeles elite very early
realized that their business was growth itself.”

While the image of southern California as pastoral paradise was a key component of the land holding companies’ strategy to sell Los Angeles, the metropolis’ form was facilitated by the massive implementation of railroad and emerging modern building technology.

As do many stories in the American West, Claremont’s begins with a land speculator—in this case Henry Austin Palmer, who in 1864 bought 80 acres of land from the Palomares family, part owners of the Rancho San Jose. Palmer knew that the Santa Fe Railroad, which was incorporated with the Atchison & Topeka Railroad in 1863, was planning to build a transcontinental railroad line through San Bernardino to Los Angeles. The railroad received a land grant in the 1860s from the federal government, which served as an incentive for building the railroad. As various parties with the available capital to purchase and develop land caught wind of the plans for a new railroad through Kansas and the southwestern states to California, the railroad’s property division coordinated the subdivision of land into settlements at each planned stop. In the foothills of the San Gabriels, the railroad and land speculators, like Henry Austin Palmer, negotiated with the original owners of Rancho land grants to purchase and “improve” the land. When the Santa Fe Railroad opened its extension through Claremont in 1888, the original grid of the City of Claremont had been neatly divided and prepared by the Pacific Land Company.

---

In Los Angeles, developers were becoming interested in electric interurban railroads, which, like traditional railroads, improved property prices by connecting subdivisions with downtown Los Angeles. Entrepreneurs Sherman and Clark coordinated subsidies from landowners in the west of Los Angeles to build an interurban rail system across the base of the Hollywood hills and Mid Wilshire to the ocean and called it the Los Angeles Pacific Railroad. As Fogelson notes, the LA-Pacific relied mostly on subsidies from existing landowners who recognized the financial benefits of improved access to their properties. Henry E. Huntington, a millionaire with a mind for vertical integration, had more ambitious plans and the capital to back them up. In 1901, he organized the Pacific Electric Railway Company and the Huntington Land
and Improvement Company, which successfully integrated track-laying and land development under a single conglomerate. Huntington sought to take the streetcar speculation model to an unprecedented regional scale. Where Sherman and Clark focused on growing suburbs west of downtown, Huntington sought to connect Los Angeles proper with cities as far east as San Bernardino and Riverside.

Frank Wheeler, an early promoter of Claremont, saw very quickly that a stop on the interurban would solidify the town’s stature as a part of the envisioned metropolis. While the Santa Fe connected Claremont—a growing frontier town—to the east and west to Los Angeles, an interurban stop would allow the town to become a proper suburb of Los Angeles. Wheeler’s account of his dealings with Huntington reveal the salience of personal relationships and back-room deals in establishing these interurban routes. Wheeler knew that Huntington had a close acquaintance with an hotelier in Riverside, and that Huntington wanted to follow “the most direct route possible.” The rail baron’s application to the City of Pomona to establish a line through the town was met with fierce opposition, which did not sit well with the wealthy developer—Huntington reportedly stormed out of the meeting, resolving to “see Pomona damned before she shall be on our main line.” Wheeler jumped at the chance to convince Huntington to route the line through Claremont. Through a mutual acquaintance (an alumni of the then-fledgling Pomona College), he secured a meeting with Huntington at the Jonathan Club in downtown Los Angeles, where he reportedly convinced Huntington that a route through Claremont would be the most direct and profitable route to San Bernardino and Riverside.

Pillsbury, as the engineer, was not convinced, and so Wheeler arranged for the two railroad men

---


8 Wheeler, 1.
to come survey the proposed route. On the day of the survey, Wheeler arrived at the Lordsburg Sante Fe Railroad depot to discover that three men from Pomona had come to convince Huntington to reconsider running his line through the city, which they reasoned was much larger than any of the surrounding cities in the Pomona Valley. Wheeler writes:

How to get rid of [the men from Pomona] and have Huntington to ourselves was a problem and we had to do some quick thinking. I went into the depot office and wired down to Charter Oak and told them to hold Mr. Huntington at Charter Oak and we would come down there to meet him, then I came on the platform and shouted out, ‘there has been some mistake this morning. Mr. Huntington is waiting for us at the S. P. Depot in Pomona—all aboard, gentlemen.’ There was a scramble for the Tally-ho and the carriages, but I held our people back till the Pomona men got out of sight, then we drove down to Charter Oak expecting to have Huntington to ourselves.

Wheeler’s party was made up of men from Claremont, Lordsburg (now La Verne), and Charter Oak (now a census-designated place on I-210 between Glendora and Covina), including President George Gates and Professor C. B. Sumner of Pomona College, whose interests were closely tied with the city of Claremont’s growth. The group was disappointed to find at Lordsburg not Huntington, but Pillsbury, who maintained that the main line could not go through Lordsburg and Claremont. The engineer offered instead that the Pacific Electric would build a line from Charter Oak, through the two towns, and on to Upland (p. 2). After this meeting, Wheeler again contacted Huntington, who agreed to come out to survey the route through Charter Oak and Lordsburg. “This trip made Huntington more enthusiastic than ever,” wrote Wheeler. The Pacific Electric Line reached Covina in 1906 and Claremont in 1914, solidifying the town’s partial role as a bedroom suburb in the fledgling metropolis.

As early as the mid-1920s, the development market had cooled off and Huntington’s interurban lines, which were made profitable by subsidies from increased land values, began to
falter in the face of competition from the automobile.⁹ As Fogelson points out, developers turned to highways and private automobiles to develop areas previously inaccessible by cars—many of them in southern California’s classic foothills, whose relative isolation allowed them to grow into elite enclaves. By the 1930s, the Automobile Association of Southern California had proposed the predecessor to the parkway and in turn the freeway system: a network of elevated highways “to save Los Angeles and other American cities from the ruin threatening them through the creeping paralysis of traffic congestion.”¹⁰ Out in the Inland Empire the effects of increasingly popular transcontinental automobile routes was reflected in the rise of Route 66, which would connect Chicago to Los Angeles and serve as a symbol of the nation’s entry into the automobile age. Between 1920 and 1924, for example, the number of private automobiles in Los Angeles County skyrocketed—from roughly 200,000 to more than 500,000.¹¹ In 1931, Claremont transformed its portion of Route 66, known locally as Foothill Boulevard, from a two-lane road to full-fledged boulevard. Over the 1920s and 30s, Route 66 would overtake the railroad as the primary mode of traveling West. At the end of the 1930s, the “Mother Road” was immortalized by Steinbeck’s The Grapes of Wrath, which captured how California’s pastoral image was given a renewed sense of hope during the Great Depression. Claremont’s portion of Foothill became a piece in a cultural and infrastructural network organized around a new, automobile-centered logic. Route 66’s iconic neon signs lined up along the road from Cajon Pass and across the Inland Empire into the San Gabriel Valley, creating a new type of main street in the region’s growing Foothill communities. Businesses shifted their focus in earnest from pedestrians to motorists, and cities were transformed from villages that spread from railroad

---

⁹ Fogelson, 151.
¹¹ Fogelson, 152.
stations and interurban stops to rapidly spreading, decentralized commercial centers, laying the groundwork for the auto-centered suburbanism that lines the region’s mega-grid today.

For most Americans, and almost every member of the nation’s middle class, the rise of the automobile signaled the end of public transportation as a desirable and viable option for daily mobility. After WWII, Los Angeles’ suburbanization exploded. Building upon the already vast network of rural railroad towns and garden cities, Los Angeles’ infatuation with car culture was made official (and—so it seems—permanent). In this sense, suburbanization in the postwar period further restricted the public domain, which contributed to social segregation by race and class by replacing public venues and services like transportation with private alternatives.

In Claremont, the Chamber of Commerce established the Post-War Planning Committee in 1944, which sought to maintain the town’s character through its anticipated expansion by planning for new parks, schools, and the maintenance of the city’s trees and streets. Zoning laws were established to designate new commercial areas near arterials that would connect to the planned Ramona Freeway (opened in 1954, now “San Bernardino” and I-10) and Foothill (2007) freeways, while arterials were directed around existing and planned residential areas. The gravel quarries to the Claremont’s immediate east became a significant obstacle to expanding development pressures in Claremont, Upland, and later, Montclair.

---

13 Hsu, Tiffany. “Now It’s a Road to Somewhere; The Final Section of the 210 Freeway Is Now Open, Easing Travel from the Inland Empire to the Los Angeles Area.” Los Angeles Times 25 July 2007. Web. 11 Dec. 2014.
Pastoral Paradigm: Los Angeles as Anti-Urban Metropolis

The streetcar system, the spread of the automobile, and the freeway allowed Los Angeles to grow to its current status as a metropolis, but transportation infrastructure does little to explain why Angelenos have craved mobility. This section investigates the narratives and social movements surrounding the development of the “suburb” in Los Angeles, and shows how the city developed multiple centers of commerce in a sea of residential sprawl.

Fishman traces the notion of the suburb to 19th century London, where the bourgeoisie, “a class with the resources and the self-confidence to reorder the material world to suit its needs,” participated in the rise of the nuclear family one mark of which was the separation of occupational and residential spaces. Suburbanization, then, “was clearly the outer edge in a wider process of metropolitan growth and consolidation that was draining the rural areas and small towns.” The bourgeois elite took ownership and transformed the relatively cheap peripheral areas of these growing metro regions to create a residential haven for the nuclear family. Thus, suburbs were imagined and designed to protect against the ills of urban life—most prominently poverty, pollution, and lack of open space. This movement in the United Kingdom parallels the emergence of a pastoral paradigm of suburban growth in North America during the same period, which was first envisioned in the form of landscape architect Andrew Jackson Downing’s country estates. Later, Frederick Law Olmsted would transform this idea into one of the nation’s first garden suburbs in Chicago and on Long Island. These early suburbs were designed in relation to the city, often organized around a central rail hub that connected them to the city center.

16 Fishman, 25.
17 Fishman, 27.
In the late 19th century, Los Angeles’ proponents marketed the region as America’s pastoral metropolis—a paradise of open land, beautiful weather, and Anglo-Saxon values. Greg Hise points to city promoters, many of them Progressives like the Reverend Dana Bartlett, who in his 1907 piece *The Better City* “waxed euphoric about the promise of Los Angeles.”\(^{19}\) Even the working classes, he wrote, were suitably pastoral, as they “live[d] in single cottages, with dividing fences and flowers in the front yard, and oftentimes with vegetables in the back yard.”\(^{20}\) Bartlett also emphasized Los Angeles’ industrial promise to create a portrait of the city as a pastoral metropolis—on the verge of an industrial boom driven by the Panama Canal and plenty of oil under the city’s vast undeveloped flats.

But even as these Progressives touted the values of Los Angeles as paradise, there was a sense that the city’s speculators had gotten ahead of themselves. Just as Bartlett and other Angelenos made their call to an American middle class disaffected by the urban ills of the eastern cities, they were wringing their hands over rampant land speculation in the city and its streetcar suburbs.\(^{21}\) These Progressives worried that Los Angeles’ economy needed industrial infrastructures to support a growing economy, but they also worried that land speculation would consume Los Angeles’ open landscape. The solution, they thought, lay in urban planning that emphasized open space, light, and nature. Hise calls this vision an “imaginative geography…a vision of manufacturing facilities and working-class residences moving out from the city center and into the surrounding country.”\(^{22}\) Progressives like Bartlett believed that Los Angeles could be at once industrial and pastoral if only the built environment were designed to effectively separate people and industrial uses.


\(^{20}\) Bartlett qtd. in Hise, 15.

\(^{21}\) Hise, 18.

\(^{22}\) Hise 17.
Claremont, especially, fit this description well—early posters advertising the city wrote that “Claremont is...for people from the East who want a place for a home that possesses all the natural attraction that makes life worth living for.” In Claremont, too, industry played a significant role in the city’s early development. In 1889, the same year that Pomona College moved to Claremont, Peter Dreher planted an orange grove in Claremont, kicking off a citrus boom that would fuel both the town’s and the colleges’ rapid growth. The area gradually became known for its citrus, and Dreher organized local growers in the Claremont Fruit Growers Exchange, which was followed shortly afterward by the College Heights Orange and Lemon Association. In the beginning of the fruit boom, The Santa Fe Depot served as a makeshift packing house, but as production picked up, growers and collectives built their own packing houses along the railroad. In the beginning, workers were drawn from the growing population of Claremont and other boomtowns in the area. Claremont exemplified Bartlett’s imagined exurban condition—and it had the citrus and growing educational industries to support its speculative plans.

---

23 Landsberg, 19.
24 Landsberg, 68. The Pitzer family would later become a significant benefactor to the Claremont Colleges, providing the titular donation for the consortium’s most recent undergraduate college.
25 A modern development in the Claremont Village—appropriately named the Packing House—has capitalized on the aesthetics of Claremont’s industrial history by reimagining its infrastructure as an anchor in the Village’s retail landscape.
By the late 1920s, citrus production in Claremont had grown to over two million boxes a year. As the industry continued to expand, Chican@s became the backbone of the workforce. The College Heights Orange and Lemon Association built Claremont’s East and West barrios to house Chican@ workers who worked the citrus industry until its slow demise in the 1970s. These Barrios had their own school systems—in which most students took their education completely in Spanish—until Chican@ children were integrated into Claremont’s white and English-speaking schools in the 1940s. Claremont’s labor landscape during the citrus years reflected wider trends in an industrializing Los Angeles. By creating the Barrios, the city was able to maintain its pastoral image while also growing with the expansion of the citrus industry.

---

26 Landsberg, 55.
27 The legacy of Claremont’s “Barrio” remained a point of tension between the city’s Chicano residents and its majority white population throughout the 20th century. As the neighborhood changed, its name was passed down through a park, established in 1969 under the name “El Barrio.” As recently as the early 1990s, Claremonters worried about “negative connotations” that had developed around a park in the neighborhood, which they thought “denotes the gang practice of marking territory with the name of a specific “barrio.” See: Zahniser, David. “Barrio Park: What’s in a Name?” Claremont Courier 30 Oct. 1991: n. pag. Print.
Unfortunately, this came at the expense of Progressive notions of equality and the worker’s paradise. As Los Angeles’ industries grew, workers housing lagged; more dense areas became filled with tenements, while in the exurbs, labor camps and “Barrios” like those in Claremont developed to house a growing lower class.

As land speculation and industrialization continued to consume southern California, wealthy citizens in communities like Claremont continued to cling (rather successfully, if you ignore sustainability) to a rural image of the region. In neighboring communities, where industries—rather than higher education—were the chief economic and political influences, the built environment began to reflect Bartlett’s nightmares. Los Angeles’ city government was never able to create a Progressive paradise on a metropolitan scale, and similarly, no metropolitan authority ever existed in the Inland Empire.

The absence of a significant metropolitan authority to maintain Los Angeles’ natural image and public domain is not due to a lack of effort. As Davis points out, Dana Bartlett fought hard to protect landscapes like the Los Angeles River and the region’s beaches for public use. The Southern Pacific Railroad, which then owned much of the riverbed, refused to stray from its plan for floodplain reclamation and industrial development.29 In 1930, the office of Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. drew up plans for a park and parkway system that would solve both the city’s dire lack of public space and keep infrastructures out of the immediate floodplain of the LA River. Unfortunately, Davis notes, the Los Angeles Times, then a notorious representative of real estate interests, led a strong offensive against legislation that would have established a public system of parks and greenways of just under 100,000 acres.30 The Times decried what its editors saw as an unjust (and, so they claimed, unprecedented) concentration of power to tax and bond

29 Davis, 63.
30 Davis, 68.
Los Angeles’ citizens. The salience of pro-private ownership arguments in early Los Angeles preempted the majority of the city’s attempts to reign in speculative development in the early 20th century. As Los Angeles struggled to embody the tranquility of pastoralism, the domestic sphere, and modern utopias, a parallel image of the city gained traction—a city run by speculative and capitalistic interests.

During and after World War II, Los Angeles came into its own as an industrial powerhouse. The Progressive image of Los Angeles as pastoral utopia was transformed into a similar notion of domestic life, which reinforced divisions between work and home. As people returned to civic life from their wartime jobs, developers in the San Fernando Valley and across the region accommodated them with an equally massive tract housing boom. As noted above, the car became a key component in the way these lands developed. Whereas streetcars facilitated the growth of towns on the exurban fringe, the car allowed ever more dispersed and decentralized tract housing to develop. Eric Avila writes: “as the iron tracks of the streetcar gave way to the concrete ribbons of freeways within the nation’s cities, Americans parted with yet another cultural venue that served the needs of a heterogeneous urban public.”

This final shift in emphasis toward the private sphere was accompanied (and driven by) the rise of racial relations and equality as a core urban issue. With the economic opportunities of World War II came a mass migration of nonwhite groups to urban, “public” spaces and the conflation of black and urban in popular culture. Eric Avila helps explain how this development occurred, theorizing that the urban condition in the first half of the 20th century created a “new mass culture” that was characterized by “a ‘heterosocial’ world of urban strangers” based on

---

public parks, transportation, and other shared urban spaces. Avila argues that the Progressive image of public space presupposed the exclusion of nonwhite populations. In the case of Claremont, this segregation was pursued intentionally as part of a plan to make use of “immigrant” Chican@ labor. African Americans, in addition to Chican@s, found economic opportunity and a temporary hope in the image of Los Angeles as paradise. “Whereas African Americans had once touted Los Angeles as a ‘ghettoless paradise,’” writes Avila, “the structure of racial inequality built into postwar suburbanization ensured that Southern California’s suburban good life would remain off-limits to blacks.” The freeway created a modern version of suburbia as privatized paradise, and solidified de facto segregation in the growing fringe of Los Angeles. Mike Davis expands on this argument, situating cities like Watts and (our infamous neighbor) Pomona in an emerging category of blighted middle-suburbs. Davis argues that these suburbs have been consumed by a continuous process of white flight, blight, and failed urban renewal. Once-booming suburban towns find themselves in competition with emerging entities like the City of Industry, which supports very few residents but hosts over 2,100 industrial entities. In short, spatial-economic mobility drained these cities of any semblance of the Progressive image of Southern California—and indeed any notion of a high-quality public realm.

As growth in Southern California accelerated through the second half of the century, the Inland Empire began to organize around a mega-grid of freeways and surface arterials that facilitated the hoarding of capital and quality urban landscapes in upscale developments. Auto-centric strip malls, born of the era of Route 66 and grandfathered into the freeway era, clustered around freeway exits and along major surface arterials. Newer cities like Montclair, founded east

32 Avila, 13.
33 Avila, 50.
34 Davis, 398-405.
of Claremont in 1956, grew up around these freeways and depend on them, as Davis notes, to feed the retail and service industries that provide critical tax dollars. While Montclair demonstrates a prototypical development organized around a freeway interchange, the Claremont Village emblematizes the opposite—a quaint, walkable downtown that marks a city that was successful in preserving its “semi-rural character” through this period of massive reform of the built environment. As Peggy Fuller and other Pitzer College students noted in a 1973 paper, Claremont’s unusually high level of citizen participation and focus on the Colleges as the city’s primary economic and cultural anchor are at the center of Claremont’s approach to land-use planning. Individual Village business-owners, rather than retailers at the town’s freeway interchanges, held power over land use planning process, and thus were able to protect businesses that depend on the Village’s emphasis on local business. During a period where the San Bernardino freeway and the more recently constructed Foothill Freeway were drastically altering the logic of development in the Inland Empire, the relative power of individuals and businesses who explicitly defied the logic of postwar development protected the Village’s walkability and Claremont’s “rural charm.”

Not all development in Claremont protected existing residential areas, however. In the 1960s, the city built Claremont Boulevard through the center of “Arbol Verde,” a neighborhood directly southeast of the colleges that adapted and grew from the city’s East Barrio. A notice from the Arbol Verde Neighborhood United organization from the mid 1980s describes how the construction of Claremont Boulevard amounted to the “severing of the traditional neighborhood into the Claremont side and the Upland/Montclair side,” with a majority of houses in the former

---

36 Davis, 28.
being owned by the Claremont University Center and CMC. Activists complained that although
the neighborhood’s citizen-built Catholic church was not in the path of the planned boulevard,
the church was demolished in the construction process.⁢³⁸

Figure 3. Between 1965 and 1982, Claremont Boulevard was added to the list of major
north-south arterials in Claremont
(Special Collections at the Honnold-Mudd Library of the Claremont Colleges—Claremontiana Vertical File)

On a wider scale, the Inland Empire follows the logic of the urban grid, although on a scale that serves the driver rather than the pedestrian. To leave the small scale of Claremont is to enter the grid on a wider scale—Towne, Indian Hill, Claremont, and Monte Vista Boulevards become the connection between the local and the regional, existing in relation to the freeways, capillary roads, and other arterials on the grid. The increasing occurrence of discretely planned developments within this grid works to incorporate individual dwellings and spaces into the logic of this grid. A rather obvious example of this lack of cohesion can be found in what was once the East Barrio/Arbol Verde neighborhood, where the organizing logic of Claremont’s original grid abuts the contemporary grid, and College Park wedges itself into part of the a new development to the east.\textsuperscript{39} As the organizing logic of the streetcar gave way to the region’s arterial grid and freeway system, the railroad and interurban-based grid in each town was incorporated into growing field of contemporary service, retail, and residential developments. As development continues in Montclair along and away from the freeway, the San Bernardino-side of the Wash is filling up with private housing developments that abut the traditional fabric of the East Barrio/Arbol Verde neighborhood. These projects, which fall somewhere along the more auto-centric end of the spectrum of new urbanism, are little more than a higher-density take on the traditional strip-mall/subdivision layout that defines a majority of development along the region’s surface grid. Recent attempts to integrate higher-density new-urbanist projects remain disconnected from both the original logic of the pedestrian grid and pay only logistical attention to the arterial grid. This neighborhood’s fragmented organization reflects the remnants of vastly different approaches to planning that have been pursued over the past century. While the history

\textsuperscript{39} See Figure 3. The College Park Development was built on the southern part of the quarry formerly connected to the CUC Pit.
of this area is thick and create interesting configurations of the built environment, connections between new developments and older neighborhoods are severely lacking.
Losing the Wash

Figure 4. View looking north across the San Antonio Wash toward Mt. San Antonio (Baldy) c. 1910. (Special Collections at the Honnold-Mudd Library of the Claremont Colleges—Claremontiana Vertical File)

*Where bleak and barren the sagebrush rolled / rise green orchards of fruited gold.*

—Torchbearers, Pomona College Song

Today, Claremont enjoys an environment that evokes the notion of Southern California as paradise. For those who live in Claremont, the area might seem static, having reached a natural balancing point of environmental harmony that supports a tranquil modern life. Just as Claremont has defined its social image in opposition to its surroundings, the city saw itself as establishing life in the region’s “bleak and barren” landscape. But this version of history

---

40 In the official version of this piece, in which the lyrics have been revised significantly, an analogous line reads, *Where wide and open / the sagebrush rolled.* Pomona College Songs Committee. *Report of the Pomona College Songs Committee.* Claremont, CA: Pomona College, 2008. Web. 15 Nov. 2014.
conveniently forgets the forceful process by which this land was shaped. Claremont’s environmental ethos was established through a process of fortification against nature and the creeping influence of Los Angeles that largely played itself out through the early years of settlement and into the mid-20th century. In short, building paradise on earth required taming Southern California’s powerful, dynamic, and stubborn ecologies. Meanwhile, 19th century conservationists were beginning to try to understand the relationships between the nation’s forested watersheds and the rapidly industrializing cities below. While conservationists of the time succeeded in articulating the national forests and wilderness lands’ role in watershed health, the ecological value of the gently sloping San Antonio Wash landscape, spreading south from the mouth of the San Antonio Canyon, was underappreciated at the time.41

Since the San Gabriel Mission was established in 1771, white settlers’ relationship to the land has been defined in large part by water, which along with fertile soils and a mild climate facilitated the Southland’s transformation into “orchards of fruited gold.” Indeed, when in 1837 Ygnacio Palomares and Ricardo Vejar received Rancho San Jose by grant from the governor ad interim of California, water rights were an assumed part of the allotment.42 The Rancho lay to the east of the San Antonio Wash and, the owners would argue, included rights to half of the water flowing out of the canyon. In the early days of the Rancho, these claims would have seemed trivial—natural springs, including the self-named Palomares cienega by which the family built a home, were relatively abundant in the area.43

These rights were solidified when in 1871, the Palomares family successfully sued to protect a ditch they had built from the mouth of the canyon to the northeast corner of the Rancho,
and were awarded a half-share of surface runoff based on the original Spanish land grant.\textsuperscript{44} The other half of the creek’s water was claimed in the Plat of the Rancho Cucamonga, on the east side of the Wash. The Rancho’s rights to San Antonio Creek were transferred through various parties to the Cucamonga Land Company in 1876, which sold the northwest portion of the Rancho, called the “San Antonio lands” to two landholding partners, J.S. Garcia and J.C. Dunlap.\textsuperscript{45}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{Diagram of San Antonio Wash with Rancho San Jose (left) and Rancho Cucamonga (right)\textsuperscript{46}}
\end{figure}

In October of 1882, Reverend Cyrus T. Mills, who lived in Oakland, and M.L. Wicks, from Los Angeles, bought a tract of the Rancho San Jose and set about establishing and subdividing a development that would become the city of Pomona. The two men also bought the
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Palomares’ ditch and began consolidating area water rights to create the Pomona Land and Water Company (PLWC). On the east side of the Wash, the Chaffey brothers had similar aspirations for their Ontario Colony. The Chaffeys established the San Antonio Water Company (SAWC) in October 1882 to hold their collective water rights in a similar “scheme of a mutual water company.” Wicks and Mills and the Chaffey brothers sought to buy the land from Dunlap, but Garcia, who was “acquainted” with the Chaffey Brothers of Ontario, sold the lands to the Chaffeys. Dunlap and Garcia thus delayed the creation of a unified watershed interest in the San Antonio Canyon and Wash. Three years later, in 1885, a man by the name of Charles French built the first piece of infrastructure in a saga of flood control management and infiltration efforts that would end flooding in the San Antonio Wash: a dam that allowed Pomona and Ontario to measure and divide the creek’s water between them.

While the speculators were busy jockeying over newly “improved” pieces of land, a growing cohort of federal conservationists were eyeing the forest in the San Gabriel mountains above as part of a new system of national forest reserves. This plan was part of a growing conservation movement that drew on contemporary European methods of forestry and positioned the newly acquired forests of the American West at the center of the growing nation’s essential natural resources. Conservationists advocated for forest management not only to preserve natural beauty, timber, and mining resources in the forests, but also to protect the relationship between forests and the watersheds—a relationship intuited by early observations of ecological relationships by white scientists. George Grinnell, an explorer, scientist, and sportsman, became

---

47 Maynard, 22-23.
For further information on the Ontario Colony, see:
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one of the first of many conservationists during this time to articulate the connection between
deforestation and reduced stream runoff to the American public. Writing in *Forest and Stream*
in 1882, Grinnell argued that “the streams of such a country will thus shrink when the mountains,
where the snows lie latest and the feeding springs are, and the swamps, which dole out their slow
but steady tribute, are bereft of shade.” In the 1890s Grinnell would become a friend and
informal advisor to Theodore Roosevelt, a relationship which historian John Reiger points out
was “influential in giving the future President a more sophisticated, broader grasp of
‘conservation’ that included both aesthetic and ecological components as well as the obvious
utilitarian one.” While a growing understanding and interest in the relationship between forests
and watershed health on the national level was quickly popularized through magazines like
*Forest and Stream*, the movement’s political advocates also emphasized the value of local
knowledge in managing resources. In most cases, conservationists’ knowledge came from
personal experiences or commissioned expeditions that aimed to tap into knowledge of local
ecosystems and harnessed land owners for the cause of conserving the nation’s lands.

Determining the extent to which the conservation movement on a national scale influenced
decision-makers in the Pomona Valley would require further research and is tangential to this
thesis, but by the turn of the century, the SAWC had taken serious steps to protect the wilderness
whose health they saw as critical to the area’s supply of clean water.

---

51 Gifford Pinchot, who would go on to heavily influence the Forest Service’s creation and serve as its first Chief
Forester, was heavily influenced by an early (for Europeans and Americans) and intuitive sense of ecological
knowledge promoted by both Grinnell and his mentor, George Perkins Marsh.
52 Grinnell, George. “Spare the Trees.” *Forest and Stream* 18 Apr. 1882: 1. Print. in Forest History Today. 19
53 Further research is required to understand exactly how local interests in the Pomona Valley were influenced by
the connection between Forestry and watershed management that was playing out in national conservation
discussions at this time.
Reiger, John. “Pathbreaking Conservationist: George Bird Grinnell.” *Forest History Today*. Forest History Society,
In the Pomona Valley, the SAWC led water protection efforts in the 1890s and early 1900s that ultimately preserved the canyon’s landscape. By the mid 1890s, the SAWC had noticed the impact that mining in the canyon could have on water quality in the valley below and moved to protect its interests. The major target was the Hocumac Company, a mining venture that, according to Southern California historian Muir Dawson, held nearly every active mining claim in the canyon. In the summer of 1895, San Bernardino County’s Superior Court awarded an injunction to the SAWC that “prohibit[ed] the Hocumac Company from polluting or discoloring the water of the San Antonio Creek in any way.” Hocumac revised its mining operations to avoid muddying the waters of the creek, but as Dawson points out, the extent to which the injunction contributed to the mine’s inability to turn a profit is unclear. In 1900 the Hocumac Company mortgaged its major holdings for the value of the equipment on the land. Eventually the SAWC, which according to Dawson sought to remove the possibility of further water pollution in the canyon and to use pipe infrastructure from the mines in projects in the valley below, acquired the title to the Hocumac Company’s Land. The SAWC played the lead role in the fight to protect the canyon’s watershed, which other than with the creation of the Pomona Valley Protective Association in 1909, marked one of the most significant successes in conserving the valley’s ecological resources.

The SAWC continued to consolidate land and water rights in the San Antonio Canyon above its mouth and French’s measuring dam in an effort to protect water quality for the valley below. By 1897 the SAWC had acquired all of the PLWC’s rights above the mouth of the canyon, and in 1906 had begun to use its property rights to restrict entrance into the canyon.
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Reasoning that the company owned the only road into the canyon since it had had rebuilt with SAWC funds in 1891, the SAWC began tolling the growing flood of motorists attempting to access Mt. Baldy’s new resorts and what was then the San Gabriel Timberland Reserve.\textsuperscript{57}

Maynard writes that the 1906 closure was in response to a 40 acre lease of federal land to a private resort development during the same year.\textsuperscript{58} A sign placed along the road into the canyon read, “CANYON PARK – Private property of the San Antonio Water Co. and the Ontario Power Co. cutting of live yucca or other plants or trees is prohibited.” The phrasing of this sign suggests that the SAWC were thinking in the mode of the federal conservationists, who were at that time rapidly expanding the national park system. Tolling in the area would continue through 1922, when the company sold the road back to San Bernardino County, ending the era of privatized access to San Antonio Canyon that sought to control the number of people entering the watershed.\textsuperscript{59}

Meanwhile, the fledgling municipalities in the valley below were beginning to worry about water quantity in addition to its quality. In 1883, a geologist E.W. Hilgard had discovered the connection between the water in San Antonio Canyon and the area’s artesian wells and recommended that the Pomona Land and Water Company make an effort to divert the canyon’s waters into the west side of the Wash. This realization proved problematic for the Company, as developers across the Pomona Valley had been building wells in the basin and piping the water to areas out of the watershed.\textsuperscript{60} By the 1890s, the water table had fallen far enough for most of the area’s artesian wells to run dry, forcing their owners to install pumps.\textsuperscript{61} In 1904, a study by

\textsuperscript{57}“Fighting for Canyon Road: Water Company and County in Legal Battle; In Court Over Title to Thoroughfare in San Antonio Canyon--Old Residents Tell of Use for Forty Years, but Plaintiff Claims It’s Private Property.” \textit{Los Angeles Times} 24 Dec. 1907: n. pag. Print.

\textsuperscript{58}Maynard, 31.

\textsuperscript{59}Maynard, 33.

\textsuperscript{60}Conserving surface flow p. 2 and Maynard thesis, page 47

\textsuperscript{61}Conserving Surface flow, page 2 –statement on lowered water table
W.C. Mendenhall confirmed that wells in the area were exceeding the capacity of the San Antonio Creek to naturally replenish them—and that the situation was becoming dire.\(^\text{62}\)

In the same year, Willis S. Jones discovered the existence of “definite boundaries” of a natural underground reservoir in the area and began a 10 year study to recommend locations for permanent spreading and infiltration infrastructure.\(^\text{63}\) At the end of this study, Jones had created a comprehensive plan for the slowing and diversion of flood waters in the land below the mouth of the canyon. To a new dam at the mouth of the canyon would be added gates and a “sluiceway,” also known as a spillway, for handling overflow. As Maynard describes, Jones’ initial plan would be realized into a system of “side channels, thirty feet wide; six main laterals covering four hundred acres with hedges and miles of smaller ditches” intended to simultaneously direct and spread floodwaters. At the bottom of this system, one and a half miles southwest of the canyon, lay “a return ditch…to collect any excess water and return it to an old channel that connects to the present stream at the Base Line.”\(^\text{64}\)

Jones’ solution for the rapidly falling water table contributed to a regional interest in infiltrating the water of the San Antonio Canyon to replenish the water in the aquifer east of the San Antonio Wash, a task which Jones argued could be accomplished by the Pomona Valley Protective Association.

Initially, the Association was established between the PLWC and a collection of other rights holders on the west side of the creek channel who aimed to protect the watershed from “invasions” by districts outside of the Pomona Valley. In a 1915 report to the members of the Association, Jones notes that at the turn of the century, “The Ontario Water Co. invaded the

\(^{62}\) Jones, Willis S. *Conservation of the Flood Waters of the San Antonio Wash in the Gravels of the Debris-Cone North East of Pomona Cal.* N.p. Print. 2 (and Maynard, 47.)

\(^{63}\) Jones, *Conservation*, 3.

\(^{64}\) Maynard, 50.
Indian Hill Basin; the San Antonio Water Co. acquired rights South of Claremont; Covina and San Dimas invaded the Palomares cienega.” The leaders of each water company in the basin met at the Pomona Valley Land and Water Company. The Chino Land and Water Company, which had been drilling wells on lands between Claremont and Pomona and piping it out of the San Antonio Watershed, was identified as a major “invader” in the district. The water interests resolved that the President of the Del Monte Irrigation Co. would “notify the Chino Land and Water Co. not to export any more water from this district than they had heretofore acquired a right to divert.” The Chino company did not respond, and continued to expand and subdivide their exported water rights.

Thus, in its early years the protective association aligned itself solidly with the interests of the PLWC in opposition to the SAWC’s attempt to expand its water claims. Despite the increased land holdings of the SAWC in San Antonio Canyon, the equal division between the two companies of water flowing out of the canyon had been reaffirmed by a 1903 decree of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. The PLWC goal of slowing and conserving of floodwaters below the mouth of the canyon, however, put the company at odds with the SAWC’s goals of retaining water above the dam. Thus, in a series of suits brought against the SAWC, the PLWC and other members of the Protective Association sought establishment of a right to the natural flow of the San Antonio Creek based on the original land grant. This process was complicated by the construction of “tunnels” or underground water channels that intercepted and pumped water before it could sink further into the aquifer. In 1910, for example, the Superior Court of Los Angeles County awarded 17 inches of “salvage water” the Ontario Power

65 Jones, Conservation, 2.
67 Los Angeles County, Superior Court, Pomona Land and Water Co. plaintiffs vs. San Antonio Water Co. et al, defendants, Judgement, 1903. in Maynard, 41.
Company, a subsidiary of the SAWC that claimed rights to 20 inches produced in this way. Litigation over the implications of disparate water uses—such as for domestic, agricultural, or use in power generation—combined with shifting and competing strategies of water conservation continued throughout the first two decades of the 20th century.  

As the threat of invasion by outside interests and the demand on the local aquifer grew, interest in a unified entity that could protect water claims in the Pomona Valley increased as well. Upon its formation, the Association immediately set out securing collective ownership of 650 acres of wash lands below the San Antonio Dam and, over the next ten years through litigation led by the PLWC against the SAWC, “won the right to have all the waters of the canyon except a limited amount to come down to the mouth of the canyon.” With the land secured, Willis S. Jones and the Pomona Valley Protective Association could begin building diversion dams and spreading grounds in earnest. As Jones argued retrospectively in the PVPA’s 1916-17 annual report, “the wisdom of keeping a large acreage of this sage brush covered land in its virgin state will become more and more apparent as time goes on and lands are cleared for cultivation.” Jones recalled that in the particularly large flood of that year, the relatively unaltered, sage-covered surfaces were almost perfectly efficient in infiltrating water (50 miners inches out of a total of 9,000 were infiltrated), “every cultivated orchard was discharging large volumes [of water].” Thus, the PVPA found itself aligned with the conservationist project of watershed landscape protection, despite the association’s focus on maximizing water available for agricultural use. Looking forward to the expansion of his association, Jones also announced plans to pursue ownership of land in the Thompson Creek Watershed, a creek in the canyon just
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east of the San Antonio Canyon. These holdings would allow the group to expand the total area of watershed volume of water available for infiltration—land that would prove critical to protecting the wilderness immediately north of Claremont from residential development.

The 1915 California Supreme Court Settlement laid the framework for the SAWC and PVWC’s joint rights in the newly established system of watershed management. Ultimately, this guideline would help establish a precedent for dividing increasingly larger total amounts of water flowing out of the canyon. In 1915, the court isolated the two companies’ claims into the PLWC’s claim to the natural flow of the canyon and the specific claims of the SAWC, divided into biannual periods before and after April 1st. The PLWC was awarded an injunction against the SAWC’s attempts to capture and store water above the mouth of the canyon and the right to spread water below the Osgoodby Dam—just south of the mouth of the canyon. The SAWC was awarded 914 inches through April 1 and 965 inches throughout the rest of the year, as well as the right to continue pumping from the improvement tunnels at the mouth of the canyon. When over 10,000 inches flowed over the Osgoodby Dam in the main channel of the creek, a further 500 inches could be taken by the SAWC at the division dam, and eligible “salvage water” could be taken by the Ontario Power Company up to 17 percent of the pipeline through the electricity plant. Finally, the division dam was to be operated jointly by the SAWC and the PVPA. Thus, the originally equally divided rights were translated into a settlement that reconciled the contemporary land holdings of the two companies and an increased capacity of flood management with the water companies’ original claims.

After the 1915 litigation, the Association’s leaders were leaning toward a wider scope of cooperation in water rights protection for the Pomona Valley. In fact, the first recommendation
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for future work by the Association, Jones wrote, was “to offer and press…the reorganization of the Association along broader and more equitable lines and securing he cooperation of every well owner and water corporation in this district.”73 Thus, the Supreme Court decision set the stage for the integration of the SAWC into the PVPA membership, allowing the PVPA to represent nearly every primary interest with claims to the water in San Antonio Creek, and many who owned wells on the area’s confined aquifer. Jones did, however, remind members of the association that “watch should be kept over every attempt to export water. You cannot too jealously guard your rights.”74 While the conflict over the water in San Antonio Creek was bitter and uniquely complex, the threat of invasion—perhaps even from Los Angeles, which was buying up rural water rights at the time—allowed the mutual water companies a uniform body under which to operate.75

In 1915 report Jones also noted the increasing interest in water conservation as a method for flood damages reduction. In the 1914 flood, Jones writes, it had been difficult to keep the floodwaters water out of “ancient channels” that directed them toward the cities of Claremont at Pomona. The PVPA, given that it all of the water, excepting the 965 inches awarded to the SAWC, was moving forward with its plans build dams across old channels just below the mouth of the canyon.76 The floods, if they were to succeed, would “be mitigated to such an extent that they will have ceased to be as great a menace as they have been in the past.”77

Flood control in the San Antonio Wash, however, proved a much more difficult task than Jones initially planned for. In January 1916, snow runoff again overran the dams that had been

74 Jones, Annual Report 1916-17. 10.
76 Jones, Conservation, 3.
77 Jones, Conservation, 2.
built in the wash Pomona College, built into the western edge of the Wash, was in the direct path of these floods. Luckily, major damage was limited to the athletic fields, which were at the time located on land that is now the football field and Haldeman Pool. The 1916 floods prompted the construction in 1917 of a larger dam across the mouth of the Canyon in addition to the reconstruction of the several 150 foot-long dams across the main channel. That year also saw the construction of the gates and a “sluiceway,” that directed water into Jones’ infiltration system. From successive strategies for reinforcement like these emerged a geometric logic of dikes, dams, and reservoirs that attempted to slow debris flow and guide precious water resources first into spreading grounds but mostly into the channel basin. The implicit goal of these efforts was to temper the force of debris that would flow out of the mountains so that the flood water could be infiltrated.

Figure 6. Aerial Photo of Claremont by Robert C. Frampton, after the flood of 1938. (Special Collections at the Honnold-Mudd Library of the Claremont Colleges)

78 Maynard, 49.
As each attempt to slow the floodwaters and direct them away from the town failed, pressure began to grow for a more permanent solution that would end the fear of flooding once and for all. Claremont’s wishes were granted when the federal government passed the Flood Control Act of 1936 as part of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal. The original act authorized surveys of several creeks and their potential for flooding in the area, including the San Antonio Creek. In 1938, record rainfall and snowmelt overwhelmed flood control infrastructure across the region, including the PVPA’s dams in the San Antonio Wash. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, flash flooding killed 6 people in the Pomona Valley. As is clear from Figure 6, this event returned the San Antonio Creek to its original channels and gouged new ones across the landscape, cutting once again perilously close to the city of Claremont, which found itself under water. In response, the Flood Control Act was amended in 1938 to create a flood control basin for San Antonio and Chino Creeks and appropriated $6,500,000 to fund improvements recommended by the Army Corps’ original study, including a dam that would contain a conservation basin with a capacity for 5,000,000 square yards of debris at the mouth of the canyon. Presenting at a public meeting in Ontario, Major Theodore Wyman, Jr. of the Army Corps of Engineers discussed the prominence of concerns over debris management in the canyon’s massive and destructive flood events in designing the project’s colossal conservation basin. Wyman reported that the Corps’ plans were “developed with the cooperation of your engineers and the Los Angeles County Flood Control District, so that the problems and desires of local interests could be met to the extent that economic and engineering constraints allow.”
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Although a majority of the new flood district would fall in San Bernardino County, Major Wyman did not name any San Bernardino County entities in the body of his report. Prior to the meeting, the San Bernardino County Surveyor, Mr. H.L. Way, met with Major Wyman to review the plan and submitted comments in person, which Major Wyman read and answered at the meeting in Ontario. In 13 questions submitted for review and answer, Way oscillated between requesting cooperation and agreement across county and water district lines and lobbying the Army Corps for reparations for what he saw as unequal and unfair water use across district lines. For other questions regarding governance of the area’s water supply, Major Wyman deferred to local interests and policymaking processes.82

Way was likely testing Wyman to understand the extent to which the Army Corps Dam would provide appropriations to manage water resources on a regional level in an era of extensive governmental expansion that led to the development of new water management infrastructures. As his questions and Wyman’s rebuttals suggest, however, the Army Corps of Engineers was interested in little more than building flood control infrastructures that supported the status quo of local control over water rights politics. Where Way was looking for a solution to the region’s bitter divide over the politics of water and land ownership, he found only an entrenchment of existing debates.

When the Army Corps Dam was completed in 1956, it did bring some sense of peace to the Pomona Valley.83 As the colleges continued their slow trek into newly protected lands, the idea of the Wash—once a scrubby wilderness, was reduced to a small swatch of trees and a collegiate fantasy. The Flood Control Acts—like most of New Deal programs—contributed to new scale of infrastructural growth in terms of project size and number. The impulse to control

82 Wyman, 6.
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flooding also entrenched a theme of technological dominance over ecological processes that allowed the traditional development game to further invade the Wash.

Despite Hilgard’s early discovery of the connection between the San Antonio Creek and the region’s artesian wells and Jones’ extensive work on groundwater flows within the basin seems to have had little effect on preservation concerns below the dams at the mouth of the canyon. While environmental quality in the canyon was fiercely guarded by the SAWC, it appears that many of the Wash lands reclaimed by the Pomona Valley Protective Association were readily handed over to gravel mining corporations. By the late 1920s, Los Angeles’ massive expansion was putting a significant strain on the region’s aggregate rock industry. Writing in 1927, mining engineer and consultant Frederick Bradshaw illustrates the demand that drove the gravel mining industry to expand rapidly into the San Antonio Washlands:

The remarkable growth of the Los Angeles district in the past ten years is continuing and will continue. The programme for new streets and highways in the district is enormous, in all Southern California as well as in the City and County. (As an instance the City budget for streets and storm sewers is thirty millions of dollars for the present year.) Building and other engineering work is expanding likewise and the demand for crushed rock products will be increased as much or more than the demand for any other material or commodity.84

The massive expansion of Los Angeles during the first half of the 20th century (the population of Los Angeles County expanded by a factor of 20 from 1900 to 1930) saw an equally impressive effort to extract aggregate material with which to build for the now over 2 million people living in the county.85 During the mid-1920s, the Pomona Valley Protective Association, as a major owner of reclaimed lands in the Wash, signed indefinite leases with multiple mining operations,

85 Fogelson, 78.
a move that sealed off these open spaces from the public and literally took large portions of the wash’s wilderness into wasteland.  

This process of extraction, as demonstrated in Claremont, has had a permanent effect on the San Gabriels’ wash landscape, whose massive fans of alluvial debris make for lucrative aggregate mining sites. Matthew Coolidge at the Center for Land Use Interpretation links this expansion with the colossal growth of highway and port infrastructures that propelled this nation into the second half of the 21st century. While Bradshaw, as a mining engineer and entrepreneur, knew that Los Angeles was destined for a promising road-based future, he could make no reference to the physical or symbolic impact aggregate mining would have on the region’s landscape. Today, the gash-like topography of the gravel pits in the San Gabriel Valley and in Claremont join the towering San Gabriels as the region’s most striking visual features—one need only drive down Claremont’s sixth street to understand this—just east of the Claremont city line the road crosses just south of the massive pit and offers stunning views of the 10,500 ft. Mount Baldy. These fissures—in tandem with the region’s concrete-jacketed rivers—bear the cultural and material impact of Los Angeles’ war on the region’s ecologies waged over the rock and gravel gouged out of the hard-packed earth.

Ironically, digging deeper into these pits reveals some the churning forces that Los Angeles has so brazenly pinned back. As Mike Davis notes, the San Gabriels’ alluvial fans, on which most of our area is situated, are so dynamic that it is difficult to distinguish between major flooding events based on traditional theories of sedimentation. Quoting geomorphologists Nathaniel Lifton and Clement Chase, Davis calls attention to the fact that “landscapes may take hundreds or thousands of years, or more, to recover from the effects of a single large-magnitude
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event.” These events—which dwarf any events in the recent account of flooding in the San Gabriels—are compounded with tectonic activity in the area (earthquakes, anyone?) to disrupt, in Lifton and Chase’s words, “the stable I and D [measures of landmass volume and topographical “roughness” respectively] to which a landscape evolves.” In short, we cannot expect in Los Angeles the same geologic, topographical, or hydrological stability that we (perhaps also falsely) expect in other regions of the world. Davis builds our contemporary understanding Los Angeles’ catastrophic landscape in opposition to the harmony, balance, and abundance that Europeans putatively observed in the first two centuries on the East Coast of the New World. That Los Angeles’ image—the pastoral—is derived from the (largely) British tradition of picturesque landscape as representing a “gentle balance” through quaint moments of “serendipity” is telling of the boldness—and perhaps naiveté—of what Los Angeles was trying to accomplish. Euro-Americans, expecting a tranquil landscape of four seasons, discovered a turbulent landscape of destruction and renewal that we have yet to fully reconcile with Los Angeles’ contemporary built environment. It should be noted, however, that the dramatic and flashy example of Los Angeles and its apocalyptic landscape reveal a national (and also international) underestimation of the power of ecological systems.

A major result of this attempt to dominate rather than work within the constraints of natural systems is the phenomenon of increasingly catastrophic “natural” disaster events. As James Kahan has argued, integrated water resource management draws on environmental history, historical and contemporary case studies, and future projections (re: climate change) to
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discover that “flood control includes conceding land to the water from time to time.”\textsuperscript{89} As with
the threat of catastrophic earthquake in this region, the question is less \textit{if} than it is \textit{when}—and as
Kahan notes, we are better off balancing the expectation of disaster with attempts to prevent it
rather than pursuing the former with fingers crossed. This criticism has two implications. First,
new watershed management infrastructures should be built with the expectation that lands cannot
be fully controlled—an understanding that means resisting the temptation to build
indiscriminately on newly reclaimed lands. As the field of environmental history continues to
examine interactions between culture, its infrastructures, and the natural systems these occupy,
designers and engineers can better determine how to build strategically in—or avoid
completely—the most volatile landscapes. Second, and perhaps more immediately, it means
understanding and planning for the risks of catastrophic dam failure as they stand. Two
catastrophic dam failures in Los Angeles—the St. Francis Dam in 1928, killing 385 people,\textsuperscript{90} and
the Baldwin Hills Reservoir in 1963, killing 5 and destroying 277 homes—remind us of the risks
of building in the paths of Los Angeles’ watersheds.\textsuperscript{91}

Those living in the Pomona Valley should keep historical failures like that in the St.
Francis Dam accident in mind—especially given recent warnings about the infrastructures in the
San Antonio Canyon. The Army Corps of Engineers has classified the San Antonio Dam as
“Level II—Urgent, Unsafe or Potentially Unsafe,” a rating that acknowledges that “the
likelihood of failure from one of these occurrences, prior to remediation, is too high to assure
public safety; or the combination of life or economic consequences with probability of failure is

\textsuperscript{89} Kahan, James P. From \textit{Flood Control To Integrated Water Resource Management: Lessons For The Gulf Coast From Flooding In Other Places In The Last Sixty Years}. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 2006. \textit{eBook Collection (EBSCOhost)}. Web. 6 Nov. 2014. 2.


very high.” At the San Antonio Dam, the risk is twofold: the dam has a high risk of failure during normal operations from seepage or “piping” of water into its foundation; it is also at high risk of being overtopped in a flooding event given the Canyon’s calculated probable maximum flood calculation. According to the Corps’ website, an Issue Evaluation Study has been in process since the Dam’s Level II classification in 2008. Meanwhile, remote monitoring and on-site inspection continue as part of an ongoing evaluation study. The Level II classification also requires the Corps to work with local agencies to establish Emergency Action Plans and disseminate information about risk and preparedness. As Kahan points out, however, governmental agencies have few plausible mechanisms for moving populations directly in the path of potential flooding—none of which are politically viable. Just as Major Wiley pointed out to citizens of San Bernardino County in 1939, the Army Corps, as a federal agency, can do little more than cooperate with local agencies.

At various points in its recent history, the San Antonio Wash has been caught in the middle of legal, political, and social battles, viewed at once as a life-giving resource and a life-threatening risk. A dissection of the region’s watershed into two distinct parts—the canyon above the dam and the wash below, was pursued under the assumption that “nature” and “natural systems” are something “over there,” while the wash has become an underdeveloped piece of the urban landscape. Except in its value as an extractive resource and as a setting for spreading and aquifer recharge, the Wash has rarely been considered for its role in the region’s greater cultural and ecological landscape. As the region’s grid expanded, this once explicitly integral landscape was further dismembered, yielding the current illusion of discrete underdeveloped sites that defines the wash. The underlying logic of the Wash still remains, however, in both the altered yet
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interconnected infrastructural ecologies of water, rock, and soil, and also in the very real risks presented by the piece of infrastructure that made this dismemberment possible—the San Antonio Dam. As the narrative of Army Corps involvement in watershed management via the San Antonio Dam suggests, consensus on a local level is required to gain traction on holistic ecological risk management in the valley. Just as the early citizens of the Pomona and Rancho basins needed the Pomona Valley Protective Association to coordinate the management of precious groundwater resources, Claremont, Upland, Montclair, and San Antonio Heights are in need of a revival of the concept of a cooperative body that can reconcile the logic of the Wash with the metropolitan grid imposed upon it.

**From Business as Usual to Gravel Pit as Inspiration**

The idea of the consortium originated in the early 1920s, when James E. Blaisdell, the college’s third President. In a letter to Ellen Browning Scripps, who would eventually give the founding donation for Scripps College, Blaisdell outlined his plan for the consortium by emphasizing California’s massive growth and the role of education in that growth. Blaisdell references Oxford University as a model for a group of residential colleges with shared resources at the center of the consortium, and he references Stanford as an example of the prestige in store for growing colleges in the American West. “All I can hope to do for Pomona College is to draw the outlines of a project so fine and yet so sane that the generations will not suffer it to fail…the most compelling uplift one can put into the world is in the creation of some vivid opportunity for men to carry on in a great way,” wrote Blaisdell. The pitch worked, and Ellen Browning Scripps donated 250 acres of land that would endow Scripps College, the group’s second undergraduate institution, and the consortium in general. Scripps’ donation came with the stipulation that the
lands be held and sold for the benefit of Scripps College or use by the consortium for educational purposes—a tenet that has been grandfathered into CUC’s contemporary land use policy.\(^{95}\)

It is from this original land grant that CUC gained what we now call the Bernard Field Station and the Claremont Golf Course that, along with the Pit and the existing campuses, comprise the Consortium’s major contiguous land holdings. Since the mid 1990s, these three sites have been at the center of CUC’s development efforts, which attempt to balance the City of Claremont’s conservative attitudes toward development with the Consortium’s historical and contemporary plans for expansion—which since Blaisdell first conceived of the consortium have been traditionally ambitious. Thus far, all three sites have presented significant roadblocks to development. This section will outline four major periods in the recent history of the consortium that have attempted to deal, in one way or another, with the gravel Pit.

**It Happened in the Pit:**

The lands east of campus have always held a particularly mythical status for students in the consortium. In the early years of the college, as I have discussed, the scrublands to the East of the campuses were wide open. Floodwaters and debris would flow down from the canyon and rip through the Wash, cutting deep channels only to overflow them the next year and spill across the land. This landscape formed the backdrop to faculty and student performances and gatherings that constructed and celebrated Claremont’s tentative domination over the preexisting landscape. The most enduring legacy of this tradition is Pomona College’s men’s alma mater, *Torchbearers*, which is still sung—though under revised words—at alumni events today. *Torchbearers*, originally titled *Ghost Dance*, was written by Professor Frank Brackett in the summer of 1890. According to his book, “Granite and Sagebrush,” Brackett wrote *Ghost Dance* after returning

---

\(^{95}\) Bernard, 18.
from a gathering of Cahuilla Indians where he secretly witnessed what he believed to be a “ghost dance,” a religious ceremony that formed part of a series of Native American ethnic regeneration movements in the late years of the 19th and early 20th centuries.96 While the origins and practices associated with the Ghost Dance movement vary across tribes, the movement can be understood as a series of religious ceremonies and practices that prophesied a resurrection of Indians murdered at the hands of Europeans.97 Although a significant portion of these movements advocated peaceful coexistence with whites, the most famous was the Lakota Ghost Dance of 1890, which the United States Government viewed as a threat to its goal of total integration of Indians into white culture. The government’s policy of military-driven cultural suppression ultimately led to the Wounded Knee Massacre. Some of the Lakota Ghost Dancers captured in this standoff would be handed over to Colonel William F. Cody, who founded Buffalo Bill’s Wild West show that toured Europe from April 1891.

Figure 7. Pomona College Students Performing “Primitive Indian Life,” n.d.  
(Special Collections at the Honnold-Mudd Library of the Claremont Colleges)

It was precisely at this time—and no doubt influenced by some of these contemporary issues that Pomona’s Frank Brackett wrote *Ghost Dance*, which proved very popular among students. They would dress up in “Indian” costumes and perform plays that copied and echoed the fetishization of Indian culture in Buffalo Bill’s Wild Show. One such play, pictured here, was titled “Primitive Indian Life.” Both the Wild West show and Pomona’s *Ghost Dance* capitalized on the mix of anxiety and fetishism with which white settlers addressed the existence of American Indian claims to traditional lifeways in the American West.

The Wash, as a “primitive” landscape, became a theatre for the othering of American Indians. In 1905, the Wash area immediately east of the Pomona campus was purchased for future expansion of the campus “due to concerns about investors purchasing it for development.”98 Three years later, a baseball diamond, a football field, and the “Greek theatre” were built in this swath of the Wash east of Marston Quad where they still stand today. As the lands between Pomona and the quarry were developed, “the Wash” was made into a small, isolated patch of native plants in the southeast corner of the College’s campus. A weekly campus party, put on by Nu Alpha Phi, maintains to a symbolic relationship to the area’s prior context, although most students and faculty don’t associate Pomona’s Wash with the region’s alluvial fan.

As quarrying began in the Consolidated Rock quarry—now the CUC Pit—as early as 1920, this portion of the greater landscape of the Wash was lost to the students of the college and the surrounding community. When Pitzer was established in 1963 on one of the last pieces of open landscape on the campuses, the western edges of the Wash began to be built and landscaped. Later, the college designated the Rodman Arboretum, a managed section of native
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plants just north of the campus below the Harvey Mudd Campus. Before Pitzer’s new dorms were built, the “Outback” was a larger L-shaped stretch of landscape that served the college in various functions, including an ecological laboratory, a site for art and performance, and a general site for “alternative” activities. Just across Claremont Boulevard, however, lay a much larger and more enticing marginal landscape—the gravel pit, which upon its decommission and partial conversion for landfill use in 1972, reopened possibilities for the colleges—who wanted to build there—and the students, who animated the pit with various performance events and parties.

Interest in marginal spaces across the 5Cs intensified during the 1970s, fueled by a climate of campus unrest that advocated for cultural liberation by challenging societal control. The early years of the 1970s saw the transformation of activism in the 1960s, then centered largely on the civil rights movement, grow into a massive counter-cultural disaffection with the American political system with anti-Vietnam War Protests. During this period of social unrest, Pitzer was attracting “students of the radical mindset” who often lead civil rights and anti-war protests in the consortium by the Student-Faculty Vietnam Protest Committee. A key indicator of Pitzer’s broad commitment to solidifying the countercultural movement, however, was the Vietnam Moratorium Coalition, which aimed to be “educational in every sense of the word.”

Milton Mankhoff and Richard Flacks observed in 1970 that “virtually all efforts [by students] to sustain a counter-culture, to find time, space, resources, and freedom for experiment, have come up against the necessity of resisting efforts by the authority structure to undermine or frustrate

---

99 In the last two decades, Professor Paul Faulstich has led the restoration of the “Outback,” protecting one of the last remaining outwash landscapes below Foothill Boulevard.

100 Neckar, Lance et. al. Revealing Values
these aspirations.” The countercultural momentum of the decade, intensified by the consortium’s support of Pitzer’s emerging (radical) social justice focus and juxtaposed against Claremont’s traditional image, inspired students to occupy and complicate formal spaces on campus—but also rekindled an interest in the leftover, less-controlled landscapes on the fringes of campus. While these spaces—protected by their marginal appearance and place—have always hosted deviant, marginal, and especially illicit activities, the 1960s and ’70s saw these spaces gain currency, both intellectually and colloquially, as spaces for novel thought, experimentation, and illicit activities.

At the Claremont Colleges, this political climate paralleled an intense period of art-based inquiry, exploration and public, performance-based, and ephemeral forms of expression. In an essay written for a companion to a 2012 retrospective, Thomas Crow wrote that art at Pomona in this time period “was as salient to art history as any being made and shown anywhere else in the world at that time.” During this time period, artists in Claremont and at Pomona College were interested in art that resisted commodification and in turn attempted to escape the structural and material nature of the campuses and the contemporary conditions. Many of these artists were inspired by and drawn to the lack of formal organization in the surrounding desert landscape and the gravel pit, which formed a sort of postindustrial setting that stood—and stands today—in stark contrast to Claremont’s formal, pastoral organization. One such performance was Pomona Professor Dick Barnes’ *The Death of Buster Quinine*, an experiential performance that required its audience to move through the Pit, which was then connected to another quarry to the south of
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102 Another prominent example, though not staged in the quarry, was emerging feminist artist Judy Chicago’s (then Judy Gerowitz) three part environmental project “Atmospheres.” Chicago’s “Snow Atmospheres,” staged in San Antonio Canyon, involved a staged pyrotechnics that “evoked explosive political actions” and called attention to the area’s landscape as a medium for performance art.
Sixth street. The audience would move through a great “Fire Arch” built by Hap Tivey ’69 and James Turrell ’65. Barnes’ performance was re-staged several times over the years, the latest being 1994. Artistic performances and underground uses of the pit continued through the early 1990s, including one piece staged by an MFA student at CGU in 1977, which used the pit as a backdrop for a light show. On the eve of the Consortium’s expansion planning efforts in the mid-90s that hoped to find a “permanent” use of the Pit, Professor Barnes staged one last performance, “A New Death of Buster Quinine.” Aside from these consortium-sanctioned performances and a small portion of the land’s use as an archery range by CMC, the quarry has remained fenced-off from the lives of students and the surrounding communities.

**The Velodrome: CMC Courts the 1984 Olympics**

The late 1970s saw another, if brief, drive in the Consortium’s planning momentum. The most recent addition to the consortium, Pitzer College, was just over a decade and a half old and was growing quickly. In 1976, Claremont Men’s College became coeducational, and in 1980 it was renamed Claremont McKenna College to reflect this switch. Jack Stark, the college’s third President, and Professors Steve Maaranan (a former Olympic bicyclist) and Harry Jaffa, had large ambitions for the gravel pit and for Claremont’s role in the 1984 Olympics and sports in general. At the time, bicycle racing was one of the fastest growing sports in international competition, and Professor Maaranan was building a competitive team at Claremont McKenna. As Mark von Wodtke, a landscape architect who worked on the master plan proposal for the project recalls, the CMC bicycling team had been training in a dry reservoir in the hills near
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Glendora. When Los Angeles’ Olympic bid was announced, the pit’s unique topography became a chance to site a racing facility that could potentially host the Olympics in 1984 and the American team for years to come.\textsuperscript{106}

The design for the sports park and velodrome capitalized on several environmental factors provided by the quarry’s topography. Stark, Maaranan, and the landscape architects at the Claremont-based firm Tojer/Abbott reasoned that building a velodrome, parking, and various other sports facilities in the pit could work with the pit’s uneven topography and avoid some of the costs of filling the enormous pit. “Any other site,” Professor Jaffa told the \textit{Los Angeles Times}, “would require years to settle. Ours would be available for use almost as soon as it finished.”\textsuperscript{107} Von Wodke, in an interview about the plans for the pit, explained that the site’s high western bank and the pit’s depth shields a majority of the wind that would prove problematic on more open sites. Further, and perhaps most importantly, President Stark had secured the donation of the gravel pit property in its entirety by the Consolidated Rock Company—a plan that was contingent on the project getting the Olympic bid.\textsuperscript{108}

President Stark knew that winning the Olympic bid and the committee’s support for the sports facility would position CMC and Claremont as one of the nation’s best cycle-training facilities. As Wodtke describes, the master plan for the complex included bicycle trails up the Wash to a preexisting world-class bicycle route over Glendora Ridge Road to Azusa—making the 5Cs some of the only colleges in the nation with direct access to such a challenging course. Even in the late 1970s, the landscape architects at Tojer/Abbott were able to propose connections to on an extensive network of bike routes that run through or nearby the gravel pit—though few

\textsuperscript{108} Von Wodke, Mark. Interview Regarding Claremont Mckenna College’s 1984 Olympic Velodrome Bid. 30 Oct. 2014.
of these trails connected to the ecology of the Wash in the way the ’84 Olympic bid proposed. Stark, the bicyclists, and their landscape architects opened the contemporary debate about what could happen in the pit with a plan that attempted to reconcile the human scale with the regional ecological connections that Claremont’s development had been all but erased from the landscape.

Although the Claremont plan was endorsed by the U.S. Cycling Federation and the Southern California Cycling Association, it failed to win unanimous support from the City of Los Angeles’s organizing committee, which decided to locate the facility at California State University in Dominguez Hills—10 miles south of Los Angeles. Claremont’s plan was among the best organized in the running, but ultimately the hefty $6 million dollar budget for the sports complex—of which only $2 million for the velodrome would come from the Olympic budget—proved difficult to fund. The Los Angeles Times also commented that Claremont’s relative distance from the City of Los Angeles made the velodrome project difficult to justify to the mayor’s Olympic committee. Without the Olympic bid, ConRock withdrew their offer to donate the quarry to the colleges and the plan quickly faded from memory.

By 1983, the ConRock had found a buyer for the pit—World Vision, an international and interdenominational charity and relief organization that planned to build offices in the pit. World Vision’s plan avoided filling in the pit completely, but called for a $8-12 million dollar re-grade of the site to soften the slopes at the edge of the pit and offices for 700-800 employees with the potential to expand to 2,500. More pressing, however, was the question of dual-county and city governance, since the border between Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties runs directly through the center of the pit from northeast to southwest. Claremont’s City Manager Leonard
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Wood, speaking with the *Los Angeles Times*, expressed concern that the organization’s non-profit status would preempt any tax revenues the city might receive from a commercial development in the pit. The Claremont City Council and the Planning Commission delayed World Vision’s initial development plan five months, but finally approved the general plan contingent on specific architectural revisions recommended by the Architectural Commission.111 Ultimately, World Vision abandoned its plans to build in the pit, and in 1988 CUC purchased the land.112

**A New College?: The CUC Planning Taskforce in the Late 1990s**

Seven years after CUC acquired the quarry, in 1995, the consortium initiated a planning process to define future uses for CUC-held lands. The first task of this committee was to review the consortium’s land use policy, which stipulates that land purchased and held in the CUC Land Bank, incorporated in 1983, is designated for the establishment of future educational entities in the group. “While this option has not been exercised in recent years,” a memo to the Claremont Colleges Community states, “the possibility exists that an appropriate opportunity will arise in the near-to-mid term future.”113 (Two years later, the Keck Graduate Institute would be established.) The taskforce used these policies to outline several possible additions to the consortium:

a. a children’s education center (approximately 4 acres)
b. a new residential undergraduate college for approximately 600 students (approximately 40 acres)
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c. a new nonresidential graduate studies center or affiliated institute (approximately 10 acres)
d. additional education-related facilities for existing colleges (e.g. married/graduate student housing)(approximately 5 acres)

In the end, revealed little more than the realization that building on any of the parcels would present significant challenges. Public interest in the revelation that the Bernard Field Station holds some of the last remaining acres of coastal sage landscape rekindled concerns over the effect the consortium’s planning practices have on open space in Claremont. Option 1 observed that taking the option to develop the CUC Golf Course west of the Rancho Santa Ana Botanical Gardens would have the lowest environmental impact. Concerns over the site’s distance from the original five campuses and the negative economic and local impacts that razing the course could have for the Consortium and Claremont in general made plans to develop a new institution on the course unpopular. In the CUC Pit, the concern was the expensive filling and reengineering process that building on the site would necessitate—roughly estimated at $90,000 per acre in a “significant portion of the Northwest corner.” This revelation was particularly troubling given this portion’s proximity to Pitzer College and Foothill Boulevard, which makes it one of the most valuable areas for future development.

Plans to develop land on and around the Bernard Field Station were stymied by the station’s relative ecological and educational value to the region and to the consortium. Advocates concerned over open space in Claremont and academic programs that use the Field Station were pitted against those who appealed to the intentions of Scripps’ original grant, which earmarked the land for the development of future educational institutions. The latter parties were bolstered
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by the Field Station’s proximity to existing institutions relative to the Golf Course. Varying environmental impact levels across the Field Station complicated the committee’s assessment: the eastern side, including the former CUC Infirmary, reflected “low environmental impact,” while the area around “pHake Lake,” immediately to the west, was rated the highest environmental impact due to its status as one of the last remaining coastal sage scrub landscapes in the area.\(^{116}\)

Despite these environmental concerns, the CUC committee designated a small portion of the Bernard Field Station for the new campus of Keck Graduate Institute in 1997, a non-residential biosciences institute established the same year. The Consortium also reaffirmed its commitment to establishing future institutions and expanding existing ones by explicitly integrating this language into CUC Policy. The KGI plans were held up, however, by a lawsuit brought by the citizen group “Friends of the Bernard Field Station” against the consortium and the City’s acceptance of the North Campus Master Plan. Meanwhile, another group, appropriately titled “The Coalition to Preserve Claremont’s Character,” collected the requisite number of citizen signatures to subject CUC’s development plan to a referendum. The City Council responded rescinded the consortium’s development plan but remained open to a resubmission. CUC and the Friends of the Bernard Field Station settled out of court, putting 45 acres of the Station on reserve for at least 50 years, but retaining 11 acres for the KGI campus.\(^{117}\)

Students at the colleges, however, were not so willing to compromise the western portion of the field station. On March 26, 2001, as planning moved forward for the new KGI campus, a group
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\(^{117}\) In 2011, a large portion of the Field Station east of the “Temporarily Restricted Area” were sold to Pitzer, Scripps and Harvey Mudd Colleges. While Pitzer plans to use its lands, including the CUC Infirmary built by Pomona College in 1921, which would house the Robert Redford Conservancy for Southern California Sustainability. Maltese, Michael. “CUC Sells Land Around BFS to Pitzer, Mudd, Scripps.” The Student Life 30 Sept. 2011: n. pag. Print.
of nearly 100 students gathered outside of the CUC business office to protest. A smaller group of these students chained themselves to a makeshift barrier of concrete-filled garbage cans that blocked the entrance to the office for 28 hours. In the end, the LA Times wrote, “police in riot helmets, aided by a forklift truck, carted off the protesters while they were still tethered to the garbage cans.”¹¹⁸ As of late 2001, Keck Graduate Institute, which is located just south of the city’s downtown core, has no plans to develop the Bernard Field Station.¹¹⁹

After the Bernard Field Station: Focus on the Pit

The compromise over the Bernard Field Station drastically shifted the Consortium’s planning efforts. With the original plan scrapped and the Bernard Field station needed to rethink its long-term approach to land use. In 2002, Robert M. Tranquada, Chair of the CUC Board of Overseers, called for the creation of a new land planning taskforce to craft policies and plans for the Consortium in general—again with an eye toward adding new member institutions to the group. This move was motivated in part by the City of Claremont’s push for a Consortium-wide Master Plan that would preserve open space. This pressure was tacitly understood, but made explicit in the CUC’s Land Use Due Diligence Report in early 2004 that “the city of Claremont will not grant entitlements to CUC for any new development until a Master Plan for all vacant properties is completed by CUC and approved by the City of Claremont’s Architectural Commission.”¹²⁰ While the city has always required the colleges to submit a Master Plan for review by the Architectural Commission, disagreement and unrest over the Bernard Field Station

development and CUC’s settlement prompted the Consortium to reconsider its land use policy and Master Plan. The chief objective of this new committee, Tranquada wrote, was to review earlier land use planning processes in the late 1990s and move forward with a Master Plan that emphasized the Consortium’s commitment to creating new member institutions.

By 2004, a Land Use Due Diligence report had been competed and the Consortium again hired a design firm, this time Gruen & Associates of Los Angeles, to complete a master plan for CUC’s vacant land in its entirety. While the taskforce accepted land use proposals from Pitzer and CMC, whose campuses are directly across Claremont Boulevard from the Pit, it emphasized that these developments are “understood to be temporarily restricted, subject to eventual permanent use for new consortial members.” Developments by existing members of CUC are also required to be “communal in nature; that is, for use by several members,” and “single institutional use or acquisition…is strongly discouraged.”

With these principles solidified, CUC reviewed proposals from Pitzer and CMC. Both reports discussed planned enrollment expansions that would create a larger demand for academic space, residence halls, parking, and sports fields. Claremont Mckenna’s submission outlined the college’s Master Plan, proposing that CMC would need to move sports facilities across Claremont Boulevard in order to reach its maximum allotted enrollment. CMC’s Master Plan, which has since been adopted, argued for expanding and moving some of the college’s sports facilities into the pit and into the Arbol Verde/El Barrio neighborhood southeast of CMC’s campus. Pitzer’s proposal grew from the college’s housing plan, in which Phase I and II residence hall expansions would displace the “East Mesa” fields to the northwest corner of the

121 “PROPOSED POLICY ON LAND USE (excerpts from Minutes of May 21, 2004, meeting).”
122 TSL article: As CMC fulfills its Master Plan, remaining communities in Arbol Verde express continued concern about the college’s encroachment on the neighborhood.
gravel pit. Pitzer also included a proposal for a computational neuroscience lab for a professor in the Joint Sciences center that catered to the consortium’s policy of joint use.

Although only one of the original options Gruen proposed in the general plan accounted for Pitzer and CMC’s proposed sports fields, the colleges’ proposals for the pit were successful. In early 2006, CUC amended its land use policy to include options to lease properties to existing colleges and sell land for expansion to existing colleges on the East Campus properties. This new policy, titled Land Use Policy 110, designated the North Campus properties for gift to new member institutions. The accompanying planning principles suggested by Gruen emphasized a strategy of interim uses as parking lots, playing fields, and “uses that may be on the perimeter of the developed portion of the existing campuses.” Gruen also articulated, on behalf of the board, goals for renewable energy, water conservation, and fostering a “sense of place” in new campus designs. Finally, the report acknowledged the need to address jurisdictional and zoning conflicts unearthed by the 2004 due diligence report regarding development in the Pit—the fact that the pit lies in two separate metropolitan and county-level spheres of influence and the rumored expansion of Cable Airport, which would increase zoning restrictions in the area. Two solutions were proposed: CUC could pursue annexation of the Pit by one civic entity, or the consortium could advocate for the creation of “a joint-powers authority to make entitlement decisions” for the Pit.

123 At the time, Tranquada was interested in the possibility of combining Claremont’s athletic teams into one program, noting that such a plan “would provide the kind of glue for all undergrads to relate to Claremont and alums.” Land Planning Task Force. “Land Planning Task Force Meeting Agenda: August 30 2004.” 30 Aug. 2004: n. pag. Print.
124 Dr. John Hilton, Kenan Chair at the Joint Sciences Center, is a computational neuroscientist who studies the effect of diseases on motion. The lab proposal consisted of a shed that opens toward a driving range on one end, which would allow for his subjects to perform complex motions like a golf swing in a controlled but realistic environment.
In the wake of the land-use policy change, Pitzer and Claremont McKenna submitted and received land purchase requests from the consortium for two swaths of land in the CUC Pit. The policy committee also investigated the possibility of converting the Pit into use as a golf course, though ultimately the extra lands would be set aside for future CUC use.\textsuperscript{126} While both colleges studied the possibility of siting residence halls across the street in the pit, they also favored plans that kept new residence halls close to existing campuses and residence halls. As a result, both plans tended to favor configurations that migrate facilities like athletic fields and parking lots, rather than residence halls, across the street. Authorities at Cable Airport also indicated that playing fields and parking lots would be the best possible use for the pit.\textsuperscript{127}

As the colleges move forward with plans to site athletic fields and parking lots in the CUC Pit, they must consider the effect that this construction will have over future configurations, especially if the Consortium plans to build new institutions on the remaining land in the site. As the Land Use Due Diligence Report of 2004 indicated, questions of dual-jurisdictional authority and the expansion of Cable Airport remain significant questions that require planning across county and city limits.\textsuperscript{128} Without a planning body that encourages dialogue and compromise across these limits, we will be left with the lowest common denominator for the Pit’s possible uses—sports fields and parking lots. This is not to say that playing fields and parking lots are illegitimate land uses. These uses, however, perpetuate the contemporary belief that the Pit and the surrounding Wash is an underdeveloped wasteland and dumping ground—the collective back

\textsuperscript{126} Claremont University Consortium Committee on Land Use. “Recommended Action on Claremont McKenna College and Pitzer College Land Purchase Requests.” 2006: n. pag. Print.

\textsuperscript{127} Exactly what is meant by this is unclear from the documentation of this meeting, but documents imply that an expansion of Cable Airport would result in the reclassification of the CUC Quarry as part of an expanded airport safety zone. “Minutes of the Land Use Planning Task Force, December 15 2006.” 15 Dec. 2006: n. pag. Print.

yard of the Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Upland, and Montclair. A specific effort must be made to ensure that this back yard maintains its potential for use as a public, communal space for recreation, residence, and work.

**Sustainability versus Conservation: Focusing on a Regional Scale**

Conservationists, environmentalists, ecologists, humanitarians, sustainability activists—these are all terms we use to describe people who are interested in humanity’s relationship to the earth and to the environments we live in. While most of the arguments made by these movements align in their investigation of ecological principles, they are differentiated by the extent to which each framework incorporates ecological thinking and in their normative approaches to the subject of “environmental” relationships. Policy scholars Mazmanian and Kraft organize the political strategies of the environmental movement into three distinct and roughly chronological “epochs”: land use and conservation through environmental regulation, resource conservation through market-based reforms, and blending social and ecological sustainability in community engagement toward a sustainable protocol. While these epochs are chronological in their development and build off one another, they are not mutually exclusive, and contemporary environmental policies employ methods and ideologies from all three epochs.129

In 1991, on the cusp of the modern sustainability movement and amid expanding understandings of the climate change crisis, *Nature Study* rated “Silent Spring” and “A Sand County Almanac” the most significant environmental books of the 20th Century. These books built on the ecological frameworks of early conservationists, whose focus on protecting
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“untouched” landscapes situates this group solidly in the first epoch of property-based government protection. George Perkins Marsh, a close mentor of George Grinnell, wrote “Man and Nature,” in 1864, making it one of the first texts to hint at ecological relationships in modern terms. Marsh’s writings were part of a movement by foresters, hunters, fishers, and other interested parties that lead the early conservationist movement. These early ecological understandings served as a bridge between Preservationists like Bernard Fernow, who argued for the inherent and spiritual value of nature, and industrialists like the Weyerhauser family, who saw forests as the key to the nation’s (and their own) prosperity.

What distinguishes “Silent Spring” and “A Sand County Almanac” from turn-of-the-century conservationists like Fernow and Pinchot, Duffy points out, is that their authors “asked for a reevaluation of the basic American premise that “more” always means “better,” and that the only way to measure progress is economically.” Where early conservationists hinted at the possibility of ecological relationships and promoted various notions of stewardship, Leopold called for a complete restructuring of American society around his proposed “ecological consciousness” and a “land ethic,” which, as Duffy observes, is “derisive of the human condition.”

When Carson published her book in 1962, environmentalists were beginning to see how the agrochemical industry has complex and catastrophic effects on organisms across watershed and ecosystems and across food distribution networks as well. Her book situated humans in an ecological framework, demonstrating how people are contingent upon the ecological processes
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that Leopold argued to protect. Where Leopold’s “land ethic” called for a new attention to ecological processes for the sake of respecting the environment for its own sake, Carson unearthed the harsh reality that humans, as part of the ecosystems that industrial processes destroy, are subject to the same poisoning that Leopold sees happening to “natural” environments. As William Cronon argues in “The Trouble with Wilderness,” a preoccupation with setting aside pristine landscapes is not enough to protect natural ecologies—and our own health—from the detrimental effects of industrial development.133

Conservationists in the second half of the 20th century, like their predecessors, viewed governmental policy as the most effective tool for protecting valuable resources and natural settings, although they had Carson’s arguments and a growing body of ecological literature to support their arguments. The response to Carson’s observations about pollutants lead to an era of pollutant-targeted environmental regulations focused on the implications of the Clean Air (1970) and Water (1972) Acts, which established pollution reduction goals to be implemented by land management bureaus, the newly formed Environmental Protection Agency, and other federal regulatory bodies.134

A second approach to environmental regulation grew around an interest in framing resource conservation and pollution reduction in economic terms and using market-based interventions to encourage efficiency and reflect the costs of pollution and overconsumption. Mazmanian and Kraft attribute this general shift in policy approach to President Carter’s focus on reconciling economic growth with environmental regulation in the 1970s and President Reagan’s aversion to federal regulation during his presidency.135 These mechanisms aimed to

134 Mazmanian and Kraft, 18.
135 Mazmanian and Kraft, 10.
measure and represent the negative impacts of industry on ecologies. Incorporating these effects, or “externalities,” would in theory create a sustainable system that assumes—and makes possible—continued economic growth.

A third approach to environmental responsibility reflects a growing understanding of the relationship between environment and society and attempts to reform environmentally damaging processes within social and economic systems. The “environment” is viewed not as a specific place in need of saving but as a collection of all of the Earth’s places that support a single ecosystem. Rather than pursuing specific environmental outcomes, sustainability theory seeks to establish a framework of ecologically consistent principles that governs actions on multiple scales by any conceivable actor. Perhaps most importantly, the sustainability paradigm focuses on equality in environments that people live in and interact with directly, bringing issues like Rachel Carson’s focus on toxicology to the forefront of environmental goals.

Sustainability theories have attempted to salvage from this past a vision of equality and ecological reconciliation that prioritizes contextual solutions to relationships between infrastructures and natural and human ecologies that make up a given “environment.” For example, the Hannover Principles, an early iteration of sustainable design principles, call attention to the interdependence of design and natural ecologies, observing that design decisions in the built environment “have broad and diverse implications at every scale.”136 Architects Sim Van der Ryn and Stuart Cowen propose a first principle of ecological design that “begins with the intimate knowledge of a particular place.”137 Problematic configurations of the built environment, while generalizable, arise from specific social and natural contexts, and improving sections of that environment requires a holistic, contextual survey of the factors of its creation.

137 Edwards, 103.
Contemporary theories of sustainability organize roughly around idealized goals for the three E’s—ecology, environment, and equality, although the implications of these theories range from market-based solution to communist revolution, and from calls for increased consumption to minimalist treatise. A fourth E, sustainability scholar Andres Edwards argues, is education, a process that serves as a collective brain that evaluates and (theoretically) governs the environmental and societal impacts of individual actions in a systemic way. A strength of sustainability is that education, in theory, provides a unified strategy that calls for ecological education and action across all scales of government and society—from local to global. While sustainability can be enacted at multiple levels, certain scales of governance are better suited to certain tasks than others. For example, environmental initiatives within Claremont have been relatively successful in that they have achieved some major goals of preserving wilderness in the hills and public parks in the city proper. Claremont has also succeeded in preventing major polluting industries from locating or dumping waste within the city. Groups like Sustainable Claremont, built on a community-based model of sustainability pioneered by Sustainable Seattle, act as important connections between local business, government, individuals and community organizations.

Sustainability scholar Lamont Hempel traces this community-based approach to sustainable planning to, among others, the ideas of planning theorist Lewis Mumford, who believed in a communitarian model he observed in historical accounts of early New England. Such a model, Mumford thought, established “techniques of building a livable place” that “correspond to a culture of community: a commonality based on civic-mindedness and social
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cohesion.” Claremont’s attempts to conform to traditionally Anglo-American notions of community and “place” have proven relatively successful, but these positive aspects of development have in many cases come at the expense of surrounding communities and a vision of a more equal metropolitan area.

A core problem that scholarship toward the third epoch of sustainability has addressed is the spatial results of an environmental ethic that stems from an inherently colonial and racist approach to environmental activism. Human geographers such as Laura Pulido have argued for a spatial definition of environmental racism, which acknowledges that places tied to the cultures of people of color have been disproportionately used as sites for toxic industries and their waste. In the Inland Empire, which follows a pattern typical of non-concentric growth in southern California, wealth is concentrated in specific neighborhoods of the original railroad towns (where they’ve been revitalized or, as in Claremont’s case, at the western edge of the Inland Empire, made effectively private by discriminatory policies) and, more commonly, in satellite developments in the foothills. These subdivisions, which maintain the image of southern California as paradise, appear in stark contrast to working-class communities organized around the region’s formerly dominant steel and manufacturing industry, and now around expanding warehouse and logistics industries. Environmentally impactful developments tend to be sited in neighborhoods of color, and access to healthy communities like Claremont remains economically and racially restrictive in comparison to several surrounding communities. Thus, the unequal distribution of resources across space due to varying governmental regulations and the aggregate

effects of an inherently racist socioeconomic system stand as significant impediments to environmental equality and, in turn, sustainability.

Early citizens of Claremont, Upland, and the greater area needed the Pomona Valley Protective Association to harness the region’s watershed and protect themselves from massive flooding. Out of a bitter standoff between the region’s two major water companies emerged an imaginative project that revolutionized the way the Valley, and indeed the world, thought about watershed management. Today, we find ourselves in need of reconnecting with the Wash as a community resource, both as an infrastructure to address increasing intensity of flood events and as a valuable addition to the region’s dwindling inventory of open space. As the CUC plan demonstrates, reclaiming the Wash will require new forms of governmental and private decision-making that protects the interests of the Wash as a whole and actively works to incorporate environmental justice narratives and concerns in decision-making processes.

**Sustainability and Urban Design Theories**

As I have shown, a dominant critique of development in Southern California asserts that the region’s public realm, and its physical proxy public space, is underdeveloped in relation to private modes of production. In Claremont, maintaining a strong public realm was a core philosophy of city leaders who wielded power over development interests from early in the city’s history. This was not the case for surrounding communities, especially as freeway-driven suburbanization became the dominant logic of organization in the region. Critiques of this condition come from across the disciplines—and more importantly from residents themselves—but interest in a high-quality public realm has been the focus of contemporary urban design theories. Some built environment theorists observe that contemporary development practices
have reduced public space to a “mere token compensation” for otherwise entirely privatized and “rationalized” development practices. “In many ways,” writes landscape theorist James Corner, “the failing of twentieth century planning can be attributed to the absolute impoverishment of the imagination with regard to the optimized rationalization of development practices and capital accumulation. Public space in the city must surely be more than mere token compensation or vessels for this generic activity called ‘recreation.’” In Southern California, as in many places, private property and space is maximized while public space is often relegated to the leftover, less profitable corners of contemporary developments. For Corner, the answer to this contemporary problem lies in the power of the designer to counteract the bitter game of speculation that created Los Angeles and the modern city. It is time, perhaps, for a new imaginative geography that sees development more clearly as a process of intervening in natural and social ecologies. In Claremont, we need an imaginative lens to understand how an emphasis on the formal qualities of new projects in CUC’s policy process yields projects that fail to contribute to contemporary models of sustainability.

Recognizing the incongruence, spatial and theoretical, of dominant planning strategies with urban and ecological problems, designers and policy scholars have begun to think in terms of “landscapes” rather than individual sites; “urban fabrics” rather than discrete buildings. One theoretical design treatise, landscape urbanism, represents a post-modern moment in landscape design in which landscape architects assert their ability to theorize and design with implications across the previously discrete disciplines of landscape and structure. Landscape urbanism, like more general theories of sustainability, argues primarily that the built environment should be viewed in terms of processes rather than forms. Modern design and planning’s emphasis on the
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formal qualities of design—the “object qualities of a space”—implies an end state that, as sustainability theory has shown, doesn’t exist. This method of traditional development, Corner writes, “consumes the potential of the site in order to project” or, in other words, create an object rather than a connective piece of public space.\textsuperscript{142} Rather than proceed under the modern paradigm of urban planning, which through its pursuit of various models of the ideal city relied on an urbanism characterized by stability rather than change, Corner’s account of a post-modern urban landscape asks for a “staging of horizontal surfaces” that allows for future possibilities and configurations rather than preempting them.\textsuperscript{143} Drawing on analogies with modern ecological sciences, landscape urbanism sees designers as intervening in processes of urban growth rather than purporting to establish discrete designs that operate under their own influences. This theoretical shift in the way designers approach the built environment allows “nature” to become its own collection of factors and influences rather than a force to be shut out, subjugated, or contained. In this way, landscape urbanism works as a direct extension and component of sustainability theory.

Corner identifies two major conceptions of “horizontal surface” in contemporary landscape design theory. The first is tied to the literal conflation of the built environment with ecological processes accomplished by emphasizing surface continuity and direct access across buildings and the urban landscapes that surround them. Defining projects of landscape urbanism like the High Line in New York City make aesthetic efforts to blend “hardscapes” and “landscapes.”\textsuperscript{144} As Landscape Architect Elizabeth Mossup notes, landscape urbanism calls for a more functional engagement with ecological processes. Projects by emerging landscape architects in the 1990s (and perhaps also more recent projects like the High Line), she argues,
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successfully capture the metaphor of landscape in the aesthetics of urban projects but accomplished little in the way of harnessing the full power ecological understanding of urbanism.\textsuperscript{145} Olmsted’s plans for the Los Angeles River, Corner observes, uses the river as a \textit{functional} landscape, even though it still relies on the rhetorical opposition of city and nature. As Mossup points out, Olmsted’s system of waterways in Boston’s Back Bay Fens exemplifies an early understanding of the power of infrastructural landscapes.\textsuperscript{146} Such a system blends infrastructure, normally the territory of engineers, with the public access of a park, forming an approach to stormwater management that maintains a high quality public realm. The impulse of these Landscape Architects was to use ecological principles and careful engineering to integrate infrastructure into an accessible park, yielding a piece of the city that functions as part of its hydrological infrastructure. Social scientists and planners expanded this systemic view of the city from the explicitly ecological to the social realm. By the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, Patrick Geddes, a Scottish biologist and planning theorist, had articulated his preference for “surgical interventions” rather than slum-razing in old Edinburgh, which reflected his early conception of the city as an organic entity rather than a fixed form.\textsuperscript{147} In short, landscape urbanism encompasses two applications of ecological thinking that prove critical to this discussion of the San Antonio Wash—the first being the integration of ecological processes into built landscapes. Geddes’ work abstracts the ecological metaphor into a second point, which hints at a notion of social ecology in city building, suggesting that planners engage with the city as if intervening in a system rather than establishing a new logic entirely.


\textsuperscript{146} Corner, 24.

Both Corner and Mossup point to prominent architectural theorists as significant contemporary interpreters of sustainable theories of urbanism. At this theoretical intersection of landscape and structure, Architects and Landscape Architects meet in their attempt to give the notion of urbanism a postmodern perspective—and do so in ways that are consistent with a theory of landscape urbanism. Corner introduces a second conception of horizontal surfaces that has emerged in design fields by referencing Rem Koolhaas’ notion of urbanism as the “irrigation of territories with potential.” While this phrase recalls the speculative growth of Los Angeles, Corner argues that its contemporary form refers to a design strategy that focuses on intervention rather than formal resolution. He makes a distinction, however, between architecture, which “consumes space in order to project [an image],” and urban infrastructure, that “sows the seeds of future possibility, staging the ground for both uncertainty and promise.” This distinction between historical conceptions of architecture and infrastructure touches on the work of a collection of architects that have attempted to complicate this theoretical distinction in their research. Contemporary architectural theorists, many of whom were heavily influenced by Los Angeles as a platform for architecture as urban design, investigate both the process and the implications of viewing the built environment as a landscape—or network—of infrastructures. Perhaps the most prominent example of contemporary research expanding on this notion is Kazys Vernalis’ book on the Infrastructural City, which looks at Los Angeles as a series of “networked ecologies.” These “networks” are influenced by various political, economic, and social (via aesthetics or art) or scientific (via engineering) factors—but the strength of a network approach to urbanism is its conflation of modes of understanding the built environment—an intellectual project that is necessary achieve the interdisciplinary goals of sustainability.

To understand how infrastructures like the San Antonio Dam can be integrated with a vision of the San Antonio Wash as a public landscape requires some imagination on the part of policy scholars, designers, and the institutional actors that serve in most cases as clients. Designers of the built environment access this imaginary by acknowledging the universal role of “representation” as a medium through which cultural ideas about the built environment are expressed. By consciously altering the way material proposals are represented, designers attempt to simultaneously invent novel configurations of the built environment and encourage a language that emphasizes the dynamic nature of processes and flows in the built environment. Examining modes of representation—primarily through drawing, diagramming, and in some cases, collaging, can reveal strategies that erode the object-focus of renderings. This strategy of representation has infiltrated contemporary configurations of design renderings that deploy ambiguity to represent contexts as in flux over time, but the object configuration of formal design representation remains problematic.

Theoretical investigations of representation will continue to examine this discrepancy, but thus far this investigation has revealed little more than the fundamentally contradictory nature of object-based intervention in postmodern design theory. In the meantime, theorists like Clive Knights have pulled architecture from the depths of postmodern deconstruction by invoking hermeneutic forms of analysis, which “charter the unexplored resources of the to-be-said on the basis of the already-said. Imagination never resides in the unsaid.”149 In short, designers concerned with sustainability have little to do but examine the historical relationships and meanings encapsulated by our built environment and attempt interventions that shift the balance toward sustainability.

**Historicity and Community in Sustainability in the Built Environment:**

If the goal of contemporary theories of sustainable urbanism is to argue for designs that acknowledge the dynamic nature of ecologies both social and infrastructural, history becomes the primary intellectual lens through which to understand these connections and their representations. Rather than invent new connections *a priori*, designers can use historical analysis as a method of identifying cultural connections and historic configurations that are obscured by the contemporary condition of the built environment. Eric Higgs has argued that contemporary ecological restoration should rely on history as a “guide” rather than a “template.” Where historical fidelity in ecological restoration once aimed toward an “original” or “pre-contact” state, history is now becoming a tool for discerning possible future configurations based on a multitude of observed pasts.150 Designers and urban policymakers need these ranges to make decisions about where and how to build in our existing cities in ways that engage with historical environmental and social narratives that change sustainability problems for the better.

History can serve as a practice of revealing alternative configurations of the built environment that integrate the public and infrastructural functions of the Wash as a landscape. Given what I have argued in my description of the CUC quarry, major regulatory actors and a central development actor, CUC, emerge as venues for imagining alternative configurations for the CUC Pit and, by extension, the San Antonio Wash. In the case of the Wash, sustainable development requires collaboration across these major development and regulator actors—but this type of regional cooperation has historical precedent in the Pomona Valley Protective Association, and can yield a better outcome for all parties involved.
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The final and perhaps most important role of history in ecological design is the power of narrative in both history and its representation in ecological design. Designs that draw on positive local memories in the Wash’s history and seek to correct past injustices and problematic developments will ultimately lead to a more sustainable relationship between Claremont, Upland, Montclair, and the ecologies that envelop this landscape. CUC’s plans for the Pit should recognize these narratives, and its designers should seek to open up further possibilities for community and ecological engagement rather than simply incorporating this special place into the status quo.

**How to reclaim our backyard:**

Development in Claremont and the Inland Empire saw the erasure of the area’s preexisting peoples and ecosystems. Claremont’s success also came at the expense of entrenchment of economic processes that degrade environmental quality in other areas and fiercely protect Claremont’s “New England” atmosphere. Some scholars characterize this process as a power struggle between industry and a Progressive, government-sponsored public realm. In Claremont, the City Council, with a third part played by private but non-profit educational interests, established and continues to reproduce a privileged enclave that protects environmental and economic (in)equality. From a preliminary historical survey emerge alternative realities that resist the static image of our built environment’s current configuration. We’ve been working with a restrictive notion of environmental quality and ecological restoration—whether it’s Claremont’s obsession with trees and the “college in a garden,” or through the belief that landscapes like the quarry have been damaged beyond useful remediation.
These strategies have restricted our accessibility to these spaces, rendering them relevant only to those who risk hopping the fence to discover a world beyond.

As I have argued, the Wash’s contemporary configuration is a result of problematic historical approaches to development in Claremont that treated it as leftover space between Claremont, Upland, and Montclair. Despite the role of the Wash as a landscape and process that drives this area’s ecosystem and provides the region’s groundwater, it has become the negative space that separates Claremont and the east side of the Wash. Impeded access to this landscape obscures the relationships between Claremont and its place within local ecologies and the urban fabric. Plans developed by the Consortium should take specific and publicized steps to turn these spaces into connective landscapes that recall the current, historical, and future configurations of the Wash. Although (and because) San Antonio Dam isn’t likely to go away soon, we should consciously integrate the Wash’ ecological and hydrological processes and their historical and contemporary significance into its the visual and practical configurations of the built environment that sits within it.

A regional planning entity like the Pomona Valley Protective Association is needed to reimagine the Wash’s current configuration and oversee its restoration. Such a body could serve both as a forum for compromise over conflicting zoning and jurisdictional disputes like that between CUC, the Cable Airport, San Bernardino County, and Los Angeles County and articulate a vision for the Wash as a connective landscape rather than a divisive one. The recent history of land use in the quarry provides a precedent for novel, community-oriented visions for this space, demonstrating the potential that expanded public access to this marginalized but fascinating space holds for a stronger, more equitable landscape in the future. Some of these plans, such as the CMC Olympic Velodrome, showed how the quarry is uniquely positioned to
serve as a centerpiece in a network of biking and hiking trails that capitalize on the Wash’s vast amount of open, if fragmented, spaces.

Investigating historical approaches to and uses of the Wash reveals at once the sense of possibility espoused by artists, designers, and average students with a countercultural bent and the brutal reality of economic and racial oppression to which Claremont owes its success. Its history captures the paradox of radical liberation and empowerment built upon oppressive social structures. As we prepare to develop the Wash—to incorporate it officially into the formal arrangements of campus and the surrounding urban fabric—we must accept that this history will be fundamentally altered and, in some senses, erased. The least we can do is envision a future configuration that recognizes this past for its lessons and its role in creating contemporary cultural and spatial configurations.

A spirit of collaboration and interconnectedness that this site embodies must become a central tenet of design interventions in the space. The role of the Wash in historical and contemporary ecological processes that support this region should be emphasized, and this systemic logic can serve as inspiration for design interventions that attempt to establish regional connections and public spaces. Designs must also actively resist the current configuration’s tendency to establish a false sense of stability and tranquility in this landscape. In some cases, violence and fear, rather than collaboration, allowed Claremont and surrounding communities to grow as they have. Substantive gestures must be made toward Native American communities in this area that recognize the violence with which this community was created and make initial steps toward reconciling this injustice despite the notion that justice may never be achieved. However, recognizing this injustice is an ongoing process that is critical to reducing the violent effects of the murder and removal of Native Americans in the Western United States. In the very
least, efforts can be made by CUC to provide academic and cultural spaces that support Native American communities.

**A new pedagogy: Melding historical narrative with interdisciplinary design education**

Academic communities, especially interdisciplinary ones like the 5C Environmental Analysis (EA) program, hold a unique position that allows access to both theoretical sustainability and design discourses and the local landscapes where theory meets practice. Institutions like the Redford Conservancy for Southern California Sustainability have the capacity to integrate rigorous historical analysis with speculative design. Students in the EA-Sustainability in the Built Environment program have the opportunity to engage with academic work across the disciplines that can inform unique design and policy proposals that solve local and regional problems. By working closely with collaborative groups like the Trust for Public Land, Sustainable Claremont, and other action-based organizations, students in the program can begin to see how complex problems might be solved through local venues—and begin the work of seeing their proposals through. Finally, the Redford Conservancy can capitalize on recent and growing legislation and private grant funding that promotes community-based sustainability planning by proposing projects and collaborations that bring innovative approaches to environmental planning and design to Claremont.\(^{151}\)

Reclaiming the idea of the San Antonio Wash as a public resource for sustainability begins with broadening the historical context of land-use planning by integrating disparate historical explanations of our relationship to the built and natural environment of this region—a
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central goal of this thesis. A strong next step is to host a public education and comment initiative that shares the history of development in the Wash with a goal of prioritizing current problems and publicizing collaborative moments in this region’s history. Such an approach would aim to encourage an expansive view of the possibilities for the San Antonio Wash rather than on the current limitations associated with that space.

As the Sustainability in the Built Environment program hosted by the Redford Conservancy expands, students and faculty have the opportunity to start to use their design projects to begin dialogues about the massive potential of the gravel pit and the greater Wash landscape as a community resource. Just as the Pomona Valley Protective Association capitalized on emerging understandings of local hydrology, students and professors can work with other local actors—whether governments, organizations, private landowners, or other interested parties—to work to expand access to public space and envision a more sustainable relationship to this region’s ecology. In short, students and faculty become the agents by which a new approach to development in this region can emerge.

**Recommendations for CUC Policies on Land Use in the pit and the Wash**

1. The planning process should begin with a statement of ecological and social sustainability and equality that supplements the consortium’s commitments to education
2. CUC should advocate, as the Consortium’s Land Use Due Diligence Report suggests, for the establishment of a metropolitan-scale entity to oversee planning and development in the Wash.
3. Projects proposed for the CUC pit should emphasize and facilitate future connections along both the Wash’s North/South orientation and across this historical divide
4. Athletic and other campus facilities situated in the pit, as well as any remaining undeveloped portions of the pit, should be considered open-access landscapes by the surrounding community
5. Projects proposed for the CUC pit should maintain a desert sage scrub landscape, using native landscapes like the Bernard Field Station, the Pitzer Outback, and the existing landscape of the quarry as precedents
6. Projects proposed for the CUC pit should consider and facilitate the future use of the site by an educational institution that emphasizes access and engagement with surrounding communities
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