

**A
Q
U
A
T
I
C**

WILDLIFE

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Aquatic Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #1:

Modify existing irrigation diversion structures to allow fish passage and reduce erosion and siltation:

- a. Divert Warm Creek back to its original channel to eliminate vertical drops which are a barrier to upstream fish passage and to reduce severe erosion and downstream siltation. (AQ 1.1) *not viable. This would result in a loss of established stream channel. RD 1987*
- b. Develop a by-pass flow at the Williams Creek diversion or a series of shallow sloped drops which would allow fish to pass upstream to spawning areas. (AQ 1.3) *not viable, water only flows past the diversion during spring, spreading out over the fan before reaching LL River RD 1987*
- c. Encourage development of a drop structure at the junction of Williams Creek and the Cedar Run ditch to prevent further deterioration of the creek. (AQ 1.4) *There is no erosion problem here at present RD 1987*
- d. Remove barriers to fish passage (vegetation jams, rock drops, existing culvert) on Badger and Horse Creeks. (AQ 4.2) *NO barriers identified at present. As problems are identified action should be taken to remove them. RD 1987*

Reasons:

Existing barriers preclude fish from passing upstream to spawning areas, contribute silt which degrades the aquatic habitat, and generally decreases the productivity of streams for fish production. Diversion of Warm Creek to its original channel would eliminate severe erosion caused by an existing vertical drop structure. Provision of by-pass flows at the Williams Creek diversion would ensure fish passage and re-establish spawning grounds upstream. This modification will require negotiations with the water user. Although the Cedar Run ditch is located on national forest lands, erosion is contributing silt and fine gravel to Williams Creek which is deteriorating the quality of the stream for fish production. Modification of this structure is consistent with Section 208 of PL 92-500.

e. Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Aquatic Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #2:

Replace the existing bridge over the Little Lost River at Clyde to reduce erosion and siltation, and to prevent the possible isolation of the road and bridge. (AQ 2.3)

Reasons:

The river makes a sharp bend against the road before flowing under the existing bridge. Current erosion pattern indicates the structure will wash out in the near future. Such an incident would isolate a high use recreation area and contribute a large silt load to the Little Lost River. The road and bridge are located on public land and constitutes a definite safety hazard. Records do not show who originally built the bridge.

*Bridge upgraded and strengthened
in present location Aug. 1986.
Erosion has not progressed. no
threat to road or bridge J*

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)

Little Lost-Birch Creek

Activity

Aquatic Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Decision #3:

Reduce siltation and degradation of stream and riparian areas through protective fencing to exclude livestock from concentrated use areas:

- a. Fence 7 miles of Wet Creek (in conjunction with recreation site development) to prevent further degradation of stream quality. Water gaps will be used to provide livestock water. (AQ 3.1)
- b. Fence the upper $\frac{1}{2}$ mile of Summit Creek to prevent damage to riparian vegetation and streambanks by livestock, if this practice is shown effective in adjacent areas. (AQ 3.2)
- c. Fence Squaw Springs to prevent continued erosion and siltation. (in conjunction with Watershed) (AQ 3.3 and 2.1)
- d. Fence about 3 miles along Birch Creek; Sec. 5, 9, 16, T. 9 N., R. 30 E.

Reasons:

all done by 1986

Fencing to exclude livestock from areas currently receiving concentrated use can greatly reduce streambank erosion, damage to riparian vegetation, and siltation of existing streams. Just above Squaw Springs, a gully 10 feet deep by 20 feet wide approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ mile long has developed primarily from rapid snowmelt. Protective fencing in conjunction with watershed (W 3.1, W 3.7) would rehabilitate the area and reduce siltation upstream. Wet Creek receives about 1000 visitor days by hunters, 2000 visitor days by fishermen and an estimated 1500 use days for general recreation. The recreation use coupled with concentrated livestock pressure are degrading water quality, aquatic organisms, and riparian vegetation. Fencing to control use along Wet Creek would decrease erosion and damage to the stream.

Summit Creek begins as a series of springs in the Salmon District where it is fenced and considered an excellent fishery. That portion in the Idaho Falls District has potential for a high quality trout stream and study area. Concentrated livestock use has eliminated or damaged riparian vegetation and contributed to erosion of streambanks and siltation of Summit Creek. Fencing to exclude livestock would allow rehabilitation of the area and ensure continued fish production. Fencing to reduce erosion is consistent with the requirements of RL 92-500.

Birch Creek is a valuable fishery and provides quality fishing opportunities. A fence exists on the east side of Birch Creek. Construction of about 3 miles of fence will allow excluding livestock from the most productive portion of the stream.

e: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)

Little Lost-Birch Creek

Activity

Aquatic Wildlife

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Fencing is necessary to protect riparian habitat along Birch Creek from livestock use which would be increased upon the reseeded area. Adequate water gaps will be constructed to provide livestock water. Fencing would run parallel to the west side of Birch Creek from the existing enclosure in Section 16 to the John Day Grave fence in Section 5 all in T. 9 N., R. 30 E. See Watershed W-1.1.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Aquatic Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #4:

Restore the Little Lost River to its original channel to reduce erosion and improve stream quality. (AQ 4.1)

Reasons:

A bend in the Little Lost River (Sec. 28, T. 9 N., R. 27 E.) has been cut by a large channel. The cut is about 300 feet long by 30 feet across with steep walls. Erosion of the banks is severe and there is a high silt load entering the river at this point. No right-of-way for the structure exists and the builder is not known. The structure violates Section 208 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Restoring the river to its original channel will reduce siltation in future years and help protect fishery values of the river.

The newer channel cut is now stabilized. The old channel has reverted to degraded vegetation and has filled in. Restoring the creek to its original channel would not be beneficial at this time. LD. 1987

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity	Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #5:

Obtain a water right on Birch Creek.

Reasons:

Birch Creek is a valuable fishery and a Habitat Management Plan has already been prepared and partially implemented. The flow of Birch Creek is appropriated from mid April through mid October, but no water rights have been established for the remainder of the year. Instream flow is now recognized as a beneficial use of water following the 1978 change in Idaho Water Law. Establishment of a water right for instream flow would assure maintenance of the fishery as no new diversion would be allowed upstream.

*SCFS instream flow secured 1986
by virtue of Birch Creek Hydes
Project J*

e. Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	Little Lost-Birch Creek
Activity	Aquatic Wildlife
Overlay Reference	Step 1AQ-6.1 Step 3

Decision #6

Modify Step 2 as Follows:

Continue to use water gaps on both Big Spring Creek and Birch Creek. Construct 2½ miles of fence on Birch Creek to exclude livestock grazing. Provide adequate water gaps for livestock. Construct 3½ miles of fence along LL road to exclude livestock from 4½ miles of Big Spring Creek and ½ mile of the Little Lost River.

Reasons

This is a change from what is shown in the LL/BC decision document which specifies elimination of the water gaps.

This action is taken due to the expense involved in providing alternate water sources and because of the additional fencing planned, which will mitigate the impact of existing water gaps on these streams. Livestock would be excluded from 7½ miles of stream by the proposed fencing. Water gaps would remain on 2½ miles of Birch Creek.

An Environmental Assessment would be prepared prior to taking any actions.

Projects Completed 1983 LD

ore: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

Name (MFP)	
Little Lost-Birch Creek	
Activity	
Aquatic Wildlife	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendations Rejected or Eliminated:

- AQ 1.2 - The Dry Creek Flume is considered in Lands L-7.5
- AQ 2.2 - Not a Land Use Decision
- AQ 2.4 - Not a Land Use Decision
- AQ 2.5 - This has been accomplished as a condition of patent in the Robison UTA sale.
- AQ 5.2 - Not a Land Use Decision
- AQ 7.1 - Not a Land Use Decision, will be developed as follow up and result of MFP.
- AQ 7.2 - Not a Land Use Decision

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)