

**W
A
T
E
R
S
H
E
D**

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK PLAN
FINAL DECISIONS - STEP 3

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

Decision #1

Reverse current trend of increasing erosion, promote soil development, and stabilize the second flood plain of Birch Creek by rotobeating and reseeding approximately 2000 acres. (W 1.1)

Reasons:

This area has a vigorous stand of Wyoming Sagebursh indicative of deep, fertile soil. However, the area is adjacent to Birch Creek and shows heavy use by livestock. Grass species make up only 7 percent density on the most productive site on this watershed. The area is crosshatched with rills and covered by an erosion pavement of small rock and gravel. Increased grass cover is needed to reduce erosion. Grazing management alone would not be expected to reduce erosion due to the slow response of the vegetation due to cold temperatures and low precipitation. Roto-beating and seeding with Siberian wheatgrass and yellow sweet clover will reduce erosion while minimizing adverse impacts to antelope.

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	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #2

Reduce erosion, increase vegetative cover, and improve watershed conditions through land treatments* or improved management on a maximum of 216,783 acres of public land where one or more of the following criteria are met:

- (a) Treatment plus management would improve the SSF 10 points or more.
- (b) Less than 15 percent density of perennial grasses.
- (c) Thirty percent or more small rock density of desert pavement.
- (d) Forty percent crown density or more of Wyoming Sagebrush, Basin, Big Sagebrush, Three-tip or Mountain Big Sagebrush.
- (e) Fifty percent or more bare gravel.

*Land treatments include interseeding, chemical spraying, and roto-beating. Controlled burning may be feasible, but specific sites and prescriptions have not been identified. (W1.2)

Reasons:

The density, vigor, and viability of desirable vegetation - particularly perennial grasses - is very low. Soil development has deteriorated through erosion and trampling. Much of the area has a desert pavement. Recovery of native range will require many years, even with optimum management or complete non-use. Potential conflicts with wildlife habitat exist - primarily for antelope and sagegrouse. The potential conflicts for this 216,783 acres is considered low and projects will be designed to avoid critical antelope areas, sagegrouse strutting and nesting areas, and other sensitive areas. Considering the outlook for funding, it is doubtful if much land treatment will actually be accomplished in the next few years.

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

Watershed

Overlay Reference

Step 1

Step 3

Decision #3

Rotobeat or use other methods to remove sagebrush cover on 50 acres of sagebrush in Squaw Springs Valley. (W-3.2)

Reasons:

The valley in the vicinity of the springs has deep soil and a high water table. The sagebrush has grown rank, up to nine feet high with a closed canopy that suppresses other vegetation. Control of the brush will encourage growth of rhizomatous and fibrous rooted plants that are better soil holders than the tap rooted sagebrush. There were no conflicts identified with other resources or programs.

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	Watershed
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Decision #4

Control headcuts and gullies in Hurst Creek by hand-constructing rock dams in the gully. Any additional gully control in the unit will be by hand-constructed rock check dams and not by mechanical water control or other artificial means. Do not divert water from gully channels. (W-3.4 and W-3.7)

Reasons:

The purpose of the hand-constructed check dams is to slow water, deposit silt and build the gully floor. A gully needs water to heal. A dry gully will remain static indefinitely. Also if water is diverted out of established gullies, it may start new erosion especially where the water returns to the main channel. Water should percolate through the hand-placed rocks and spill to the lower level thus reducing the channel gradient. Dams are meant to assist in natural reclamation of the gully; not to control massive heads of water. Artificial or mechanical reclamation of the gullies will cause more soil disturbance and soil loss than will occur naturally within the next 25 years. Protection from livestock grazing will not materially assist the recovery of the gullies and would disrupt the orderly grazing in various allotments.

Note: 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	
Watershed	
Overlay Reference	
Step 1	Step 3

Recommendations Dropped or Rejected

- W 1.3 - Development of AMPs for all allotments were dropped because it is already covered in the Range Management section (RM 1.1, 1.2, 1.3).
- W 1.4 - Rehabilitation of crested wheatgrass seedings was dropped since it is covered in the Range Management section (RM 3.1, 3.2, 3.3).
- W 2.1 - Livestock management to protect springs and riparian areas is adequately addressed in Range Management and Aquatic Wildlife sections.
- W 3.1 - Protection of Squaw Springs is provided for in Aquatic Wildlife.
- W 3.3 - Not a Land Use Decision
- W 3.5 - Administration of this area will be handled by USFS in conjunction with National Forest, so the recommendation is rejected. Most of this drainage area is USFS so control is needed on upper drainage.
- W 3.6 - This recommendation was rejected because the headcuts and gullies are not considered to need rock check dams.
- W 4.1 - The proposal to return the Dry Creek Flume to its original channel was rejected because a right-of-way is in effect. The right-of-way cannot be cancelled. The Dry Creek Flume is addressed in Lands L-7.5.

Note: Attach additional sheets, if needed

(Instructions on reverse)

Form 1600-21 (April 1975)