

Table of Contents

Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan

Available <http://www.fs.fed.us/dxnf/uswmp/index.html>

Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan	i
Executive Summary	i
Watershed Management Plan/Assessment	i
Key Issue Results	ii
Water Quality Results	ii
Steering Committee Recommendations	ii
Abbreviations Used	1-1
Chapter 1- Introduction and Background	1-1
Watershed Plan Description	1-1
Major Endeavors of the Upper Sevier River Community Watershed Project	1-1
Why Cooperative Watershed Management	1-2
Questions Addressed During Initial Assessment	1-3
Context for Cooperative Plan Development	1-3
Watershed Level Plan Assessment	1-3
Assessment Level Description	1-4
Document Uses	1-4
Relationship to Federal Land Management Plans and other Documents	1-4
Chapter 2 -Basin Description	2-1
Watershed Characteristics	2-1
Physical Characteristics	2-1
<i>General Location</i>	2-1
<i>Basin Location and Classification</i>	2-1
<i>Major Land Resource Areas</i>	2-1
<i>County Location</i>	2-1
<i>Elevation</i>	2-5
<i>Precipitation</i>	2-5
<i>Geology</i>	2-5
<i>Soil types</i>	2-7
<i>Erosion Processes</i>	2-7
<i>Vegetation</i>	2-7
<i>Noxious Weeds</i>	2-10

<i>Stream Miles</i>	2-10
<i>Water Related Land Uses</i>	2-10
<i>Fish and Wildlife</i>	2-10
Social and Economic Settings	2-11
<i>Settlement History</i>	2-11
<i>Current Population</i>	2-12
<i>Income and Employment</i>	2-13
<i>Land Ownership/Use</i>	2-15
<i>Recreation</i>	2-15
<i>Roads and Trails</i>	2-15

Chapter 3 - Issue Development 3-1

Assessment Strategy	3-1
Technical Advisory Committees (TACs)	3-2
Characterization and Assessment of Watersheds and Subwatersheds	3-2
Goal and Objective Statements	3-4
<i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>	3-4
<i>Agriculture</i>	3-4
<i>Fire and Fuels</i>	3-5
<i>Human Uses</i>	3-5
<i>Vegetation</i>	3-5
<i>Species and Habitat</i>	3-6
Issue Development	3-6
Issue Rankings	3-6
<i>Fire</i>	3-7
Communities at Risk	3-7
Fuel Conditions	3-7
<i>Human Uses</i>	3-7
Development and Effects to Ground/Surface Water	3-7
Development and Impacts to Adjacent Lands	3-7
Access Management	3-7
Developed and Dispersed Recreation	3-8
<i>Vegetation Composition</i>	3-8
Sagebrush/Grass	3-8
Aspen	3-8
Grassland - Meadow	3-9
Mixed Conifer - Mountain Fir	3-9
Oak - Mahogany - Mountain Shrub	3-9
Pinyon - Juniper	3-9
Ponderosa Pine	3-9
Spruce - Fir	3-9
Tall Forb	3-9
Noxious Weeds	3-10
<i>Species and Habitat - Priorities for Enhancement or Protection of:</i>	3-10

Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Habitat	3-10
Utah Prairie Dog Habitat	3-10
Bald Eagle Habitat	3-10
Spotted Bat Habitat	3-11
Townsend’s Big-eared Bat Habitat	3-11
Flammulated Owl Habitat	3-11
Three-toed Woodpecker Habitat	3-11
Northern Goshawk Habitat	3-12
Peregrine Falcon Habitat	3-12
Sage Grouse Habitat	3-12
Mule Deer Habitat	3-12
Rocky Mountain Elk Habitat	3-12
Pronghorn Habitat	3-13
Turkey Habitat	3-13
Brian Head Mountain Snail Habitat	3-13
Beaver Habitat	3-13
Boreal Toad Habitat	3-13
Bonneville Cutthroat Trout Habitat	3-14
Fisheries Habitat	3-14
<i>Hydrology/Water Quality</i>	<i>3-14</i>
Hydrology	3-14
Hillslope Processes	3-15
Riparian Vegetation/ Habitat	3-15
Water Quality	3-15
Channel Morphology	3-16
<i>Agriculture</i>	<i>3-16</i>
Animal Feeding Operations (AFO)	3-16
Water Conservation Concerns	3-16
Pasture Management	3-17
Wildlife Management on Private Lands	3-17
Key Issue Descriptions	3-17
Key Issue Maps	3-17
Water Quality Studies	3-18
Steering Committee Recommendations	3-18

Chapter 4 - Watershed Description, Key Issue Descriptions and

Issue Rankings	4-1
General Watershed Information	4-1
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	<i>4-1</i>
<i>Land Ownership</i>	<i>4-1</i>
<i>Elevation Roads and Streams</i>	<i>4-2</i>
Key Issue Descriptions	4-2
<i>Current Conditions, Patterns, and Trends</i>	<i>4-2</i>

<i>Reference Conditions Patterns and Trends</i>	4-3
<i>Natural/Human Causes of Change Between Current/Reference Conditions</i>	4-3
Key Issue Overlaps	4-3
Key Issue Maps	4-3
ASAY CREEK WATERSHED	4-5
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-5
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-5
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-6
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-10
Access Management	4-10
Aspen/Mixed Conifer – Vegetation Composition	4-11
Communities at Risk to Wildfire	4-12
Development and Effects to Ground/Surface Water & Summer Home Development - Hydrology	4-13
Enhancement or Protection of Deer/Elk Habitat	4-14
Enhancement or Protection of Riparian Habitat & Riparian Vegetation Composition	4-15
Noxious Weeds	4-16
Ponderosa Pine – Vegetation Composition & Ponderosa Pine/Mixed Conifer – Fuel Conditions	4-17
Tall Forbs – Vegetation Composition	4-17
Wildlife Management in Agricultural Areas	4-18
MAMMOTH CREEK WATERSHED	4-23
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-23
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-23
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-24
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-28
Aspen/Mixed Conifer – Vegetation Composition	4-28
Communities at Risk to Wildfire	4-29
Development and Effects to Ground Water & Summer Home Development	4-30
Development and Impacts to Adjacent Lands	4-31
Enhancement or Protection of Goshawk Habitat	4-32
Enhancement and Protection of Riparian Habitat & Riparian Vegetation Composition	4-33
Noxious Weeds	4-34
Ponderosa Pine – Fuel Conditions	4-35
Tall Forbs – Vegetation Composition	4-36
Spruce-Fir – Fuel Conditions	4-36
Wildlife Management in Agricultural Areas	4-38

PANGUITCH CREEK WATERSHED	4-43
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-43
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-43
<i>Elevation, Roads and Streams</i>	4-44
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-48
Accelerated Erosion	4-48
Communities at Risk to Wildfire	4-49
Development and Effects to Ground/Surface Water	4-50
Development and Impacts to Adjacent Lands	4-51
Enhancement or Protection of Deer/Elk Habitat	4-51
Enhancement and Protection of Sage Grouse Habitat	4-53
Enhancement and Protection of Riparian Habitat & Riparian Vegetation Composition	4-53
Noxious Weeds – Vegetation Composition & Agriculture	4-54
Ponderosa Pine – Fuel Conditions	4-55
Pinyon-Juniper, Sagebrush-Grasslands – Fuel Conditions & Vegetation Composition	4-56
Wildlife Management in Agricultural Areas	4-57
 PASS CREEK SEVIER RIVER WATERSHED	 4-63
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-63
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-64
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-65
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-69
Active Channel Adjustments	4-69
Communities at Risk to Wildfire	4-70
Developed and Dispersed Recreation	4-70
Development and Effects to Ground/Surface Water	4-71
Enhancement or Protection of Sage Grouse Habitat	4-72
Enhancement and Protection of Utah Prairie Dog Habitat	4-73
Noxious Weeds	4-74
PJ, Sagebrush-Grasslands - Fuel Conditions, Vegetation Composition, Accelerated Erosion	4-75
Wildlife Management in Agricultural Areas	4-75
 BEAR CREEK WATERSHED	 4-81
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-81
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-81
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-82
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-86
Access Management	4-86
Pasture Management	4-86
Enhancement and Protection of Riparian Habitat	4-88

Current Conditions, Patterns and Trends	4-88
Enhancement or Protection of Sage Grouse Habitat	4-89
Noxious Weeds	4-90
PJ, Sagebrush-Grasslands – Accelerated Erosion, Fuel Conditions, Vegetation Composition	4-91
Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Listed and Potentially Listed Waters	4-92
CITY CREEK WATERSHED	4-97
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-97
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-97
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-98
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-102
Access Management	4-102
Aspen/Spruce – Vegetation Composition	4-103
Enhancement or Protection of Deer Habitat	4-104
Enhancement and Protection of Sage Grouse Habitat	4-105
Pasture Management	4-106
PJ, Sagebrush-Grasslands – Accelerated Erosion, Vegetation Composition, Fuel Conditions	4-107
Water Conservation Concerns	4-108
UPPER EAST FORK WATERSHED	4-113
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-113
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-113
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-114
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-118
Accelerated Erosion	4-118
Access Management	4-118
Communities at Risk to Wildfire	4-119
Fuel Conditions - Decrease in Historical Aspen Stands	4-120
Development and Effects to Ground Water	4-121
Enhancement and Protection of Riparian Habitat & Riparian Vegetation Composition	4-122
Wildlife Management in Agricultural Areas &	4-123
Enhancement or Protection of Utah Prairie Dog Habitat	4-123
Fuel Conditions - Shade Tolerant Vegetation	4-124
Noxious Weeds	4-125
Vegetation Composition - Sagebrush/Grasslands	4-126
MIDDLE EAST FORK WATERSHED	4-131
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-131
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-131
<i>Elevation, Roads and Trails</i>	4-132

<i>Key Issues</i>	4-136
Accelerated Erosion	4-136
Access Management	4-137
Communities at Risk to Wildfire	4-138
Dispersed Recreation	4-138
Enhancement or Protection of Sage Grouse Habitat	4-139
Enhancement or Protection of Fisheries Habitat	4-140
Fuel Conditions - Mountain Brush Species & Sagebrush/Grassland Areas	4-141
Noxious Weeds	4-142
Pinyon-Juniper - Vegetation Composition	4-143
Riparian Vegetation Composition	4-144
Wildlife Management in Agricultural Areas	4-145
LOWER EAST FORK WATERSHED	4-149
<i>Land Ownership</i>	4-149
<i>Vegetation Types</i>	4-150
<i>Elevation, Roads & Streams</i>	4-150
<i>Key Issues</i>	4-154
Access Management	4-154
Dispersed Recreation	4-155
Enhancement or Protection of Deer Habitat	4-155
Enhancement or Protection of Fisheries Habitat	4-156
Fuel Conditions and Vegetation Composition - Sagebrush/Grassland Areas & Mountain Brush Species	4-157
Noxious Weeds	4-158
Pasture Management	4-159
Pinyon-Juniper - Fuel Conditions, Vegetation Composition & Accelerated Erosion	4-160
Riparian Vegetation Composition	4-161
Chapter 5 - TMDL/Water Quality Analysis	5-1
Water Quality Standards	5-1
Impaired Waters	5-1
Water Quality Standards and Impairments	5-3
Linkage Analysis	5-3
<i>Upper Sevier River</i>	5-3
<i>Panguitch Lake</i>	5-5
<i>Navajo Lake</i>	5-5
Upper Sevier River	5-6
<i>Surface and Groundwater Hydrology</i>	5-6
<i>Nonpoint Sources of Pollution</i>	5-6
Natural Sources	5-7
Human Sources	5-8

<i>Point Sources of Pollution</i>	5-10
<i>Water Quality Analysis</i>	5-10
Total Phosphorus	5-10
TSS	5-13
Habitat Alteration	5-14
<i>Water Quality Targets and Endpoints</i>	5-16
<i>Total Phosphorus</i>	5-16
<i>TMDL Allocations</i>	5-17
<i>Total Phosphorus</i>	5-17
Point Sources	5-17
Nonpoint Sources	5-18
<i>Septic Systems</i>	5-21
<i>Total Phosphorus Allocation</i>	5-21
<i>Total Suspended Solids</i>	5-22
<i>Streambank Erosion</i>	5-25
<i>Habitat Alteration</i>	5-26
<i>Margin of Safety and Seasonality</i>	5-26
<i>Implementation Strategy</i>	5-27
Point sources	5-27
Nonpoint Sources	5-27
<i>Implementation Endpoints</i>	5-28
Mammoth Creek	5-28
Sevier River From the Long Canal Diversion Upstream to Mammoth Creek	5-28
Sevier River from Horse Valley Diversion Upstream to Long Canal Diversion	5-28
Sevier River from Circleville Canyon Upstream to Horse Valley Diversion	5-29
Selection Criteria	5-29
<i>Evaluation and Monitoring Plan</i>	5-29
Panguitch Lake	5-29
<i>Surface and Groundwater hydrology</i>	5-29
<i>Nonpoint Sources of Pollution</i>	5-31
Ipson Creek	5-31
Clear Creek	5-31
Deer Creek	5-31
Bunker Creek	5-32
Blue Spring Creek	5-32
<i>Point Sources</i>	5-33
<i>Lake Status</i>	5-34
<i>Biological conditions</i>	5-35
<i>Water Quality Analysis</i>	5-35

<i>Internal Loading</i>	5-38
<i>Lake Modeling</i>	5-39
<i>Implementation Strategy</i>	5-39
Option 1: Chemical Precipitation of Phosphorus.	5-40
Option 2: BMP Implementation	5-40
<i>TMDL Water Quality Targets and Endpoints</i>	5-41
<i>Margin of Safety and Seasonality</i>	5-41
<i>Monitoring Plan</i>	5-42
Navajo Lake	5-42
<i>Surface and Groundwater hydrology</i>	5-42
Human Sources	5-43
Point Sources	5-43
<i>Water Quality Analysis</i>	5-43
<i>Lake data</i>	5-45
<i>TMDL Water Quality Targets and Endpoints</i>	5-47
<i>Monitoring Plan</i>	5-47

Chapter 6 - Steering Committee Recommendations 6-1

Initial Focus Area Recommendations	6-1
Incorporation of Public Input	6-1
Utility of Plan	6-1
<i>Focus Area - Sevier River 1</i>	6-3
Steering Committee Recommendations	6-3
Additional Goals & Opportunities Identified Through Public Input Process	6-3
Agriculture	6-3
Human Uses	6-3
Species and Habitat	6-4
Vegetation	6-4
Hydrology & Water Quality	6-4
<i>Focus Area - Sevier River 2</i>	6-7
Steering Committee Recommendations	6-7
Additional Goals & Opportunities identified through Public Input Process .	6-7
Agriculture	6-7
Human Uses	6-8
Species and Habitat	6-8
Vegetation	6-8
Hydrology/Water Quality	6-8
<i>Focus Area - Sevier River 3</i>	6-9
Steering Committee Recommendations	6-11
Additional Goals & Opportunities identified Through Public	
Input Process	6-11
Agriculture	6-11
Vegetation	6-11
<i>Focus Area - East Fork Sevier River 4</i>	6-14

Steering Committee Recommendations	6-14
Additional Goals & Opportunities identified Through Public	
Input Process	6-14
Agriculture	6-14
Human Uses	6-14
Species and Habitat	6-14
Vegetation	6-15
Hydrology/Water Quality	6-15
Additional Opportunities Identified Through the Public Input Process	6-18
<i>Asay Creek Watershed</i>	6-18
<i>Mammoth Creek</i>	6-18
<i>Panguitch Creek</i>	6-19
<i>Pass Creek Sevier River</i>	6-19
<i>Bear Creek</i>	6-20
<i>City Creek Watershed</i>	6-20
<i>Upper East Fork Sevier River</i>	6-20
<i>Middle East Fork Sevier River</i>	6-21

Chapter 7 - Appendices 7-1

Appendix A. Steering Committee Members for the Upper Sevier	
Watershed Management Plan.	7-2
Appendix B. Technical Advisory Committee Members for the Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan.	7-2
Appendix C. Fuel model used by fire and fuels TAC committee for issue rankings.	7-4
Appendix D. Key Issues Identified for all 9 Upper Sevier River Watersheds.	7-5
Appendix D (cont). Key Issues Identified for all 9 Upper Sevier River Watersheds.	7-6
Appendix E. Total acres/miles identified as priority issues for all 9 Upper Sevier River Watersheds.	7-7
Appendix E (cont). Total acres/miles identified as priority issues for all 9 Upper Sevier River Watersheds.	7-8
Appendix F. Vegetation types (acres) by watershed and subwatershed, for entire Upper Sevier River basin. (This table is a two-page spread.).....	7-10
Appendix F. Vegetation types (acres) by watershed and subwatershed, for entire Upper Sevier River basin. (This table is a two-page spread.).....	7-11
Appendix F (cont). Vegetation types (acres) by watershed and subwatershed, for entire Upper Sevier River basin.(This table is a two-page spread.)	7-12
Appendix F (cont). Vegetation types (acres) by watershed and subwatershed, for entire Upper Sevier River basin.(This table is a two-page spread.)	7-13
Appendix G. Land ownership (acres) by watershed and subwatershed, for entire Upper Sevier River basin.	7-14
Appendix G (cont). Land ownership (acres) by watershed and subwatershed, for entire Upper Sevier River basin.	7-15
Appendix H (cont). Data tables for water quality, Asay Creek at U89 Crossing – 494990.	7-16
Appendix H (cont). Data tables for water quality, Asay Creek at U89 Crossing – 494990.	7-17
Appendix H (cont). Data tables for water quality, Asay Creek at U89 Crossing – 494990	7-18
Appendix H (cont). Data tables for water quality, Mammoth Creek at	

U89 Crossing – 494970.	7-19
Appendix H (cont). Data tables for water quality, Mammoth Creek at U89 Crossing – 494970.	7-20
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Mammoth Creek at U89 Crossing – 494970.	7-21
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River at U12 Crossing - 494963. ...	7-22
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River East of Panguitch - 494966. .	7-23
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River at Airport Road Crossing - 494967.	7-24
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River at Sanford Road Crossing - 494964.	7-25
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River 2.5 Miles South of Circleville – 494945	7-26
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River 2.5 Miles South of Circleville – 494945	7-27
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River 2.5 Miles South of Circleville – 494945	7-28
Appendix H (cont) . Data tables for water quality, Sevier River 2.5 Miles South of Circleville – 494945	7-29
Appendix I. Graphs for water quality, Sevier River at U12 Crossing - 494963.	7-30
Appendix I (cont). Graphs for water quality, Sevier River at Panguitch Airport Road - 494967.	7-31
Appendix I (cont). Graphs for water quality. Sevier RIver above Sanford Creek - 494964.	7-32
Appendix I (cont). Graphs for water quality. Sevier River in Circleville Canyon - 494945. ...	7-33
Appendix J. SVAP and SECI Tables.	7-34
Appendix J (cont). SVAP and SECI Tables.	7-35
Appendix K. Waterbody Assessments.(This table is a two-page spread.)	7-36
Appendix K. Waterbody Assessments.	7-37

Chapter 8 - References8-1

Memorandum of Understanding between Upper Sevier River Community

Watershed Partners.	MOU-1
PURPOSE.....	MOU-1
GOALS	MOU-2
STATEMENT OF MUTUAL BENEFITS AND INTERESTS	MOU-2
Geographic Scope of MOU	MOU-3
Development and Implementation of a Comprehensive Watershed Assessment, Implementation Plan and Monitoring Program	MOU-3
AdministrationCoordinating Committee	MOU-4
Steering Committee	MOU-4
Technical Advisory Committees	MOU-4
Signatures	MOU-5

List of Figures

<i>Fig. E-1. A summary of key issues addressed within the Upper Sevier Management Plan within the 9 Upper Sevier Watersheds. Note that some issues have been addressed more than once within a watershed.</i>	iii
<i>Fig. 1-1. The Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan examines issue at the watershed level (USGS 5th field HUC). There are nine 5th field watersheds within the Upper Sevier River Basin.</i>	1-5
<i>Fig. 1-2. Priority focus areas were established during the initial basin-wide assessment during Fall, 1999. Efforts continue to be placed in these areas; however, recent work has evolved into a watershed management plan to help develop priorities within the whole Upper Sevier River Basin.</i>	1-6
<i>Fig. 1-3. The Upper Sevier Watershed Project is one of approximately 15 efforts selected nationwide by the USDA Forest Service to implement holistic watershed restoration in cooperation with land management agencies, private landowners, and other interested parties. The watershed, located in south-central Utah, is a 1,324,899 acre area covering the headwaters of the Sevier River in Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, Piute and Wayne counties.</i>	1-7
<i>Fig. 2-1. Portions of the basin fall within Beaver, Piute, Wayne, Garfield and Kane counties. Land ownership is diverse with sections of state, federal and private lands. There are 9 watersheds within the Upper Sevier River basin.</i>	2-2
<i>Fig. 2-2. The Upper Sevier River basin is located entirely within the Great Basin Region.</i>	2-3
<i>Fig. 2-3. Almost 94 percent of the Upper Sevier River Basin is within the Wasatch and Uintah Major Land Resource Areas</i>	2-4
<i>Fig. 2-4. The largest portion of the basin falls within Garfield County.</i>	2-5
<i>Fig. 2-5. Both the lowest and the highest points in the watershed are located within the City Creek Sevier River Watershed - the northwestern most watershed within the Upper Sevier River</i>	
<i>Fig. 2-6. Temperature and precipitation information for seven locations located throughout the Upper Sevier River Basin.</i>	2-7
<i>Fig. 2-7 (a). Map unit names, number and locations as contained within the State Soil Geographic Database</i>	2-8
<i>Fig. 2-7 (b). Most of the basin-related land use occurs directly along the Upper Sevier River and Upper East Fork.</i>	11

Fig 2-8 (a). Pinyon-juniper and sagebrush/grasslands occupy much of the basin, while ponderosa pine, aspen, spruce-fir and mixed conifer occupy areas within the higher reaches. 2-9

Fig. 2-8 (b). Populations for counties in which the Upper Sevier River Basin resides, have changed little since the first of the Century, except for Iron County. Most of the growth within Iron County has occurred in urban areas, such as Cedar City, which is located outside of the basin boundaries. 2-13

Fig. 2-9. Employers in Wayne, Piute, Kane, Iron, Garfield and Beaver Counties and percent labor force. Totals for each county equal 100 percent of labor force. 2-14

Fig. 2-10. Average annual income for Wayne, Piute, Kane, Iron, Garfield, and Beaver Counties in which the Upper Sevier River Basin resides. 2-15

Fig. 2-11. Land ownership within the basin is diverse, with private, state, National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management lands represented. 2-15

Fig. 2-12. The 3,991 total miles of road represent an average of 1.93 roads per square mile of the Upper Sevier River Basin. 2-16

Fig. 3-2. Original projects and assessments for the Upper Sevier Basin were based on old watershed and subwatershed boundaries. 3-3

Fig. 3-3. Watershed and subwatershed boundaries for the current Upper Sevier Assessment are based on current USGS mapping standards. The current boundaries represent 9 watersheds and 67 subwatersheds. 3-3

Fig 4-1. Key Resource issues identified for the Upper Sevier Watershed vary based on different uses, land ownership, elevation, accessibility and vegetation types within each watershed and subwatershed. The key issues addressed in this chapter, as well as the additional issue category ratings, represent input from hydrology, vegetation, species and habitat, agriculture, fire and human uses technical advisory committees (TAC's). 4

Fig. 4-2. Forested lands within the Asay Creek Watershed are heavily utilized by recreationists. ... 4-5

Fig. 4-3. U.S. Forest Service lands and private lands make up the majority of the Asay Creek Watershed and five subwatersheds. 4-7

Fig. 4-4. Ponderosa pine and mixed conifer forests are the predominant vegetation types within the Asay Creek Watershed. 4-8

Fig. 4-5. Travel along Highway 14, through Cedar Canyon and enroute to Panguitch, Brian Head, and/or Cedar Breaks National Monument continues to increase, as tourists travel from all over the world to visit area national parks and monuments. In addition, Navajo Lake, Duck Creek Reservoir and Aspen Mirror Lake are popular recreation areas for local citizens as well as tourists. 4-9

Fig. 4-6. The 13 key issues identified (descriptions included in the 10 narratives) for the Asay Creek Watershed represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees. 4-20

Fig. 4-7. Land ownership within the Mammoth Creek Watershed is primarily U.S. Forest Service lands. 4-23

Fig. 4-8. U. S. Forest Service lands encompass eighty-two percent of the Mammoth Creek Watershed. This watershed is a popular camping, hiking and recreational use area. 4-25

Fig. 4-9. The Mammoth Creek Watershed is highly valued for its scenic areas, with colorful high mountain meadows, portions of Cedar Breaks National Monument, abundant wildlife and dense ponderosa pine and aspen forests. 4-26

Fig. 4-10. Brian Head Peak, at 11,300 feet in elevation, is the highest point within the Upper Sevier River Watershed. Expansive high mountain tall forb meadows once dotted the watershed; however, high ungulate use has all but eliminated most of these areas. 4-27

Fig. 4-11. The 13 key issues identified for the Mammoth Creek Watershed (described within the 11 Mammoth Creek Watershed narratives) represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees (TACs). 4-39

Fig. 4-12. Although the Panguitch Creek Watershed does not contain any National Park Service Lands, it is the gateway to several area national parks and monuments. 4-43

Fig. 4-13. Private lands along the Sevier River are valued as rangeland, and are used for agriculture and to build recreational homes. 4-45

Fig. 4-14. Pinyon-juniper continues to increase throughout the Panguitch Creek Watershed. Although currently only 20% of the watershed is pinyon/juniper, historically, this vegetation component was much lower. 4-46

Fig. 4-15. Highway 143, running north-south between Panguitch, Utah and Duck Creek, Utah, is used extensively by tourists during summer months. The road provides access to area national parks and a variety of wildlife and vegetation types are visible along the road corridor. 4-47

Fig. 4-16. The 13 key issues identified for the Panguitch Creek Watershed (as described in the 11 narratives) represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees (TACs). 4-59

Fig. 4-17. Twenty-five percent of the land within the Pass Creek Watershed is private, with ranches and farms scattered all along the Upper Sevier River. 4-63

Fig. 4-18. Most of the agricultural lands along the Sevier River have been owned by generations of pioneer families. 4-66

Fig. 4-19. Ponderosa pine, sagebrush/grasslands and pinyon-juniper are the dominant vegetation types within the Pass Creek Watershed. 4-67

Fig. 4-20. Highway 12, recently named an All-American Road, boasts over 1.5 million travelers each year, en-route to area National Parks. The main stem of the Sevier traverses north-south through the watershed and is heavily utilized for grazing and agricultural enterprises. 4-68

Fig. 21. The 11 key issues identified for the Pass Creek Watershed (as discussed in the 9 narratives) represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat and vegetation technical advisory committees (TACs). 4-77

Fig. 4-22. Bureau of Land Management and private lands are found along the Upper Sevier River and make up portions of all ten subwatersheds. 4-81

Fig. 4-23.. Bureau of Land Management lands make up much of the land ownership within the Pass Creek (55,104 acres), Bear Creek (64, 175 acres), and City Creek (59,525 acres) Watersheds 4-83

Fig. 4-24. Sagebrush/grasslands and pinyon-juniper dominate areas within the Panguitch Valley. 4-84

Fig. 4-25. Highway 89 runs north-south through the Bear Creek Watershed. Highway 20, historically used by pioneers to cross from Parowan to the Panguitch Valley, is still the quickest route to Highway 89 and Panguitch, Utah, from Interstate 15. 4-85

Fig. 4-26. The nine key issues identified for the Bear Creek Watershed represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees (TACs). 4-94

Fig. 4-27. Bureau of Land Management lands and U.S. Forest Service lands make up a large portion of the City Creek Watershed and eight subwatersheds. 4-97

Fig. 4-28. The town of Circleville was one of the first established areas within the Upper Sevier

River Watershed. Today, small rural communities exist up and down the Sevier River. 4-99

Fig. 4-30. Many of the routes established today were once used by pioneers to move cattle and supplies from areas along the I-15 corridor. The lower elevations within the watershed are used for farming and recreational use. 4-101

Fig. 4-31. The 8 key issues identified for the City Creek Watershed represent input from fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees. 4-109

Fig. 4-32. The six subwatersheds within the Upper East Fork watershed are composed of state, federal, park service and private lands. 4-113

Fig. 4-33. The six subwatersheds that make up the Upper East Fork watershed are dominated by forested lands. The lush ponderosa pine forests and proximity to Bryce Canyon National Park make this a popular destination spot for outdoor enthusiasts. 4-115

Fig. 4-34. The Upper East Fork watershed supports the largest population of ponderosa pine within the Upper Sevier River watershed. The distinctive soils and vegetation in this area are homes to such unique organisms as boreal toad, beaver, flammulated owl, northern goshawk, Utah prairie dog, as well as mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk and antelope. 4-116

Figure 4-35. Two major highways support over 1.5 million tourists annually that visit Bryce Canyon National Park, or travel enroute to other area National Parks. 4-117

Fig. 4-36. The ten key issues identified for the Upper East Fork Watershed represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees. 4-127

Fig. 4-37. U.S. Forest Service Lands make up the majority of the Middle East Fork Watershed. 4-131

Fig. 4-38. State, private and Bureau of Land Management lands lay along the main Upper East Fork Sevier River corridor. Climactic changes and use of water for irrigation, has changed vegetation structural diversity and impacted riparian areas within the twelve subwatersheds. 4-133

Fig. 4-39. Pinyon-Juniper and Sagebrush-grasslands dominate much of the Middle East Fork Watershed. 4-134

Fig. 4-40. At 6,430 to 6,800 feet elevation, the agricultural lands through the Middle East Fork Watershed are utilized for raising crops and grazing cattle. The recent paving of Highway 22 has increased traffic throughout the area. 4-135

Fig. 4-41. The 12 key issues identified for the Middle East Fork Watershed represent input from agriculture, fire, human uses, hydrology, species and habitat, and vegetation technical advisory committees. 4-146

<i>Fig. 5-1 Beneficial use classification and support status (2002) for the Upper Sevier River Watershed.</i>	5-2
<i>Fig. 5-2. Available flow data for the Upper Sevier River, showing the mean monthly discharge for two stations on the river, located near Hatch in the upper watershed and the lower river in Circleville Canyon.</i>	5-6
<i>Fig. 5-3. Irrigation diversions on the Upper Sevier River and tributaries (DWR, 2003).</i>	5-7
<i>Fig. 5-4. Stream reaches assessed using the Stream Visual Assessment Protocol (SVAP).</i>	5-8
<i>Fig. 5-5. Mean total phosphorous loads for selected station on the Upper Sevier River.</i>	5-10
<i>Fig. 5-6. Annual phosphorus loads for selected stations on Mammoth Creek and the Sevier River.</i>	5-11
<i>Fig. 5-7. Dissolved to Total Phosphorus ratios at selected sites within the Sevier River Watershed.</i>	5-11
<i>Fig. 5-8. Correlation of Total Phosphorus to Total Suspended Solids at Station 494945 (Circleville Canyon)</i>	5-12
<i>Fig. 5-9. Regression analysis of total phosphorous and total suspended solids at Station 494945 (Circleville Canyon)</i>	5-12
<i>Fig. 5-10. Mean total suspended solids loads for selected stations on the Upper Sevier River</i>	5-13
<i>Fig. 5-11. Estimated cumulative contribution of sediment from streambank erosion along Mammoth Creek and the Sevier River.</i>	5-14
<i>Figure 5-12. Reaches assessed for cattle numbers and loading estimates</i>	5-20
<i>Figure 5-13. Sediment delivery rates (USLE model results).</i>	5-24
<i>Fig. 5-14. Panguitch Lake watershed and major streams.</i>	5-30
<i>Fig. 5-15. Carlson Chlorophyll a TSI Value by year for Panguitch Lake above dam (1990 to 2003) - 594548.</i>	5-34
<i>Fig. 5-16. Carlson Chlorophyll a, TP and Secchi Depth TSI Values from Pangitch Lake (1990-2003) - 594545</i>	5-34
<i>Fig. 5-17. Average total phosphorus concentrations in Panguitch Lake above dam (1990-2003) - 594948.</i>	5-34

<i>Fig.5-18. Ratios of dissolved to total phosphorus in tributaries to Panguitch Lake (1990-2003).</i>	5-34
<i>Fig. 5-19. Mean monthly total phosphorus loads for tributaries to Panguitch lake (1990-2003).</i>	5-37
<i>Fig. 5-20. Phosphorus Response Model.</i>	5-38
<i>Fig. 6-1. The four focus areas for this initial watershed management plan are Sevier River-1, Sevier River-2, Sevier River-3 and East Fork Sevier River-4. The focus areas contain opportunities for multiple-partnership projects.</i>	6-2
<i>Fig. 6-2. Sevier River - 1 - Land Ownership</i>	6-5
<i>Fig. 6-3. Sevier River - 1 - Key Issues.</i>	6-6
<i>Fig. 6-4 Sevier River - 2 - Land Ownership.</i>	6-9
<i>Fig. 6-5. Sevier River 2 - Key Issues.</i>	6-10
<i>Fig. 6-6. Sevier River 3 - Land ownership..</i>	6-12
<i>Fig. 6-7. Sevier River 3 - Key Issues.</i>	6-13
<i>Fig. 6-8.Upper East Fork Sevier River - 4 Focus Area</i>	6-16
<i>Fig. 6-9. East Fork Sevier River - 4 - Key Issues.</i>	6-17

List of Tables

<i>Table 2-1. Third through sixth level hydrologic cataloging units (HUC).</i>	2-4
<i>Table 2-2. Portions of the Upper Sevier River Basin (watershed) are located in Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, Piute and Wayne Counties. The basin represents less than one-third of the total acres within all counties in which it is located.</i>	2-5
<i>Table 2-3. Map Unit names, numbers and locations as contained within the State Soil Geographic Database (STATSGO)</i>	2-8
<i>Table 2-4. Together, pinyon-juniper and sagebrush/grass cover more than 50 percent of the watershed.</i>	2-10

<i>Table 2-5. Water-related land uses, Division of Water Resources.</i>	<i>2-10</i>
<i>Table 2-6. Number of farms and farmland acres for counties in which portions of the Upper Sevier River Basin are located.</i>	<i>2-12</i>
<i>Table 2-7. The total population of the watershed is estimated at 3,704 people or .56 person per square mile of the watershed.</i>	<i>2-13</i>
<i>Table 2-8. Total labor force (number of workers) for Beaver, Garfield, Iron, Kane, Piute and Wayne Counties. Figures represent county totals and are not weighted by percent of basin within each respective county.</i>	<i>2-14</i>
<i>Table 4-1. The Asay Creek Watershed is composed of 5 subwatersheds.</i>	<i>4-5</i>
<i>Table 4-2. Sagebrush/grasslands and pinyon-juniper encompass the majority of the Asay Creek Watershed.</i>	<i>4-6</i>
<i>Table 4-3. Issue ratings for all five Asay Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-21</i>
<i>Table 4-3 (con't). Issue ratings for all five Asay Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TAC's). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-22</i>
<i>Table 4-4. The four subwatersheds in the Mammoth Creek Watershed contain the least number of acres within the Upper Sevier River Basin..</i>	<i>4-23</i>
<i>Table 4-5. Although only a small portion of the watershed, tall forb communities are considered high priority for protection by resource personnel.</i>	<i>4-24</i>
<i>Table 4-6. Issue ratings for all four Mammoth Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-40</i>
<i>Table 4-6(con't). Issue ratings for all four Mammoth Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-41</i>
<i>Table 4-7. The six subwatersheds in the Panguitch Creek Watershed consist of a variety of land ownership.</i>	<i>4-43</i>
<i>Table 4-8. Extensive sagebrush/grasslands are valued as priority habitat for deer, elk, sage grouse and numerous other birds and small mammals.</i>	<i>4-44</i>

<i>Table 4-9. Issue ratings for all six Panguitch Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-60</i>
<i>Table 4-9 (con't). Issue ratings for all six Panguitch Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-61</i>
<i>Table 4-10. The ten Pass Creek Watersheds are known for the geological Claron formation hoodoos.</i>	<i>4-64</i>
<i>Table 4-11. The large expanses of sagebrush/grassland within the watershed provide habitat for Utah prairie dog and sage grouse, as well as elk and deer. Maintaining diversity within the sagebrush/grass and pinyon-juniper vegetation types, is listed as a priority by many of the technical advisory committees.</i>	<i>4-64</i>
<i>Table. 4-12. Issue ratings for all 10 Pass Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-78</i>
<i>Table. 4-12 (cont).. Issue ratings for all 10 Pass Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-79</i>
<i>Table 4-13. The Bear Creek Watershed is composed of 10 subwatersheds.</i>	<i>4-81</i>
<i>Table 4-14. With only 37 acres, the aspen component has been all but lost in this watershed. Pinyon-Juniper and sagebrush/grasslands dominate (50% and 14%, respectively) areas within Bear Creek.</i>	
<i>Table 4-15. Issue ratings for all ten Bear Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-95</i>
<i>Table 4-15(cont). Issue ratings for all ten Bear Creek subwatersheds, as identified by Technical Advisory Committees (TACs). Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this section.</i>	<i>4-96</i>
<i>Table 4-16. The eight City Creek Subwatersheds comprise a total of 158986 acres.</i>	<i>4-98</i>
<i>Table 4-17. The City Creek Watershed contains the largest percentage of agricultural lands within the Upper Sevier River Basin. In addition, much of the public land within the watershed is grazed by area ranchers.</i>	<i>4-98</i>
<i>Table 4-18. Priority ratings for all eight City Creek subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees. Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this chapter.</i>	<i>4-110</i>

<i>Table 4-18 (cont). Priority ratings for all eight City Creek subwatersheds, as identified by Technical Advisory</i>	<i>4-111</i>
<i>Table 4-19. The 6 subwatersheds in the Upper East Fork Watershed make up 187720 acres.</i>	<i>113</i>
<i>Table 4-20. Ponderosa pine and sagebrush are the dominant vegetation types in the Upper East Fork watershed.</i>	<i>4-113</i>
<i>Table 4-21. Priority ratings for all six Upper East Fork subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees.</i>	<i>4-128</i>
<i>Table 4-21 (con't). Priority ratings for all six Upper East Fork Subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees.</i>	<i>4-129</i>
<i>Table 4-22. The Middle East Fork is the largest watershed with 210,875 total acres. Subsequently it contains the most subwatersheds.</i>	<i>4-132</i>
<i>Table 4-23. Unique to this watershed are limber and bristlecone pine.</i>	<i>4-132</i>
<i>Table 4-24. Priority ratings for all twelve Middle East Fork Subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees. Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this chapter.</i>	<i>4-147</i>
<i>Table 4-24 (con't). Priority ratings for all twelve Middle East Fork Subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees. Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this chapter.</i>	<i>4-148</i>
<i>Table 4-25. The six subwatershed inthe Lower East Fork occupy 156,887 acres</i>	<i>4-149</i>
<i>Table 4-26. Historic sagebrush/grasslands and pinyon-juniper communities occur int he Lower East Fork Sevier River; however, in recent years many sagebrush/grasslands have been displaced through pinyon-juniper expansion.</i>	<i>4-150</i>
<i>Table 4-27. Priority ratings for all seven Lower East Fork Subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees. Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this chapter.</i>	<i>4-164</i>
<i>Table 4-27 (con't). Priority ratings for all seven Lower East Fork Subwatersheds, as identified by technical advisory committees. Issues highlighted in blue are addressed in detail in this chapter.</i>	<i>4-165</i>
<i>Table 5-1. Impaired waterbodies and pollutants of concern (2002 303d List).</i>	<i>5-2</i>
<i>Table 5-2. Utah Water Quality Criteria for Class 3A Waters.</i>	<i>5-3</i>

<i>Table 5-3. 303(d) criteria for assessing beneficial use support.</i>	<i>5-4</i>
<i>Table 5-4. Exceedence report for total phosphorus for selected stations 1996-97.</i>	<i>5-4</i>
<i>Table 5-5. Selected SVAP scores for reaches along Mammoth Creek and the Upper Sevier River. ..</i>	<i>5-9</i>
<i>Table 5-6. Summary statistics for Mammoth Creek Fish hatchery*.....</i>	<i>5-10</i>
<i>Table 5-7. Annual total phosphorous concentrations, loads, loading capacity, and load reduction.</i>	<i>5-17</i>
<i>Table 5-8. Total suspended solids loads and loading capacity at selected stations.</i>	<i>5-17</i>
<i>Table 5-9. Cattle numbers by month, stream reach, and subwatershed.</i>	<i>5-19</i>
<i>Table 5-10. Load summaries from cattle by month for subwatersheds and river reach.</i>	<i>5-20</i>
<i>Table 5-11. Annual total phosphorus load allocations (units are in kg/year).</i>	<i>5-21</i>
<i>Table 5-12. Estimated load reduction for impaired river segments (units in kg/yr).</i>	<i>5-22</i>
<i>Table 5-13. Sediment delivery by subwatershed.</i>	<i>5-23</i>
<i>Table 5-14. Upper Sevier Streambank Erosion Condition Inventory (October, 2001).</i>	<i>5-25</i>
<i>Table 5-15. Sediment allocation at Circleville Canyon.</i>	<i>5-26</i>
<i>Table 5-16. Mean inflow phosphorus concentration and loading (1990-2003).</i>	<i>5-36</i>
<i>Table 5-17. Phosphorus allocations by watershed and source type.</i>	<i>5-37</i>
<i>Table 5-18. Loading estimates for Vollenweider model.</i>	<i>5-39</i>
<i>Table 5-19. Implementation endpoints and load reductions.</i>	<i>5-41</i>
<i>Table 5-20. Water Quality in Cascade Spring and Duck Creek (Averages for 1993).</i>	<i>5-44</i>
<i>Table 5-21. Water quality for all three lake sites by year, 1997-2003.</i>	<i>5-45</i>
<i>Table. 6-1. Comparison of actual acres identified through the issue identification process of the Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan and Steering Committee treatment goals for imple- mentation. - Focus Area - Sevier River 1.</i>	<i>6-3</i>
<i>Table. 6-2. Comparison of actual acres identified through the issue identification process of the Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan and Steering Committee treatment goals for imple-</i>	

mentation - Focus Area - Sevier River 2..... 6-7

Table. 6-3. Comparison of actual acres identified through the issue identification process of the Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan and Steering Committee treatment goals for implementation - Focus Area - Sevier River 3..... 6-11

Table. 6-4. Comparison of actual acres identified through the issue identification process of the Upper Sevier Watershed Management Plan and Steering Committee treatment goals for implementation - Focus Area 4 - East Fork Sevier River. 6-14