Instream flow studies on Granite Creek, a tributary of the Hoback River

Mike Robertson, Fisheries Biologist, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, 5400 Bishop Blvd, Cheyenne, WY 82006

Abstract

One segment was selected for instream flow water rights filing consideration on Granite Creek, a tributary of the Hoback River near Bondurant, WY. The segment was selected considering land ownership, hydrology, and stream channel characteristics to maintain or improve the Snake River cutthroat trout (SRC) fishery in this stream. The species is common throughout the Hoback River watershed, which is managed as a wild SRC fishery. This report provides flow recommendations for Granite Creek developed from studies conducted in 2008-2009. The modeling technique employed to develop instream flow recommendations for maintaining SRC spawning habitat during spring runoff was fisheries habitat evaluation with the River 2D model. Riffle hydraulic characteristics were examined using the Habitat Retention approach to ensure that flow recommendations developed would not be so low as to impede fish movement. The Habitat Quality Index (HQI) model was used to assess the relationship between stream flow and juvenile and adult trout habitat quality in the summer. During the winter months, November through March, natural winter flows were recommended to maintain all life stages. The 20% monthly exceedance was selected to represent natural winter flow. Finally, a dynamic hydrograph model was used to quantify flow needs for maintenance of channel geomorphology.

Approximately 8.5 miles of stream habitat will be directly protected if this instream flow application advances to permit status. Recommended flows range from a low of 29 cubic feet per second (cfs) during the winter to 70 cfs during spring.

Introduction

There are five primary riverine components that characterize a stream or river: its hydrology, biology, geomorphology, water quality and connectivity (Annear et al. 2004). When the hydrology is changed, other components are influenced to varying degrees. As water resources are developed in Wyoming for out-of-stream, or consumptive, uses there are corresponding changes in other riverine components that may alter the quality of a stream for supporting fisheries habitat. Rivers and streams are important to the residents of Wyoming, as evidenced by the passage of W.S. 41-3-1001-1014 in 1986 that established instream flows as a beneficial use of water when used to maintain or improve existing fisheries. The statute directed that any unappropriated water flowing in any stream or drainage in Wyoming may be appropriated for instream flows when it provides this beneficial use (see Appendix A for more information on instream flows in Wyoming). The statute and Wyoming water law clearly note

that all existing water rights in that stream remain unaffected by a permitted instream flow water right.

Purpose for Hoback River Instream Flow Studies and Water Rights

The Wyoming Game and Fish Commission initiates all studies designed to evaluate the instream flow needs for fisheries in Wyoming. These studies do not address all five riverine ecosystem components or all aspects of each component (e.g., long-term habitat processes). Instead the focus is on the goal of "maintaining or improving" existing habitat for important fisheries throughout the state.

Guidance for selecting streams to evaluate statewide was provided by the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD), Water Management Plan (Annear and Dey 2006). The five-year plan identified and prioritized high quality habitats for instream flow studies and identified native Yellowstone cutthroat trout (YSC; *Oncorhynchus clarkii bouvieri*) and Snake River cutthroat trout (SRC; *Oncorhynchus clarkii behnkei*) as the greatest priority species for this planning period. The plan identified the Greys-Hoback watershed as the highest priority for conducting instream flow studies.

Yellowstone cutthroat and SRC were prioritized for instream flow studies, in part, because these cutthroat trout subspecies were recently considered for federal listing as threatened or endangered. Between 1998 and 2006, there were several actions regarding these two subspecies, including a decision to treat the two as "a single entity" (Federal Register 2001, Federal Register 2006). The most recent finding of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service was that the species (aggregate of both subspecies) does not warrant listing (Federal Register 2006). In response to the petition for federal listing of YSC, the WGFD developed significant, targeted management efforts to protect and expand habitat and populations of both YSC and SRC within their historic range (WGFD 2005a) and has participated in multi-state strategic planning efforts (Range-Wide YCT Conservation Team 2009a, 2009b).

Yellowstone cutthroat trout historically occupied Wyoming waters in the Snake River and Yellowstone River drainages, including the tributary Wind/Bighorn and Tongue River drainages (Behnke 1992, Kruse et al. 1997, Dufek et al. 1999, Kruse et al. 2000, May et al. 2003). The range of SRC occurs within the range of the more widely distributed YSC and includes the headwaters of the Snake River and its tributaries (Van Kirk et al. 2006, May et al. 2007). Debate continues about whether YSC and SRC are distinct subspecies (Van Kirk et al. 2006, Sweet 2009). Leary et al. (1987) was not able to differentiate the two subspecies using genetics and Kruse (1998) did not find meristic differences (counting features such as fins rays or scales) between the two subspecies. However, there are morphological distinctions that are not typically found in the same watersheds, so the WGFD manages them separately (Gipson 2006, Sweet 2009).

The prioritization of watersheds and streams for instream flow studies in Wyoming was based on available information on YSC and SRC populations, including genetic status and population demographics. A range-wide status assessment conducted by fisheries biologists from Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho (May et al. 2003, May et al. 2007) identified conservation populations and assessed the relative extinction risk among populations. Of the extant populations in Wyoming, those in the Greybull River, Wood River, and East Fork Wind River were believed to contain genetically pure populations that span a large geographic area (Kruse et al. 2000) and these streams were targeted for instream flow studies during 1997 through 2006. The next watershed in priority was the Greys-Hoback and tributaries of these two rivers. These

were identified as high priority streams for instream flow studies because much of the watershed contains SRC populations of high genetic purity. Since genetic status of SRC was similar throughout this watershed (predominantly unaltered; Novak et al. 2005), individual streams were selected based on current understanding of their importance to the local SRC population in terms of contributing to the long-term persistence of the population (e.g., does a stream contain regularly-used spawning habitat?), the length of stream (longer streams provide greater protection for level of effort expended), and ease of logistics (streams selected in a small geographic area for a given year can be more efficiently studied). From 2008 through 2010 studies were conducted on the Hoback River and its tributaries, and in 2010 a study was also conducted on the Little Greys River.

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to 1) quantify year-round instream flow levels needed maintain SRC habitat and 2) identify a channel maintenance flow regime that will maintain long-term trout habitat and related physical and biological processes (Appendix B). The audience for this report is broad and includes the State Engineer and staff, the Water Development Office, aquatic habitat and fishery managers, and non-governmental organizations and individuals interested in instream flow water rights and SRC management in general or in the Hoback River watershed in particular.

Study Area

The Hoback River enters the Snake River at Hoback Junction, approximately 17 miles downstream of the Highway 89 crossing in Wilson, Wyoming (Figure 1). The basin includes two separate watersheds classified at the 5th level hydrologic unit code (HUC) scale, the upper (HUC 1704010303) and lower (HUC 1704010304) Hoback River. In total, the two watersheds comprise 566 square miles, which is about 10% of the Snake River headwaters basin (HUC 170401) area. Land ownership in the watershed includes 5.3% private and 94.7% public lands. The public land includes 94.3% Forest Service and 0.4% Bureau of Land Management lands. Recreational uses in the drainage include wildlife observation, hiking, fishing, camping, hunting, floating the river, horseback riding and packing, cross country skiing, snow machine riding, and snowshoeing.

The Hoback River basin elevation ranges from 5,900 ft above sea level at the mouth of the Hoback River to 11,682 ft above sea level at Doubletop Peak in the Dell Creek watershed. There are several tributaries in the Hoback watershed where alpine glaciation resulted in U-shaped valleys that conform to valley type V from Rosgen's (1996) level I geomorphic classification and others with more gradual sloping sides (Type II). The Hoback River itself travels predominantly east to west through a series of north-south oriented mountains, which results in predominantly Type II valleys. Some areas in the middle and lower parts of the river have well developed floodplains (e.g., Type VIII valleys). Stream channels throughout the Hoback River basin are primarily classified as "B" and "C" based on inspection of 1:24,000 scale topographic maps. Some braided "D" channels occur in places where the valleys are not constricted and a wide floodplain is present.

FIGURE 1. Location of Granite Creek, Wyoming (HUC 170401030405) in the Hoback River watershed.

The climate in this watershed includes annual precipitation that averaged 21.1 inches in the town of Bondurant over the period 1948–2005 according to data from the Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC 2011). Much of the precipitation falls as snow with an average of 138.7 inches annually from 1948–2005. The average minimum air temperature was 15.9°F and the average maximum was 50.7°F in that same period. Winter conditions typically result in widespread frazil and anchor ice development, which may impact over-winter habitat for fish.

As part of its strategic habitat plan (SHP), the WGFD has prioritized the upper Hoback watershed as a "crucial habitat area" for aquatic habitat. The lower Hoback basin is an "enhancement habitat area" for aquatic habitat in the Jackson Region (WGFD 2009). According to the SHP, *"crucial habitats have the highest biological values, which should be protected and managed to maintain healthy, viable populations of terrestrial and aquatic wildlife. These include habitats that need to be maintained as well as habitats that have deteriorated and should be enhanced or restored."* The plan also states that enhancement areas *"are important wildlife*

areas that can or should be actively enhanced or improved by WGFD and partners over the next few years if opportunities exist."

Geology

    The Hoback River Basin lies within the overthrust belt region of the state, which is described as *"a series of large overthrust sheets of rock that overlap one another like shingles on a roof."* This region is a short section of a longer trend of thrust faults and folds that extend approximately 5,000 miles between Alaska and Mexico (Lageson and Spearing 1996). These faults are relatively shallow and flat and do not cut into Precambrian basement rocks. The exposed rocks in this watershed are primarily sandstone and shale (Eocene Wasatch formation) which were deposited as stream and floodplain sediments (Lageson and Spearing 1996). The soils are mainly characterized as gravelly sandy loams (BLM 2003). The Hoback River watershed also has evidence of being influenced by glaciers with some valleys in the watershed displaying characteristic U-shaped cross-sectional profiles (e.g., Granite Creek). The resulting glacial deposits can be seen in the floodplains and in many areas resulted in coarse gravel-cobble glacial outwash.

Hydrology

    Two USGS gages operated historically in the Hoback River watershed, but neither is currently in use. A gage operated in the lower Hoback (13019500) from 1944–1958 and another in Little Granite Creek (13019438) from 1981–1992. The Little Granite Creek gage was chosen as the most representative gage for streams in the Hoback watershed (HabiTech 2009). Stream flow at the Little Granite Creek gage is typical of snowmelt runoff streams with short periods of high (runoff) flow and a substantial portion of the annual flow as a low (base) flow (Figure 2). Annual peak flow occurred between May 1 and June 15 over the period of record (median date was May 28). Base flow recession occurs throughout summer with base flow levels attained by September. Annual flow minima occurred in winter (December, January, or February [Figure 3]).

FIGURE 2. Flow exceedance curves for the Little Granite Creek USGS stream gage station (13019438) over the period of record 1981–1992; developed from Table 3 in HabiTech (2009).


FIGURE 3. Hydrographs for representative wet (1984), average (1989), and dry (1987) water years from the Little Granite Creek USGS stream gage station (13019438). Representative years were randomly selected from within each of three flow exceedance classes (wet 0–10%, average 30–70%, and dry 90–100%; HabiTech 2009).

Biology

Riparian and Upland Resources

Vegetation in the Hoback River basin is primarily alpine and sub-alpine forest types with lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*), whitebark pine (*Pinus albicaulis*), limber pine (*Pinus flexilis*), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), Douglas-fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*), subalpine fir (*Abies lasiocarpa*), Englemann spruce (*Picea engelmannii*), and blue spruce (*Picea pungens*). The highest elevations in the watershed contain alpine moss-lichen-forb communities. Mountain big sagebrush (*Artemisia tridentate*) is the dominant vegetation type in lower elevations. There are several grasses and forbs associated with the sagebrush community including: Idaho fescue (*Festuca idahoensis*), Letterman's needlegrass (*Achnatherum lettermanii*), elk sedge (*Carex geyeri*), sulphur buckwheat (*Eriogonum umbellatum*), yarrow (*Achillea millefolium*), rockcress (*Arabis lyrata*), and lupine (*Lupinus sp.*). Riparian habitats are predominantly willow communities with four common willow species (coyote, Booth's, Drummond's, and wolf). Narrowleaf Cottonwoods (*Populus angustifolia*) are present but very sparse in this region. Canada thistle as a common noxious weed in riparian areas.

There were substantial changes in vegetation communities in the Greys-Hoback watershed in recent years. Whitebark pine historically dominated upper forest ecotones in the Bridger-Teton National Forest (BTNF 2009); however, up to 95 percent of this community type has been lost due to the exotic blister rust fungus, mountain pine beetles, and effects of an altered fire regime (CH2MHill 2004). Mountain mahogany (*Cercocarpus montanus*) also was much more prevalent in the Greys-Hoback watershed, but most of it was lost due to the effects of an altered fire regime (CH2MHill 2004). In addition, lodgepole pine are currently suffering dramatic losses in the BTNF due to very high levels of mountain pine beetles; at least 75 percent of these trees are currently mature and susceptible to infestation (BTNF 2009). Grazing has also impacted the Greys-Hoback watershed, especially riparian areas, by inducing changes in plant species composition, diversity, and density and contributing to high soil erosion (NPCC 2005).

Fish and Other Aquatic Resources

The fish community in the Hoback River basin includes two native game species, SRC and mountain whitefish (MWF; *Prosopium williamsoni*). Other native species include bluehead sucker (BHS; *Catostomus discobolus*), mountain sucker (MTS; *Catostomus platyrhynchus*), longnose dace (LND; *Rhinichthys cataractae*), speckled dace (SPD; *Rhinichthys osculus*), Pauite sculpin (PSC; *Cottus beldingi*), mottled sculpin (MSC; *Cottus bairdi*), and Utah sucker (UTS; *Catostomus ardens*). Introduced brook trout (BKT; *Salvelinus fontinalis*) are also found in the watershed. The most abundant species captured during WGFD sampling efforts in Granite Creek was SRC, but MWF, MSC, and BKT also occur there. There are also several amphibians associated with riparian habitat in the watershed, all of which are listed as "species of greatest conservation need" (WGFD 2010). These include the blotched tiger salamander *(Ambystoma mavortium melanostictum)*, boreal toad (*Anaxyrus boreas boreas*), great basin spadefoot (*Spea intermontana*), northern leopard frog (*Lithobates pipiens*), boreal chorus frog (*Pseudocris maculata*), and Columbia spotted frog (*Rana luteiventris*).

The current management objective is to maintain a wild population of SRC. Brook trout were stocked initially in 1933 and sporadically for several years after that. SRC stocking began in 1939 and continued annually through 2005. In addition to stocking the mainstem Hoback River, stocking of BKT and SRC also occurred in several tributaries (Cliff, Dell, Fisherman,

Granite, Shoal, and Willow creeks). The only other known introduction in the drainage was Bonneville cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki utah*), which were stocked into Turquoise and Shoal Lakes (Rhea and Gipson 2007). From 1999 to 2005 the number of SRC stocked in the Hoback River was reduced annually. Rhea and Gipson (2007) found stocking did not enhance the fishery and that reduced stocking efforts actually enhanced the wild SRC population. Therefore, the stocking program in the Hoback River was eliminated in 2005.

Habitat preferences of target species, and their life stages, are an important component of instream flow studies. Flow recommendations are based on maintaining sufficient habitat for target species to carry out life history functions (e.g., growth and reproduction). Species-specific habitat preferences are used to develop habitat suitability curves that are in turn used in PHABSIM and River 2D models (described below). Most research on habitat use has focused on YSC (perhaps including SRC in some cases since the two are not always differentiated). However, since SRC are genetically very similar, it is likely that they behave similarly to YSC in regards to habitat preferences and reproduction. Dey and Annear (2006) found that adult YSC in Trout Creek (tributary of the North Fork Shoshone River) were most commonly found in areas with depths of 1.15–1.60 ft and average column velocities of 0.36–1.91 ft/s. For juvenile YSC, these ranges were slightly different with depths of 1.0–1.5 ft and average column velocities of 0.38–1.65 ft/s (Dey and Annear 2006). Most growth of adult and juvenile SRC occurs during the relatively short summer and early fall periods. Habitat for these life stages is also critical during winter to allow over-winter survival.

In addition to adults and juveniles, two other life stages were evaluated for habitat availability, spawning adults and fry. YSC and SRC generally spawn between March and July depending on local hydrology and water temperatures (believed to be triggered around 41°F; Kiefling 1978, Varley and Gresswell 1988, De Rito 2005). The stream gradient observed in spawning areas is usually less than 3% (Varley and Gresswell 1988), but non-migratory fluvial populations have been documented in streams with a mean gradient of 6% (Meyer et al. 2003). Spawning activity for YSC and SRC in Wyoming has been observed during May and June in watersheds within the Big Horn River Basin in north central Wyoming (Greybull River, Shoshone River and their tributaries; Kent 1984, Dey and Annear 2002, Dey and Annear 2006). Elevation influences the timing of spawning in YSC and SRC; stream segments located at higher elevations more likely to remain colder and cause both spawning and egg incubation to occur later in the summer. Dey and Annear (2003) found that spawning occurred into July in streams above approximately 8,000 ft in elevation (in the Greybull watershed) and extended recommendations for spawning flows through July 15 in such high elevation sites. The upstream boundary of the instream flow segment is about 6,870 ft in elevation. It is possible that spawning may extend into July in the very upper portion of the watershed (above the segment), but most activity in the segment likely occurs in June. Dey and Annear (2006) were unable to observe statistically acceptable numbers of spawning YSC ($n=4$) to develop habitat suitability curves for spawning YSC and SRC in Wyoming and did not search for fry. Spawning YSC habitat suitability data from a Snake River tributary in Idaho are presented in Thurow and King (1994); they found that velocity preference ranged from 1.12 to 1.72 ft/sec and depth preference from 0.52 to 0.82 ft.

Fry habitat data for Colorado River cutthroat (*Oncorhynchus clarkii pleuriticus*; CRC) in Wyoming (Bozek and Rahel 1992) were used in the absence of any data available for YSC or SRC. The velocity range most often used by CRC fry was less than 0.1 ft/sec and the depth

range was 0.36 to 0.49 ft. Fry are most likely to be present during July, August, and September in the Hoback River watershed.

Geomorphology

Maintaining appropriate stream channel characteristics in a given stream reach is important for maintaining fish habitat throughout that stream. Channel form is a direct result of interactions among flow regimes (Schumm 1969), sediment loads (Komura and Simmons 1967), and riparian vegetation, which are in turn a direct function of the form and condition of the watershed (Leopold et al. 1964; Heede 1992; Leopold 1994). For many alluvial streams in their natural state, the channel exists in a state of dynamic equilibrium in which the sediment load is balanced with the stream's transport capacity over time (Bovee et al. 1998). When sediment load exceeds transport capacity, aggradation or other alteration of channel form will occur. When transport capacity exceeds sediment load, the channel may adjust through widening the channel or degrading the bed.

A natural range of flows, including occasional high flow, is needed to maintain diverse riparian and floodplain vegetation and, in turn, provide suitable conditions for the community of animals that use these habitats. An effective instream flow regime should include these higher flows that maintain the channel form and habitat conditions for fish over the long term. These flows sustain the river channel conditions by permitting a connection to the floodplain, preventing buildup of fine sediments, and facilitating a variety of other important ecological processes (Carling 1995, Annear et al. 2004, Locke et al. 2008). Any time water is extracted from a stream this condition changes; larger quantities of extraction have a greater impact on natural processes.

Physical changes in the stream caused by road building, culvert addition, riparian habitat reduction, and other impacts also affect the ability of the stream to sustain effective sediment transport and regenerate riparian plant communities. In the Hoback watershed, few anthropogenic disturbances occur compared to many watersheds; although naturally occurring steep, unstable slopes occur that produce frequent mass wasting events. In addition, the highly erodible sedimentary geology of the watershed contributes substantial sediment loads to the Hoback River and its tributaries during spring runoff. Additional streambank instability and sediment inputs result from land management practices (grazing and channel alterations) and road construction and maintenance activities in the watershed. The resulting streambank instability, channel widening and high sediment loads promote unstable stream channel dynamics that limit pool development and increase stream channels dominated by long series of runs and riffles. A lack of pool-forming large woody debris in many locations also contributes to a lack of pools. However, where large woody debris is abundant (e.g., Shoal Creek) pools are more common. Also, beaver activity enhances instream habitat complexity in some locations (e.g., portions of Granite Creek and North Fork Fisherman Creek).

The current interpretation of the instream flow statute does not consider high flows that are important for channel maintenance to be necessary to support a fishery. These high flows have a critical influence on physical habitat conditions in a stream and if substantially reduced would have negative impacts on habitat, riparian assemblage of plants and animals, and ultimately the resident fishery (Stromberg and Patten 1990, Rood et al. 1995, Mahoney and Rood 1998). Recommendations for flows sufficient to allow channel maintenance and provide a more complete flow pattern that fully maintains fishery habitat are presented in Appendix B. Should

opportunities arise in the future to secure instream flow water rights for long-term maintenance of fluvial geomorphic processes, this information may provide a valuable reference.

Water Quality

Water quality is a critical component of any fishery. The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality rates Granite Creek as a "Class 1" water (WYDEQ 2007). According to their classification system, *"Class 1 waters are those surface waters in which no further water quality degradation by point source discharges other than from dams will be allowed. Nonpoint sources of pollution shall be controlled through implementation of appropriate best management practices. Pursuant to Section 7 of these regulations, the water quality and physical and biological integrity which existed on the water at the time of designation will be maintained and protected. In designating Class 1 waters, the Environmental Quality Council shall consider water quality, aesthetic, scenic, recreational, ecological, agricultural, botanical, zoological, municipal, industrial, historical, geological, cultural, archaeological, fish and wildlife, the presence of significant quantities of developable water and other values of present and future benefit to the people."* As noted above, high sediment loads are common which increases turbidity during runoff and after rain events.

Connectivity

Connectivity of a river system refers to the ability of fish and other organisms to navigate between habitats to complete each portion of their life cycles. However, it is more than that. Connectivity of a stream system also incorporates the pathways that move energy and matter through the system. River system connectivity is manifested along four dimensions: longitudinal, lateral, vertical, and time (Ward 1989). Lateral connectivity is critical to the functioning of floodplain-based stream ecosystems because of the transport of nutrients and organic matter from the floodplain to the stream during floods. This process often drives development of aquatic food elements that affects productivity of the fish. The seasonal flooding of unregulated streams creates and maintains diverse species of riparian vegetation (Nilsson et al. 1989), which, in turn, fosters diverse animal communities both within and adjacent to the stream channel.

The Hoback River and its tributaries have few barriers restricting flow in the stream channels. There are no large dams in the watershed, but a few small diversion structures and culverts that affect fish passage and flow pathways. Access to the floodplain is good throughout the watershed and is only restricted in areas with canyon walls and naturally limited floodplain development.

Methods

Instream Flow Segment and Study Site Selection

One stream segment is proposed for an instream flow water right filing in Granite Creek (Figure 4; Table 1). The boundaries for the segment were identified after considering land ownership, hydrology, and stream channel characteristics. Within the stream segment, instream flow recommendations were developed for individual life stages of SRC (fry, spawning, juvenile, and adult). Securing instream flow water rights on this stream segment will help ensure the future of SRC and other important fish species in Wyoming by protecting existing base flow

conditions in priority against potential, but presently unidentified, future consumptive and diversionary demands.

Instream flow segments are nearly always located on public land where unappropriated water remains, and the public has access to the fishery. However, in some instances landowners that are nearby or adjacent to a proposed segment are given the opportunity to request that the state extend an instream flow segment on the portion or portions of any streams crossing their property. Such requests are strictly voluntary and must be made in writing to the department. Regardless of whether instream flow segments are placed entirely on public lands or include private segments, instream flow water rights are junior to existing water rights in the stream and will not affect their lawful use in any way.


FIGURE 4. Data were collected to evaluate fish habitat at one potential instream flow segment on Granite Creek.

TABLE 1. Location and length of the proposed instream flow segment on Granite Creek. Coordinates and elevations are provided for the downstream end of the segment and are UTM Zone 12, NAD83 datum.

Segment	Description	Length (mi)	Easting	Northing	Elevation (ft)
Granite Creek	Wilderness boundary down to confluence with Little Granite Creek	8.47	539145	4793798	6,385

The instream flow segment selected on Granite Creek is located entirely on public land. Because there were no nearby private property sections through which the creek flows, there was no need to contact individual landowners and assess interest in extending the proposed segment through private lands. Interested landowners in this watershed may contact the WGFD to evaluate opportunities for including potential segments through their property under the present proposal. Separate, new studies would be needed should private landowners in the watershed decide to seek an instream flow right through their property in the future. The department has no plans to conduct such studies at the present time.

Within the Granite Creek instream flow segment, one representative study site (approximately 750 ft long) was selected (Figure 5). The bankfull width in this reach was approximately 62.4 ft. This is within the length of study site recommended by Bovee (1982; 10-14 times the channel width). The complexity of this site is representative of the range of habitat conditions available in the instream flow segment. All data collection was conducted in this study site and extrapolated to the entire proposed instream flow segment. These data were analyzed to determine the availability of suitable habitat for all life stages of SRC at various flow conditions.

Hydrology in the Instream Flow Segment

Development of flow recommendations for an instream flow study segment requires an understanding of local stream flow conditions. In most cases, stream gage data are not available within the segment and the data must be derived from a regional reference gage. That is the case for Granite Creek since there were no localized stream gage data available. The reference gage used for all instream flow segments in the Hoback River watershed (HabiTech 2009) was the Little Granite Creek USGS gage (13019438) with data available from late 1981 through 1992.

Similar to previous instream flow studies, mean annual flow (also called "average daily flow" or ADF), annual flow duration, monthly flow duration, and flood frequency were estimated for the proposed instream flow segment (HabiTech 2009). HabiTech (2009) calculated average daily flows from the contributing basin area models of Miselis et al. (1999) and Lowham (1988) and determined that neither model accurately predicted flows at the reference gage. Alternative models using channel geometry (bankfull width) by Lowham (1988) and Miselis et al. (1999) yielded more accurate estimates of the reference gage data with the former being the best. The bankfull width at the downstream end of the Granite Creek instream flow segment was used for the model calculations.

FIGURE 5. Granite Creek at a discharge of 399 cfs. Discharge was high but within the banks at this flow; this was the highest measured flow that was included in fish habitat modeling.

A dimensional analysis approach was used to develop both annual and monthly flow duration information. Dimensionless duration tables were created for the reference gage by dividing each duration class by the mean annual flow. The dimensionless flow value for each annual and monthly percentile was then multiplied by the estimated average annual flow for the instream flow segment to develop flow duration values for the segment. A similar approach was used to develop the flood frequency series. For further details on the procedures used, see HabiTech (2009).

Average daily flow estimates were used in applying the Habitat Quality Index and Habitat Retention models (described below). The 1.5-year return interval on the flood frequency series was used to estimate bankfull flow (Rosgen 1996) for use in the Habitat Retention model and for developing channel maintenance flow recommendations (Appendix B). Channel maintenance calculations also used the 25-year peak flow estimate from the flood frequency analysis. The monthly flow duration series was used in developing winter flow recommendations. Throughout this report, the term "exceedance" is used, as in "20% exceedance flow." The 20% exceedance flow refers to the flow level that would be exceeded 20% of the time or that would be available approximately one year out of every five consecutive years. Flow measurements collected by WGFD during instream flow habitat studies were used to help validate the models and enhance the accuracy of the hydrological estimates.

Biology – Fish Habitat

Availability of fish habitat is evaluated using several different habitat models for a study site. "Habitat" in this report refers the combination of physical conditions (depth, velocity, substrate, and cover) for a given area. These physical conditions vary with discharge. It is important to note that these variables do not represent a complete account of all variables that

comprise trout habitat. Habitat for trout also includes environmental elements such as water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and other variables. These other variables are important, but are not included in models used for these analyses because they do not fluctuate with changes in the quantity of flow as predictably as the physical habitat parameters and thus were assumed to be constant over the range of flows analyzed. Interpretation of model results based on these physical habitat parameters assumes that this subset of trout habitat is important and provides a reasonable estimate of habitat availability at each flow and ability of trout to persist on a short-term basis.

River2D Model

Habitat modeling has been used extensively for developing instream flow recommendations since inception of the PHABSIM model in the 1970s (Stalnaker et al. 1995, Bovee et al. 1998). However, two-dimensional models, such as River 2D, have received increasing attention and use (Ghanem et al. 1994, 1996, Bovee et al. 2008). These tools generate depth and velocity predictions throughout study reaches as opposed to the one-dimensional transect-based output that simulates physical habitat only in a longitudinal dimension. The end result of total area of useable habitat (weighted usable area; WUA) is similar to PHABSIM, but the results are finer scaled and present a much more detailed characterization of habitat availability throughout the study site. The model is also able to predict conditions around complex habitats like multiple channels and eddies that are impossible or extremely complicated with a transect-based dataset. The two-dimensional model also generates habitat depictions that ease interpretation of the spatial relationships of habitat availability. The River2D model (Steffler and Blackburn 2002) was employed in the study segment.

One of the primary differences between PHABSIM and River2D models is that the latter entails development of a detailed map of elevation and substrate data of the stream channel bed and banks. The model uses the detailed elevation map and stage discharge relationship (developed at the downstream boundary) to move water through the site at a given discharge and allow estimates of depth and velocity at any location. We collected all bed elevation points (northing, easting, and elevation) for the River2D model site with a TopCon model 211D total station. Boulders were surveyed using a model where three points where recorded in the field (following the longest axis) and width and shape of the boulder recorded. Data for each boulder were put in the model to generate a series of points that more accurately represented each boulder and these points were put into the River 2D elevation map. Substrate was mapped throughout the site using the categories vegetation, mud, silt, sand, gravel, cobble, boulder, and bedrock. The percentages of dominant and subdominant classes were assigned to each mapped area.

Once a working model was developed from substrate, elevation, and discharge data, it was calibrated to improve predictions of depth and velocity throughout the study site. Calibration was done by attempting to match predicted water surface elevation throughout the site to data collected at each of several discharges. The primary tool for this calibration is adjusting roughness to minimize the average difference between the predicted and measured water surface elevations at several points throughout the study site. Adjustments were made to roughness values as needed to achieve the best possible model fit with the available data. When the model was calibrated at a given discharge it was then run at another calibration discharge and further modified until it worked well at both discharges. This process was repeated for all calibration discharges. A second, fine-scaled, calibration step involved comparing observed

depths and velocities (collected at randomly spaced points) to predicted values at a calibration discharge and adjusting roughness to further refine the model fit. With each adjustment, all calibration discharges were re-run with the new roughness values to determine change to each.

The final result was a single calibrated model that was run at several discharges over the evaluation range. The calibrated model was used to simulate physical conditions in the study reach and estimate WUA for each SRC life stage at each discharge. The results are evaluated in terms of the "peak" of habitat availability over the range of modeled discharges.

Habitat Retention Model

We used the Habitat Retention Method (Nehring 1979, Annear and Conder 1984) to identify the flow that maintains specified hydraulic criteria (Table 2) in riffles. Maintaining depth, velocity, and wetted perimeter criteria in riffles is based on an assumption that other habitat types like runs or pools remain viable for fish when adequate flows are provided in shallow riffles that serve as hydraulic controls (control water surface elevations for the pools and runs immediately upstream of the riffle) (Nehring 1979). Flow recommendations derived from the Habitat Retention Method describe instream flows needed to maintain fish passage between habitat types and benthic invertebrate survival at any time of year when the recommended flow is naturally available. The flow identified by the Habitat Retention Method is important year round, except when higher instream flows are required to meet other fish life history needs or fishery management purposes.

Simulation tools and calibration techniques used for hydraulic simulation in PHABSIM are also used with the Habitat Retention approach. The difference is that Habitat Retention does not translate depth and velocity information into conclusions about incremental changes in the amount of physical space suitable for trout life stages. The Habitat Retention method focuses on identifying riffle hydraulic characteristics that maintain fish passage and invertebrate production. The AVPERM model within the PHABSIM methodology is used to simulate cross section depth, wetted perimeter, and velocity for a range of flows. The flow that maintains two out of three criteria (Table 2) for all three transects is then identified; however, because of the critical importance of depth for maintaining fish passage, the 0.2 ft threshold must be one of the criteria met for each transect.

TABLE 2. Hydraulic criteria for determining maintenance flow with the Habitat Retention method in streams up to 20 ft wide. For streams with a mean bankfull width greater than 20 ft the mean depth criteria is the product of 0.01 times mean bankfull width.

Category	Criteria
Mean Depth (ft)	0.20
Mean Velocity (ft/s)	1.00
Wetted Perimeter[a] (%)	50

a - Percent of bankfull wetted perimeter

Habitat Quality Index Model

We used the Habitat Quality Index (HQI; Binns and Eiserman 1979, Binns 1982) to determine relative trout habitat suitability or production potential over a range of late summer

(July through September) flow conditions. Most of the annual trout production in Wyoming streams occurs during the late summer, following peak runoff, when longer days and warmer water temperatures facilitate growth. The HQI was developed by the WGFD to provide an index of relative habitat suitability, which is correlated to trout production as a function of nine biological, chemical, and physical trout habitat attributes. Each attribute is assigned a rating from 0 to 4 with higher ratings representing better trout habitat features. Attribute ratings are combined in the model with results expressed in trout Habitat Units (HU's), where one HU is defined as the amount of habitat that will support about 1 pound of trout, though the precise relationship can vary between streams. HQI results were used to identify the flow between July 1 and September 30 needed to maintain existing levels of adult and juvenile Yellowstone cutthroat trout production (habitat quality) and are based on an assumption that flow needs for other life stages are adequate at all other times of year. The model also assumes that water quality is not a limiting factor.

In the HQI analysis, habitat attributes measured at various flow events are assumed to be typical of late summer flow conditions. For example, stream widths measured in June under high flow conditions are considered an estimate of stream width that would occur if that flow level were a base flow occurring in September. Under this assumption, HU estimates are extrapolated through a range of potential late summer flows (Conder and Annear 1987). Some attribute ratings were mathematically derived to establish the relationship between discharge and trout habitat at discharges other than those measured. In calculating Habitat Units over a range of discharges, temperature, nitrate concentration, invertebrate numbers, and eroding banks were held constant.

Article 10, Section d of the Wyoming Instream Flow statute states that waters used for providing instream flows "*shall be the minimum flow necessary to maintain or improve existing fisheries.*" The HQI is used to identify a flow to maintain the existing fishery in the following manner: the number of habitat units that occur under normal July through September flow conditions is quantified and then the flow that maintains that level of habitat is identified. The August 50% monthly exceedance flow is often used as a reference of normal late summer flow levels and is consistent with how the HQI was developed (Binns and Eiserman 1979). This flow is not the minimum flow needed to keep the target fish species alive, but is the least amount of water needed to realize the statutorily authorized beneficial use of maintaining the existing fishery.

Natural Winter Flow

The three habitat modeling approaches described above are not well suited to determine flow requirements during the ice-prone period (October through early April). These methods were developed for, and apply primarily to, open-water periods. Ice development during winter months can change the hydraulic properties of water flowing through some stream channels and compromise the utility of models developed for open water conditions. The complexities of variable icing patterns make direct modeling of winter trout habitat over a range of flows difficult if not impossible. For example, frazil and surface ice may form and break up on multiple occasions during the winter over widely ranging spatial and temporal scales. Even cases that can be modeled, for example a stable ice cap over a simple pool, may not yield a result worthy of the considerable time and expense necessary to calibrate an ice model. There are no widely accepted aquatic habitat models for quantifying instream flow needs for fish in under-ice

conditions (Annear et al. 2004). As a result, a different approach was used to develop recommendations for winter flows.

For Wyoming headwater streams, a conservative approach is needed when addressing flow requirements during harsh winter habitat conditions. Scientific literature indicates that stressful winter conditions for fish would become more limiting if winter water depletions were to occur. Even relatively minor flow reduction at this time of year can change the frequency and severity of ice formation, force trout to move more frequently, affect distribution and retention of trout, and reduce the holding capacity of the few large pools often harboring a substantial proportion of the total trout population (Lindstrom and Hubert 2004). Hubert et al. (1997) observed that poor gage records often associated with the winter season requires use of a conservative value. The 50% monthly exceedance does not provide an appropriate estimate of naturally occurring winter flow. It is more appropriate from the standpoint of maintaining fisheries to recommend the higher flows of a 20% monthly exceedance. Such an approach assures that we recommend flow approximating the natural winter condition even in cases where flow availability is prone to being underestimated due to poor gage records or other estimation errors. This approach has been used for many recent instream flow recommendations (e.g., Dey and Annear 2006, Robertson and Dey 2008) and likewise, was adopted for the instream flow segment on Granite Creek.

Geomorphology

The geomorphology of the proposed instream flow segment was evaluated by visual observation of physical habitat conditions and by evaluating the current flow characteristics. In addition, we conducted a detailed assessment of channel maintenance flow requirements for the stream (Appendix B).

Water Quality

No detailed assessment of water quality was conducted as part of this study because water quality conditions throughout the Hoback River watershed are considered excellent (WYDEQ 2001). A review of data stored in the EPA STORET database was conducted to reveal any anomalies in reported data, and a temperature logger was installed in the study site during summer data collection. Based on this review, the water quality condition was considered to be in very good condition at this time, but could potentially deteriorate with any substantial reduction in flow in ways that are difficult to predict.

Connectivity

In developing instream flow recommendations for Granite Creek, the presence of barriers to connectivity were considered for physical, chemical, and even biological conditions in all four dimensions. The Habitat Retention Method was used to quantify the flow needed to maintain continuous hydrologic connectivity within the stream channel. No detailed assessment was conducted to quantify flows needed to maintain lateral connectivity nor was an assessment done to evaluate the relationship between ground water and flow (vertical connectivity). An evaluation of the ability of the stream to transport nutrients, energy and sediments was beyond the scope of this study due to the level of effort required to evaluate such processes, but it is an important aspect to a properly functioning stream environment.

Instream Flow Recommendations

Wyoming statute 41-3-1001-1014 declares that instream flows may be appropriated for maintaining or improving fisheries. This statute has been interpreted by the Wyoming State Engineer's Office to include only the hydrology and biology (fisheries) riverine components. The law does not specifically provide that other widely accepted components of a fishery including geomorphology, water quality, or connectivity may serve as a basis for quantifying flow regime needs for fisheries. As a result, the instream flow recommendations generated in this report provide a good means of ensuring that physical habitat will be available for SRC in Granite Creek for the near term. Over a longer temporal scale, a flow regime that does not provide sufficient flow at appropriate times of year to maintain the necessary geomorphology, water quality, or connectivity conditions will likely not achieve the statutorily authorized beneficial use of maintaining the existing fishery in perpetuity. The analyses presented in this report indicate what flows provide suitable hydraulic habitat within this existing channel form, but the channel form may change over time.

Within the constraints described above, we recommend instream flows for Granite Creek during four seasonal periods, which are based on SRC biology and Hoback River hydrology (Table 3; Figure 6). Over-winter survival of adult and juvenile SRC is addressed with natural winter flow from October 1 through March 31. The hydrograph indicates that, on average, relatively low base flow conditions in winter persist through March 31 during both the highest and lowest flows recorded in the Hoback River. Habitat for juvenile and adult SRC was evaluated using River2D habitat modeling for the early spring connectivity period, which occurs prior to spawning during the rising limb of spring runoff from April 1 to April 30. Spawning and incubation habitat for SRC was evaluated with habitat modeling results for the spawning lifestage using River2D for the period May 1–June 30. Summer habitat for growth and production of fry and juvenile SRC was evaluated with Habitat Quality Index results (adult SRC habitat) and modeling results from River2D for the period July 1–September 30. The Hoback River hydrograph indicates that during low water years, there is little variation between flows in the early and late parts of this seasonal period (Figure 6).

A combination of several different methods was used to develop instream flow recommendations to maintain or improve the fishery (biological riverine component) in Granite Creek. When possible, data were collected to run each of several habitat models for the study site (including the PHABSIM or River 2D habitat model, the Habitat Retention model, and the Habitat Quality Index model). However, the ecological characteristics and issues at the study site were sometimes unique and not necessarily appropriate for scaling up to the entire segment. As a consequence, the models used for developing a recommendation were selected based on their appropriateness for the characteristics and flow needs at the site. These models provide an evaluation of physical habitat for trout, thus flow recommendations based on these analyses were chosen to maintain sufficient habitat, which is defined as water depth, velocity, and cover necessary for each fish species and life stage of interest. Recommended flows were designed to protect habitat during portions of the year that are most critical to a given species and life stage. Recommendations were also evaluated relative to natural flow conditions, but because the instream flow segment did not have stream gage data, estimates of stream flow were developed for comparison.

When two or more methods could be used for a recommendation, the method chosen was the one that yielded the higher flow needed for a particular fishery maintenance purpose. For example, the Habitat Retention approach may provide a base flow that is too low to maintain

sufficient habitat for all life stages and will not be used for instream flow recommendations when other aspects of fishery maintenance require higher flows. When habitat is maximized at flows greater than the natural 20% exceedance flow, the latter will be used as a maximum recommended instream flow. Channel maintenance flows perform their function during runoff in April, May, June, and July (Appendix B) but are not used in the instream flow water right application.

TABLE 3. Snake River cutthroat trout life stages and seasons considered in developing instream flow recommendations. Numbers indicate the method used for each combination of season and life stage, and grey shading indicates the primary data used for flow recommendations in each season.

Life stage and Fishery Function	Winter Oct 1 – Mar 31	Early Spring Apr 1 – Apr 30*	Spring May 1 – Jun 30*	Summer Jul 1 – Sep 30
Survival of all life stages	1			
Connectivity between habitats	2	2	2	2
Adult and juvenile habitat availability	3	3	3	3
Spawning habitat availability		3	3	
Fry habitat availability				3
Adult and juvenile growth				4
Habitat maintenance for all life stages*		5	5	

1=Natural winter flow or Habitat Retention, whichever is greater, 2=Habitat Retention, 3=River 2D Simulation, 4=Habitat Quality Index, 5=Channel Maintenance.

* Channel maintenance flow recommendations are presented in Appendix B.

FIGURE 4. Lowest and highest daily historical discharge values in the Hoback River and critical time periods for SRC. Data are from USGS gage 13019500 on the Hoback River (1944–1958).

Results and Discussion

Hydrology in the Instream Flow Segment

Since the USGS reference gage used for hydrology estimates (Little Granite Creek gage) was not functional in 2008, another gage was used to compare the mean discharge in the Hoback River watershed during the study period (2008) with the reference period (1981–1992). The reference gage is in the Snake River just upstream from Alpine, WY (site 13022500; this is the nearest gage downstream from the Hoback watershed). The mean daily discharge at the Alpine gage during July, August, and September in 2008 (6646 cfs) was higher than 8 of the 12 years in the reference period. This mean discharge value was substantially higher than during the three previous years (3940, 4143, and 5087 cfs).

Mean annual flow was estimated for the Granite Creek instream flow segment in addition to select flood frequency and monthly flow duration estimates (Table 4; Table 5). HabiTech (2009) noted that WGFD discharge measurements collected in the segment were within expectations of their estimates and concluded that their approach yielded reasonable results. Due to the higher than average flow conditions in 2008 compared with the reference period, the four discharges measured by WGFD in 2008 (Table 6) were greater than the estimated 50% monthly exceedance flows. The fact that these data were collected at higher than typical flow levels did not affect the modeling accuracy or the results and recommendations obtained from the models.

In addition to monthly exceedance values as an indicator of flow conditions in the segment, HabiTech (2009) also produced daily flow estimates for three years (the period of record was first divided to represent wet, average, and dry conditions, then a representative year

randomly selected from each group). Reference gage data from the randomly selected three years were used to prepare daily flow estimates for the Granite Creek segment (Figure 7). These hydrographs indicated the range of discharge conditions that may occur in the instream flow segment; however, in reality there is considerable variation in the timing and pattern of flow within a given year and between different years that is not fully described by three individual hydrographs simulated by HabiTech (2009). As a consequence these should be viewed only as a general template of runoff patterns; flow recommendations from the analyses will not vary as a function of water year characteristics.

TABLE 4. Estimated hydrologic characteristics for the Granite Creek instream flow segment (HabiTech 2009).

Flow Parameter	Estimated Flow (cfs)
Mean Annual	136
1.5-year peak	966
25-year peak	4770

TABLE 5. Estimated monthly exceedance values for the Granite Creek instream flow segment (HabiTech 2009).

Month	50% Exceedance (cfs)	20% Exceedance (cfs)
October	34	52
November	31	42
December	26	35
January	23	30
February	23	29
March	30	41
April	129	261
May	400	773
June	418	867
July	131	226
August	68	96
September	42	65

TABLE 6. Dates of collection and discharge measurements collected in the Granite Creek instream flow segment in 2009.

| Date	Discharge (cfs)
July 17	426
August 12	141
August 24	106
September 23	74

FIGURE 5. Simulated annual hydrographs for wet, dry, and average conditions at the Granite Creek instream flow segment (HabiTech 2009).

Biology – Fish Habitat

River2D Model

A River 2D model was created from bathymetry data collected at the field site and calibrated at each of the three measured discharges (399 cfs, 141 cfs, and 74 cfs). Calibration was accomplished by adjusting model inputs to closely match field observations of stage (water surface elevation) and velocity. Model inputs included discharge, water surface elevation (at the downstream end of the study site), and a channel roughness factor for each node in the underlying model mesh. To calibrate, the discharge and observed stage were input with the initial roughness values and the predicted water surface elevation was compared to the observed elevation at several points along the study site. To improve predicted elevation values from the

model, initial roughness values were adjusted up (to raise predicted water surface elevation) or down (to lower the elevation). These adjustments improved the model predictions. The greatest number of calibration points (n=459) was collected when discharge was 74 cfs. With several adjustments the model was improved such that the mean deviation between the observed and predicted water surface elevation values at 74 cfs was 0.07 inches (Figure 8). The maximum deviation was 6.7 inches and 77% of the predictions were within 2 inches of the observed water surface elevations.

FIGURE 6. Final model-predicted and observed water surface elevations at 74 cfs along the right bank in the Granite Creek study site.

Velocity calibration was accomplished by comparing modeled and observed velocities across a single cross-section (at the downstream end of the study site) over three discharges (399, 141, and 74 cfs). In addition, velocity data were collected at two cross-sections (on the two channels split by the island) when discharge was 141 cfs. The same range of roughness conditions used to calibrate the model for water surface elevations was also used to calibrate velocity data. Because data were collected for cross-sections, it was possible to match the pattern of velocity across the channel rather than focus on individual measurements (Figure 9 and Figure 10). The final patterns matched closely despite errors in individual measurements of up to 1.6 ft per second over the three calibration discharges.

Once the River 2D model was calibrated to provide the most accurate predictions of both water surface elevation and velocity at all three calibration flows, a wider range of simulations were conducted for the study site including flows between 60 cfs and 900 cfs. Because flows

were higher than normal during the study period and no low flow conditions could be evaluated in the field, the stage-discharge predictions could not predict below 60 cfs. The lower portion of the range of flow modeling was higher than the predicted 20% exceedance flows for the winter period (October through March), but the higher end of the range reached approximately bankfull flow (966 cfs; HabiTech 2009). Five cfs increments were simulated up to 100 cfs and the increments became larger with increasing discharge. At each flow, the calibrated River 2D model predicted depth and velocity (and other values such as Froude number and shear velocity magnitude) at all nodes on the mesh and interpolated values between nodes. These data, combined with the substrate conditions, allowed predictions of available habitat for the species/life stages of interest.


FIGURE 7. Final model-predicted and observed velocities at 141 cfs along the two side channel cross-sections in the Granite Creek study site.

FIGURE 8. Final model-predicted and observed velocities at 399 cfs along the upstream cross-section in the Granite Creek study site.

We used habitat suitability curves representing the four life stages (fry, juvenile, adult, and spawning) of SRC to interpret the hydraulic conditions predicted at each flow by the River 2D model. Depth, velocity, and substrate data were used to estimate a combined suitability value for each life stage in all areas in the study site. Each area was multiplied by the combined suitability value to generate a weighted usable area (WUA) for the entire study site for a given life stage and discharge.

A review of change in WUA over the range of flows revealed discharge values that provide the amount of physical habitat at each specified flow. There is not a substantial amount of habitat available to SRC fry in this reach, but the peak in habitat suitability occurs at 110 cfs (Figure 11). In this discharge range, the flow remains within the active channel (well below bankfull flow) and all suitable habitat for fry occurs along the margins of the channel (Figure 12). At 110 cfs, some habitat appears to occur in small isolated pools within the island that the model suggested would be connected at a slightly higher flow. Least favorable conditions for fry habitat availability occur above 160 cfs.

FIGURE 9. Relationship between weighted usable area and discharge for all life stages in the Granite Creek study site.


FIGURE 10. Combined suitability for SRC fry in the Granite Creek study site at 110 cfs discharge.

For juvenile SRC, habitat suitability is maximized at 65 cfs (Figure 11) and then declines with increasing discharge. Suitable habitat occurs primarily in a large pool at the head of the reach and a smaller one in a side channel. There is also substantial habitat available along the channel margins behind boulders (Figure 13).

For adult SRC, habitat availability is maximized at 70 cfs (Figure 11). Similar to juvenile habitat conditions, habitat suitability for adult SRC decreases with increasing discharge. Suitable habitat for adult SRC occurs in nearly the same areas as for juvenile SRC, but with a larger distribution around the same pools and in a greater portion of the channel in the lower half of the study area (Figure 14).

For spawning SRC, habitat suitability is maximized at 65 cfs (Figure 11). Spawning habitat is common in the study site (Figure 15), including several distinct locations with high suitability. This segment of Granite Creek is an important spawning tributary to the Hoback River and it is critical to maintain flows for spawning in this reach. The 50% exceedance flows for April through July were estimated at 130-400 cfs, so the 65 cfs flow that maximizes habitat suitability for spawning should occur frequently during this period.


FIGURE 11. Combined suitability for juvenile SRC in the Granite Creek study site at 65 cfs discharge.

FIGURE 12. Combined suitability for adult SRC in the Granite Creek study site at 70 cfs discharge.

FIGURE 13. Combined suitability for spawning SRC in the Granite Creek study site at 65 cfs discharge.

Habitat Retention Model

The habitat retention model was used to evaluate hydraulic characteristics that affect the survival and movement of all life stages over a range of discharges in the Granite Creek instream flow segment. This model addresses a portion of the connectivity riverine component as well as the biology riverine component. With this model, the hydraulic characteristics of three riffle transects were estimated and evaluated to determine the discharge that maintains fish passage (connectivity) between habitat types and provides sufficient depth, velocity, and wetted area to ensure survival of fish prey items (benthic invertebrates).

All three riffle cross-sections used for this analysis had similar hydraulic attributes (Table 7). Estimates of bankfull discharge ranged from approximately 550 cfs to 1300 cfs in this reach and at the bankfull flow riffles 1, 2, and 3 resulted in stream widths of 66, 54 ft, and 68 ft.

TABLE 7. Estimated hydraulic conditions at three riffles over the range of modeled discharges in the Granite Creek instream flow segment. Bold indicates that the threshold was met for an individual hydraulic criterion (see Table 2); the greyed-out discharge value meets the selection criteria. Bankfull width (ft) for transect 1 = 65.8, for transect 2 = 53.8, and for transect 3 = 67.6.

Riffle Transect Number	Discharge (cfs)	Mean Velocity (ft/sec)	Mean Depth (ft)	Wetted Perimeter (% of bankfull)
1	1300*	7.54	2.47	1.00
	106.3	1.97	0.88	0.87
	60	1.50	**0.66**	0.85
	30	1.09	0.50	0.75
	25	**1.00**	0.45	0.74
	20	0.91	0.40	0.72
	10	0.67	0.31	**0.65**
2	550*	5.12	1.99	1.00
	71.5	1.76	0.81	0.88
	60	1.62	0.77	0.85
	30	1.17	**0.55**	0.79
	21	**1.00**	0.48	0.77
	10	0.71	0.41	**0.60**
3	1100*	6.89	2.20	1.00
	100	1.97	0.82	0.87
	69	1.68	**0.68**	0.85
	30	1.24	0.47	0.75
	20	1.07	0.46	0.62
	17	**1.00**	0.42	0.58
	10	0.81	0.32	**0.47**

*= Bankfull flow

The final result of this analysis indicated that a discharge of 25 cfs maintains two of the three hydraulic criteria at all three riffles. This flow would maintain base level conditions for fish passage while providing habitat for benthic invertebrate populations across the riffles.

Habitat Quality Index Model

The HQI model data (Figure 16) were important in evaluating late summer habitat production potential for this instream flow segment. The 50% exceedance flow value for August and 20% exceedance flow value for September (68 cfs and 65 cfs, respectively; Table 5) were used as estimates of late summer flow levels for evaluating the results of this model. At each of these flows, the stream provides 128 Habitat Units (Figure 16); the lowest flow that would maintain this amount of habitat is 65 cfs. Decreasing discharge to 60 cfs or lower would decrease the number of HUs by over 50%. The final result of this analysis indicates that a discharge of 65 cfs maintains adult SRC habitat during the late summer period.


FIGURE 14. Habitat Quality Index vs. discharge in the Granite Creek instream flow segment. X-axis values are not to scale; the values were chosen to indicate where changes in Habitat Units occur. The recommended flow is indicated by the light shaded bar.

Natural Winter Flow

Between October and March, the estimated monthly 20% exceedance values in the proposed instream flow segment ranged from 29 cfs to 52 cfs (Table 5). The minimum value for

that time period was compared with Habitat Retention result of 25 cfs (Table 7) to determine the appropriate recommended flow for the winter season.

Geomorphology

Currently, the Granite Creek watershed has not been dramatically altered. A detailed description of recommended channel maintenance flows to maintain the channel form and fisheries habitat in the proposed instream flow segment over the long term is presented in Appendix B.

Water Quality

Water quality conditions in the Hoback River watershed are considered excellent in and upstream of the instream flow segments during most times of year and in most years. There are some issues with turbidity in the Hoback watershed, particularly in areas that have unstable slopes, but water temperature, and various organic and inorganic constituents are believed to be at normal (historic) levels and relatively little anthropogenic pollution is apparent. A nutrient sample was collected and analyzed by the Wyoming Department of Agriculture analytical services lab for nitrates; the result was <0.01 mg/L.

Flow recommendations in this report are expected to maintain water quality within natural bounds and it is assumed that existing water quality features will remain within existing limits of natural variability. If drastic long-term changes to watershed form or function occur, then flow recommendations would need to be reviewed.

Connectivity

Connectivity in a stream includes the ability of fish to move up and downstream, but also includes the connection of the stream to its floodplain and the groundwater. All of these connectivity factors also have a temporal relationship (e.g., upstream migration of fish and inundation of the floodplain are most important during certain seasons). In the Hoback watershed, there are some barriers to upstream migration (i.e., road culverts), but connectivity has been largely un-impacted in this watershed since much of it includes land managed by the US Forest Service. Maintaining needed flows on a continuous basis throughout the year will address the connectivity elements.

Instream Flow Recommendations

The instream flow recommendations to maintain short-term habitat for SRC in Granite Creek (Table 8; Figure 17) assume that geomorphic characteristics of the stream do not change. Four seasonal time periods were identified for instream flow recommendations. These distinct seasons include winter fish survival (October 1–March 31), an early spring period (April 1–30) that is important for longitudinal habitat connectivity in anticipation of SRC spawning, the spring SRC spawning period (May 1–June 30), and the summer months that facilitate trout production potential (July 1–September 30).

Winter flow recommendations were based on a combination of Habitat Retention results and the lowest 20% monthly exceedance value during the winter period for each segment. Early spring recommendations were based on adult and juvenile habitat requirements (determined using the River2D model). Recommendations for the spring spawning period were based on peak SRC spawning habitat suitability determined using the River2D model. Summer flow recommendations were based on habitat requirements to maintain fry habitat (River2D results) as

well as adult and juvenile trout production (HQI results). In a few cases, habitat models indicated that most favorable conditions were greatest for target species / life stages at discharges that are higher than what naturally occurs in the segment. In those instances a different model result was used, or as a last resort, the 20% exceedance flow (the lowest monthly value estimated for the given time period) was recommended.

The flows recommended to maintain seasonal fishery needs in the Granite Creek instream flow segment are:

➢ Winter (October 1–March 31) – Natural winter flows of up to 29 cfs are needed to maintain over-winter survival of all life stages of SRC at existing levels. This is the lowest estimated value for the 20% monthly exceedance discharge for any month during that time period (the range is 29-52 cfs). Habitat Retention results suggest that slightly lower flow (≥25 cfs) would provide necessary connectivity between habitats in this reach.

➢ Early Spring (April 1-30) – Natural flow up to 70 cfs is needed based on a combination River2D results for adults and juvenile SRC. This flow is intended to maintain longitudinal connectivity within the instream flow segment. Connectivity between habitats is particularly important during this time period as SRC move to spawning areas and prepare to spawn.

➢ Spring (May 1 – June 30) – Natural flow up to 65 cfs is needed based on maximum spawning habitat availability for SRC (River2D results). This level of flow will maintain existing habitat for this life history need and is consistent with observations of spawning activity during field data collection.

➢ Summer (July 1 – September 30) – Natural flow up to 65 cfs is needed based on HQI results to maintain sufficient habitat conditions for growth and production of juvenile and adult SRC.

TABLE 8. Flow recommendations (cfs) for the proposed instream flow segment in Granite Creek.

Study Segment	Winter Oct 1 – Mar 31	Early Spring Apr 1 – Apr 30*	Spring May 1 – Jun 30*	Summer Jul 1 – Sep 30
Granite Creek	29	70	65	65

* Channel maintenance flow recommendations for the spring runoff period are higher, and can be found in Appendix B.

FIGURE 15. Recommended instream flows in the proposed segment (when available) relative to wet, dry, and average flow years.

Summary

Granite Creek provides important SRC habitat for ensuring the long-term persistence of the species in the Hoback River drainage and throughout Wyoming. This population is managed as a wild SRC fishery within the recreationally important Hoback River watershed. If approved by the State Engineer, the proposed instream flow water right filing on Granite Creek will maintain existing base flow conditions when they are naturally available against presently unknown future out-of-channel uses up to the limit of recommended water rights for each segment described in this report. Approximately 8.5 miles of stream habitat will be directly maintained if these instream flow applications advance to permit status. Existing (senior) water rights will remain unaffected if the proposed water rights are approved because the proposed instream flow rights will have a current day (junior) priority date and water for all senior water rights would be honored in their entirety when water is available according to state law.

Acknowledgements

Literature Cited

Andrews, E. D. 1984. Bed-material entrainment and hydraulic geometry of gravel-bed rivers in Colorado. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 95:371–378.

Annear, T. C., and A. L. Conder. 1984. Relative bias of several fisheries instream flow methods. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 4:531–539.

Annear, T., I. Chisholm, H. Beecher, A. Locke, and 12 other authors. 2004. Instream Flows for Riverine Resource Stewardship. *Revised edition.* Instream Flow Council, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Annear, T., and P. Dey. 2006. Water management unit 5-year plan: 2006–2010. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Behnke, R. J. 1992. Native trout of western North America. American Fisheries Society Monograph 6, Bethesda, Maryland.

Binns, N. A. 1982. Habitat Quality Index Procedures Manual. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne.

Binns, N. A. and F. Eiserman. 1979. Quantification of fluvial trout habitat in Wyoming. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 108:215–228.

BLM (Bureau of Land Management). 2003. Pre-decisional environmental assessment: Hoback ranches community. BLM Report NW-ID-2003-069.

Bohn, C. C., and J. G. King. 2001. Stream channel responses to streamflow diversion on small streams in Idaho. Stream Notes. Stream Systems Technology Center, U.S. Forest Service, Fort Collins, Colorado. pp 6–7.

Bovee, K. D. 1982. A guide to stream habitat analysis using the instream flow incremental methodology. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-82/26. 248 pp.

Bovee, K., and R. Milhous. 1978. Hydraulic simulation in instream flow studies: theory and technique. Instream Flow Information Paper 5, FWS/OBS-78/33, Cooperative Instream Flow Service Group, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Fort Collins, Colorado.

Bovee, K. D, B. L. Lamb, J. M. Bartholow, C. B. Stalnaker, J. Taylor, and J. Henriksen. 1998. Stream habitat analysis using the instream flow incremental methodology. U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division Information and Technology Report USGS/BRD-1998-0004. viii + 131 pp.

Bovee, K. D, T. J. Waddle, C. Talbert, J. R. Hatten, and T. R. Batt. 2008. Development and application of a decision support system for water management investigations in the

upper Yakima River, Washington. U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Division Information and Technology Report USGS/BRD-2008-1251. xvii + 289 pp.

Bozek, M. A., and F. J. Rahel. 1992. Generality of microhabitat suitability models of young Colorado River cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki pleuriticus*) across site and among years in Wyoming streams. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science 49:552–564.

BTNF (Bridger Teton National Forest). 2009. Bridger Teton National Forest five year monitoring report. September 2009.

Carling, P. 1995. Implications of sediment transport for instream flow modeling of aquatic habitat. *In* D. Harper and A. Ferguson, editors. The Ecological Basis for River Management. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, England. pp17–32.

CH2MHill. 2004. Addendum to the Upper Snake Province Assessment. Draft report prepared for the Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Portland, Oregon.

Conder, A. L., and T. C. Annear. 1987. Test of weighted usable area estimates derived from a PHABSIM model for instream flow studies on trout streams. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 7:339–350.

De Rito, Jr. J. N. 2005. Assessment of reproductive isolation between Yellowstone cutthroat trout and rainbow trout in the Yellowstone River, Montana. Master's thesis. Montana State University, Bozeman.

Dey, P. D., and T. C. Annear. 2002. Instream flow studies on Francs Fork, a Greybull River tributary. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Dey, P. D., and T. C. Annear. 2003. Instream Flow Studies on Pickett Creek, a Greybull River Tributary. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Dey, P. D., and T. C. Annear. 2006. Trout Creek, Tributary to North Fork Shoshone River, Instream Flow Studies. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Dufek, D., K. Johnson, J. Kiefling, R. McDowell, R. McKnight, S. Roth, and S. Yekel. 1999. Status and management of Yellowstone cutthroat trout *Oncorhynchus clarki bouvieri*. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Emmett, W. W. 1975. The channels and waters of the upper Salmon River area, Idaho. U.S. Geological Survey, Professional Paper 870-A. 116 pp.

Federal Register (U.S. Office of the Federal Register). 2001. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: 90-day finding for a petition to list the Yellowstone cutthroat trout as threatened. Federal Register 66:37 (23 February 2001): 11244–11249.

Federal Register (U.S. Office of the Federal Register). 2006. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants; 12-month finding for a petition to list the Yellowstone cutthroat trout as threatened. Federal Register 71:34 (21 February 2006): 8818–8831.

Ghanem, A., P. Steffler, F. Hicks, and C. Katapodis. 1994. Two-dimensional finite element modeling of physical fish habitat. Proceedings of the 1st International Symposium on Habitat Hydraulics. August 18–20, 1994. Trondheim, Norway.

Ghanem, A., P. Steffler, F. Hicks, and C. Katapodis. 1996. Two dimensional hydraulic simulation of physical conditions in flowing streams. Regulated Rivers: Research and Management 12:185–200.

Gipson, R. 2006. Management Implications. Page 15 *in* R. W. Van Kirk, J. M. Capurso, and M. A. Novak, editors. Exploring differences between fine-spotted and large-spotted Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Symposium Proceedings, Idaho Chapter American Fisheries Society, Boise.

Gordon, N. 1995. Summary of technical testimony in the Colorado Water Division 1 Trial. USDA Forest Service, General Technical Report RM-GTR-270. 140 pp.

HabiTech, Inc. 2009. Flow duration and flood frequency analyses for selected streams in the Hoback River drainage of the Snake River Basin, Wyoming. Prepared by HabiTech, Inc., Laramie, Wyoming.

Heede, B.H. 1992. Stream dynamics: an overview for land managers. USDA Forest Service, Washington, D.C. Gen. Tech. Rep. WO-12.

Hill, M. T., W. S. Platts, and R. L. Beschta. 1991. Ecological and geo-morphological concepts for instream and out-of-channel flow requirements. Rivers, 2(3): 198–210.

Hubert, W. A. C. A. Pru, T. A. Wesche, and T. Bray. 1997. Evaluation of flow duration analysis to establish winter instream flow standards for Wyoming trout streams. Final Report WWRC-97-03. Wyoming Water Resources Center, Laramie.

Kent, R. 1984. Fisheries management investigations in the upper Shoshone River drainage 1978–1982. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Kiefling, J. W. 1978. Studies on the ecology of the Snake River cutthroat trout. Fisheries Technical Bulletin No. 3, Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne.

Kruse, C. G. 1998. Influence of non-native trout and geomorphology on distributions of indigenous trout in the Yellowstone River drainage of Wyoming. Dissertation, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Kruse, C. G., W. A. Hubert, and F. J. Rahel. 1997. Geomorphic influences on the distribution of Yellowstone cutthroat trout in the Absoroka Mountains, Wyoming. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 126:418–427.

Kruse, C. G., W. A. Hubert, and F. J. Rahel. 2000. Status of Yellowstone cutthroat trout in Wyoming Waters. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 20:693–705.

Kuhnle, R. A., A. Simon, and R. L. Bingner. 1999. Dominant discharge of the incised channels of Goodwin Creek. Published in the Proceedings 1999 Water Resources Conference, American Society of Civil Engineers. Seattle, Washington.

Lageson, D. R., and D. R. Spearing. 1996. Roadside Geology of Wyoming. Mountain Press Publishing Company, Missoula, Montana. 271 pp.

Leary, R. F., F. W. Allendorf, S. R. Phelps, and K. L. Knudsen. 1987. Genetic divergence and identification of seven cutthroat trout subspecies and rainbow trout. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society. 116:580–587.

Leopold, L. B. 1994. A View of the River. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 298 p.

Leopold, L.B., Wolman, M.G., and Miller, P., 1964. Fluvial Processes in Geomorphology. W.H. Freeman and Company, 522 p.

Lindstrom, J. W., and W. A. Hubert. 2004. Ice processes affect habitat use and movements of adult cutthroat trout and brook trout in a Wyoming foothills stream. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 24:1341–1352.

Locke, A., C. Stalnaker, S. Zellmer, K. Williams, H. Beecher, T. Richards, C. Robertson, A. Wald, A. Paul, and T. Annear. 2008. Integrated approaches to riverine resource management: Case studies, science, law, people, and policy. Instream Flow Council, Cheyenne, Wyoming. 430 pp.

Lowham, H. W. 1988. Streamflows in Wyoming. Water-Resources Investigations Report 88-4045, U.S. Geological Survey, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Mahoney, J. M., and S. B. Rood. 1998. Streamflow requirements for cottonwood seedling recruitment: An integrative model. Wetlands 18(4): 634–645.

May, B., S. E. Albeke, and T. Horton. 2007. Range-wide status assessment for Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii bouveri*): 2006. Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout Conservation Team Report. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Helena. 410 pp.

May, B., E. W. Urie, and B. Shepard. 2003. Range-wide status of Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki bouvieri*): 2001. Yellowstone Cutthroat Trout Conservation Team Report. Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks, Helena. 201 pp.

Meyer, K. A., D. J. Schill, F. S. Elle, and J. A. Lamansky, Jr. 2003. Reproductive demographics and factors that influence length at sexual maturity of Yellowstone cutthroat trout in Idaho streams. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 132:183–195.

Miselis, D. V., T. A. Wesche and H. W. Lowham. 1999. Development of hydrologic models for estimating streamflow characteristics of Wyoming's mountainous basins. Wyoming Water Resource Center Report, University of Wyoming, Laramie.

Nehring, R. 1979. Evaluation of instream flow methods and determination of water quantity needs for streams in the state of Colorado. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Fort Collins.

NPCC (Northwest Power and Conservation Council). 2005. Upper Snake Province Assessment. *In* Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program. Portland, Oregon.

Novak, M., J. Kershner, and K. Mock. 2005. Molecular genetic investigation of Yellowstone cutthroat trout and finespotted Snake River cutthroat trout. Completion report to the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission, grant agreement number 165/04, Cheyenne, Wyoming.

Range-Wide YCT Conservation Team. 2009a. Conservation strategy for Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii bouvieri*) in the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Helena.

Range-wide YCT Conservation Team. 2009b. Conservation agreement for Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii bouvieri*) in the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming. Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks, Helena.

Rhea, D., and R. Gipson. 2007. Hoback River stocking evaluation: 2000–2006 population estimates, 2006 programmed creel, and 2000–2005 spot creel. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Richter, B. D., J. V. Baumgartner, J. Powell, and D. P. Braun. 1996. A method for assessing hydrologic alteration within ecosystems. Conservation Biology 10:1163–1174.

Rood, S. B., J. M. Mahoney, D. E. Reid, and L. Zilm. 1995. Instream flows and the decline of riparian cottonwoods along the St. Mary River, Alberta. Canadian Journal of Botany 73:1250–1260.

Rosgen, D. 1996. Applied river morphology. Wildland Hydrology, Pagosa Springs, Colorado.

Ryan, S. E. 1996. Bedload transport patterns in coarse-grained channels under varying conditions of flow. *In* Proceedings of the 6th Inter-agency sedimentation conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, March 10–14. p VI-22 to VI-27b.

Schmidt, L. D., and J. P. Potyondy. 2004. Quantifying channel maintenance instream flows: an approach for gravel-bed streams in the Western United States. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-128.

Stromberg, J. C., and D. C. Patten. 1990. Riparian vegetation instream flow requirements: A case study from a diverted stream in the eastern Sierra Nevada, California, USA. Environmental Management 14(2): 185–194.

Stalnaker, C., B. L. Lamb, J. Henriksen, K. Bovee, and J. Bartholow. 1995. The instream flow incremental methodology - A primer for IFIM. Biological Report 29, March 1995, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Biological Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Steffler P., and J. Blackburn. 2002. River 2D: Two-dimensional depth averaged model of river hydrodynamics and fish habitat. User manual for River 2D software. Available at: http://www.river2d.ualberta.ca/index.htm.

Sweet, D. 2009. Variation in spotting patterns within the cutthroat trout of the Upper Snake River drainage, Wyoming. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

Thurow, R. F. and J. B. King. 1994. Attributes of Yellowstone cutthroat trout redds in a tributary of the Snake River, Idaho. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 123:37–50.

Trush B., and S. McBain. 2000. Alluvial river ecosystem attributes. Stream Notes. January 2000. Stream systems technology Center, USDA Forest Service. pp 1–3.

U. S. Forest Service. 1997. An approach for quantifying channel maintenance instream flows in gravel-bed streams. Draft manuscript. Boise Adjudication Team, Boise, Idaho. 98 pp.

Van Kirk, R. W., J. M. Capurso, and M. A. Novak, editors. 2006. Exploring differences between fine-spotted and large-spotted Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Symposium Proceedings, Idaho Chapter American Fisheries Society, Boise.

Varley, J. D. and R. E. Gresswell. 1988. Ecology, status, and management of the Yellowstone cutthroat trout. Pages 13–24 *in* R.E. Gresswell, editor. Status and management of interior stocks of cutthroat trout. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 4, Bethesda, MD.

Wolman M. G., and J. P. Miller. 1960. Magnitude and frequency of forces in geomorphic processes. Journal of Geology 68:54–74.

WGFD (Wyoming Game and Fish Department). 2005a. Wyoming Game and Fish Department management activities for Yellowstone cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki bouvieri*). Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

WGFD (Wyoming Game and Fish Department). 2005b. A Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy for Wyoming. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

WGFD (Wyoming Game and Fish Department). 2009. Strategic Habitat Plan. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Fish Division, Cheyenne.

WGFD (Wyoming Game and Fish Department). 2010. State Wildlife Action Plan. Administrative Report. Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Cheyenne.

WRCC (Western Regional Climate Center). 2011. Monthly climate summary, Bondurant, Wyoming. Available: http://www.wrcc.dri.edu/ (October 2011).

WYDEQ (Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality). 2001. Wyoming surface water classifications list. Report available at: http://deq.state.wy.us/wqd/watershed/surfacestandards/index.asp. Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, Cheyenne.

WYDEQ (Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality). 2007. Water Quality rules and regulations. Report available at: http://deq.state.wy.us/wqd/watershed/surfacestandards/index.asp. Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality, Cheyenne.

Appendix A. Instream Flows in Wyoming

Guiding Principles for Instream Flow Recommendations

The analyses and interpretation of data collected for this report included consideration of the important components of an aquatic ecosystem and their relationship to stream flow. Stream ecosystems are complex, and maintaining this complexity requires an appropriate flow regime. This report describes recommendations for instream flows that were developed using an ecosystem approach that is consistent with contemporary understanding of stream complexity and effective resource management. The recommendations of the Instream Flow Council (IFC), an organization of state and provincial fishery and wildlife management agencies, provide comprehensive guidance on conducting instream flow studies. The approach described by the IFC includes consideration of three policy components (legal, institutional, and public involvement) and five riverine components (hydrology, geomorphology, biology, water quality and connectivity; Annear et al. 2004). Sections of this report were selected to reflect appropriate components of that template as closely as possible. By using the eight components described by the IFC as a guide, we strive to develop instream flow recommendations that work within Wyoming's legal and institutional environment to maintain or improve important aquatic resources for public benefit while also employing a generally recognized flow quantification protocol.

Legal and Institutional Background

The Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) manages fish and wildlife resources under Title 23 of Wyoming statutes (W.S.). The WGFD was created and placed under the direction and supervision of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission (Commission) in W.S. 23-1-401 and the responsibilities of the Commission and the WGFD are defined in W.S. 23-1-103. In these and associated statutes, the WGFD is charged with providing "... *an adequate and flexible system for the control, propagation, management, protection and regulation of all Wyoming wildlife.*" The WGFD mission statement is: "Conserving Wildlife - Serving People", while the WGFD Fish Division mission statement details a stewardship role toward aquatic resources for the people who enjoy them. In a 2005 policy statement, the Commission formally assigned certain responsibilities for implementing instream flow water rights to the WGFD and specified procedures for notifying the Commission of instream flow filing activities. Briefly, the Department is directed to notify a Commission member when a stream in his or her district is identified as a candidate for filing. If that Commission member has concern about the proposed recommendation, it will be brought to the full Commission in open session. In addition, the Department will advise all Commission members at least two weeks prior to submitting materials for each instream flow filing recommendation, as well as provide notice of any changes in the Instream Flow Program.

The instream flow law, W.S. 41-3-1001-1014, was passed in 1986 and establishes that "*unappropriated water flowing in any stream or drainage in Wyoming may be appropriated for instream flows to maintain or improve existing fisheries and declared a beneficial use...*" The statute directs that the Commission is responsible for determining stream flows that will "*maintain or improve*" important fisheries. The WGFD fulfills this function under the general policy oversight of the Commission. Applications for instream flow water rights are signed and held by the Wyoming Water Development Office on behalf of the state should the water right be

approved by the State Engineer. The priority date for the instream flow water right is the day the application is received by the State Engineer.

One of the critical terms associated with the present instream flow statute relates to the concept of a "fishery." From a natural resource perspective, a fishery includes the habitat and associated natural processes that are required to support fish populations. The primary components that comprise needed physical habitat include, but are not limited to, the stream channel, riparian zone and floodplain, as well as the processes of sediment flux and riparian vegetation development that sustain those habitats (Annear et al. 2004). To maintain the existing dynamic character of an entire fishery, instream flow regimes must maintain the stream channel and its functional linkages to the riparian corridor and floodplain to perpetuate habitat structure and ecological function. The State Engineer has concluded that a full range of channel maintenance flow regimes is not consistent with the legislative intent of the instream flow statute. Therefore, until interpretation of state water law changes, channel maintenance flow recommendations are not included on instream flow applications. Channel maintenance flow requirements are presented in Appendix B of this report and may be useful should opportunities arise in the future to secure a broader, more appropriate range of instream flow water rights for this important fishery management purpose.

Through January 2012, the WGFD has forwarded 115 instream flow water right applications to the Wyoming Water Development Office for submission. Of these, the State Engineer has permitted 86 and the Board of Control has adjudicated 10.

Public Participation

The general public has several opportunities to be involved in the process of identifying instream flow segments or commenting on instream flow applications. Individuals or groups can inform WGFD of their interest in protecting the fisheries in specific streams or stream segments with instream flow filings. In addition, planning and selection of future instream flow study sites are detailed in the Water Management Unit's annual work schedules and five-year plans, which are available for public review and comment (either upon request or by visiting the WGFD web site at http://wgfd.wyo.gov). The public is also able to comment on instream flow water rights that have been filed with the State Engineer through public hearings (required by statute) that are conducted by the State Engineer's Office for each proposed instream flow water right. The State Engineer uses these public hearings to gather information for consideration before issuing a decision on the instream flow water right application. To help the public better understand the details of instream flow filings and the public hearing process, WGFD personnel typically conduct an informal information meeting a week or two prior to each public hearing. Additional presentations to community or special interest groups at other times of year also provide opportunity for discussion and learning more about instream flow issues and processes.

Appendix B. Channel Maintenance Flows

Background

The term "channel maintenance flows" refers to flows that maintain existing channel morphology, riparian vegetation and floodplain function (Schmidt and Potyondy 2004). The basis and approach used below for defining channel maintenance flows applies to snowmelt-dominated gravel and cobble-bed (alluvial) streams. By definition, these are streams whose beds are dominated by loose material with median sizes larger than 0.08 in. and with a pavement or armor layer of coarser materials overlaying the channel bed. In these streams, bedload transport processes determine the size and shape of the channel and the character of habitat for aquatic organisms (Andrews 1984, Hill et al. 1991, Leopold 1994).

A flow regime that provides channel maintenance results in stream channels that are in approximate sediment equilibrium, where sediment export equals sediment import on average over a period of years (Leopold 1994, Carling 1995, Schmidt and Potyondy 2004). Thus, stream channel characteristics over space and time are a function of sediment input and flow. When sediment-moving flows are removed or reduced over a period of years, some gravel-bed channels respond with reductions in width and depth, rate of lateral migration, stream-bed elevation, stream side vegetation, water-carrying capacity, and changes in bed material composition.

Maintenance of channel features and floodplain function cannot be obtained by a single threshold flow (Kuhnle et al. 1999). Rather, a dynamic hydrograph within and between years is needed (Gordon 1995, Trush and McBain 2000, Schmidt and Potyondy 2004). High flows are needed in some years to scour the stream channel, prevent encroachment of stream banks, and deposit sediments to maintain a dynamic alternate bar morphology and a riparian community with diverse successional states. Low flow years are as valuable as high flow years on some streams to allow establishment of riparian plant seedlings on bars deposited in immediately preceding wet years (Trush and McBain 2000). The natural interaction of high and low flow years maintains riparian plant community development and aquatic habitat by preventing annual scour that might occur from continuous high flow (allowing some riparian development) while at the same time preventing encroachment by riparian plants that could occur if flows were artificially reduced at all times.

Channel maintenance flows must be sufficient to move the entire volume and all sizes of material supplied to the channel from the watershed over a long-term period (Carling 1995, Schmidt and Potyondy 2004). A range of flows, under the dynamic hydrograph paradigm, provides this function. Infrequent high flows move large bed elements while the majority of the total volume of material is moved by more frequent, but lower flows (Wolman and Miller 1960, Leopold 1994). In streams with a wide range of sediment sizes on the channel boundary, a range of flows may best represent the dominant discharge because different water velocities are needed to mobilize different sizes of bed load and sediment. Kuhnle et al. (1999) noted "A system designed with one steady flow to transport the supplied mass of sediment would in all likelihood become unstable as the channel aggraded and could no longer convey the sediment and water supplied to it. A system designed with one steady flow to transport the supplied sediment size distribution would in all likelihood become unstable as the bed degraded and caused instability of the banks."

Bedload Transport

A bedload transport model (Figure B-1) shows the total amount of bedload sediment transported over time (during which a full range of stream discharge [Q] values occur). Smaller discharges, such as the substrate mobilization flow (Q_m) occur more frequently, but not much sediment is moved during those times. The effective discharge (Q_e) mobilizes the greatest volume of sediment and also begins to transport some of the larger sediment particles (gravels and small cobbles). The bankfull discharge (Q_{bf}), in which flow begins to inundate the floodplain and which has a return interval of approximately 1.5 years on average, typically occurs near the Q_e. The discharge corresponding to the 25-year return interval (Q_{25}) represents the upper limit of the required channel maintenance flow regime, since the full range of mobile sediment materials move at flows up to this value, but these higher flows are infrequent. The more frequent discharges that occur between the Q_m and the Q_e move primarily smaller-sized particles (sand and small gravel) and prevent filling in of pools and other reduction in habitat complexity. Since these particles are deposited into the stream from the surrounding watershed with greater frequency, it is important to maintain a flow regime that provides sufficient conveyance properties (high frequency of moderate discharges) to move these particles through the system. However, alluvial streams, particularly those at higher elevations, also receive significant contributions of larger-sized particles from the surrounding watershed and restrictions to the flow regime that prevent or reduce the occurrence flows greater than Q_e (which are critical for moving these coarser materials) would result in gradual bedload accumulation of these larger particles. The net effect would be an alteration of existing channel forming processes and habitat (Bohn and King 2001). For this reason, flows up to the Q_{25} flow are required to maintain existing channel form and critical habitat features for local fish populations.


FIGURE B-1. Total bedload transport as a function of bedload transport rate and flow frequency (adapted from Schmidt and Potyondy 2004).

Channel Maintenance Flows Model

The model used to recommend flows to maintain the form and function of the stream channel is derived from bedload transport theory presented above. Based on these principles, the following channel maintenance flow model was developed by Dr. Luna Leopold and is used in this report to calculate the appropriate instream flows up to the Q_{25}:

$$Q \text{ Recommendation} = Q_f + \{(Q_s - Q_f) * [(Q_s - Q_m) / (Q_{bf} - Q_m)]^{0.1}\}$$

Where: Q_s = actual stream flow
Q_f = fish flow (required to maintain fish habitat)
Q_m = sediment mobilization flow = $0.8 * Q_{bf}$
Q_{bf} = bankfull flow

The Leopold model calculations could be used to yield a continuous range of instream flow recommendations at flows between the Q_m and Q_{bf} for each cubic foot per second increase in discharge. However, this manner of flow regulation is complex and could prove burdensome to water managers. To facilitate flow administration while still ensuring reasonable flows for channel maintenance, WGFD modified this aspect of the approach to recommend instream flows for four quartiles between the Q_m and Q_{bf}.

Channel maintenance flow recommendations developed with the Leopold model require that only a portion of the flow remain instream for maintenance efforts. When total discharge is less than Q_m, only fish flows are necessary; discharge between the fish habitat flows recommended in the main body of this report and Q_m is available for other uses (Figure B-2). Similarly, all discharge greater than the Q_{25} flow is less critical for channel maintenance purposes and available for other uses (these higher flows do allow a connection to the floodplain and it is valuable for infrequent inundation of riparian habitat to occur, but not for the physical maintenance of the stream channel). Between the Q_m and Q_{bf}, the model is used to determine what proportion of flow should remain in channel for maintenance activities. For those relatively infrequent flows that occur in the range between Q_{bf} and the Q_{25}, all flow is recommended to remain in the channel for these critical channel maintenance purposes.

Using this "dynamic hydrograph" approach, the volume of water required for channel maintenance is variable from year to year. During low-flow years, less water is recommended for channel maintenance because flows may not reach the defined channel maintenance level. In those years, most water in excess of fish habitat flows is available for other uses. The majority of flow for channel maintenance occurs during wet years. One benefit of this dynamic hydrograph approach is that the recommended flow is needed only when it is available in the channel and does not assert a claim for water that is not there as often happens with a threshold approach.

Y-axis: Discharge (cfs) — 0, 500, 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500, 3000, 3500, 4000, 4500

X-axis: Return Interval (years)

Labels: Q_m, Q_bf, Q_25

"Available for other uses"

Legend:
— Available Disharge
— Instream Flow Recommendation

FIGURE B-2. General function of a dynamic hydrograph instream flow for fishery maintenance. Q_m is substrate mobilization flow, Q_{bf} is bankfull flow, and Q_{25} is the discharge with a 25-year return interval.

This channel maintenance flow model is the same as the one presented in Gordon (1995) and the Clark's Fork Wild and Scenic water right (C112.0F) filed by the U.S. Forest Service with the Wyoming State Engineer, with one exception. The model presented in those documents used the average annual flow to represent Q_m. More recent work by Schmidt and Potyondy (2004) identified Q_m as occurring at a discharge of 0.8 times Q_{bf}. Initial particle transport begins at flows somewhat greater than average annual flows but lower than Q_{bf} (Schmidt and Potyondy 2004). Ryan (1996) and Emmett (1975) found the flows that generally initiated transport were between 0.3 and 0.5 of Q_{bf}. Movement of coarser particles begins at flows of about 0.5 to 0.8 of Q_{bf} (Leopold 1994, Carling 1995). Schmidt and Potyondy (2004) discuss phases of bedload movement and suggest that a flow trigger of 0.8 of the Q_{bf} "provides a good first approximation for general application" in defining flows needed to maintain channels.

Granite Creek

Like all properly functioning rivers, Granite Creek has a hydraulically connected watershed, floodplain, riparian zone, and stream channel. Bankfull and overbank flow are essential hydrologic characteristics for maintaining habitat in and along these river segments in their existing dynamic form. These high flows flush sediments from the gravels and maintain channel form (i.e., depth, width, and pool and riffle configuration) by periodically scouring encroaching vegetation. Overbank flow maintains recruitment of riparian vegetation, encourages lateral movement of the channel, and recharges ground water tables. Instream flows that

maintain the connectivity of these processes over time and space are needed to maintain the existing fishery (Annear et al. 2004).

The Leopold model was used to develop channel maintenance recommendations for the Granite Creek instream flow segment (Table B-1). The fish flow used in the analysis was the spawning flow (65 cfs). For naturally available flow levels less than the spawning flow, the channel maintenance instream flow recommendation is equal to natural flow. The spawning flow level is substantially less than Q_m (773 cfs). For the flow range between the spawning flow and Q_m, the channel maintenance flow recommendation is equal to the spawning flow (Table B-1). When naturally available flows range from Q_m to Q_{bf}, the Leopold formula is applied and results in incrementally greater amounts of water applied toward instream flow (Table B-1). At flows between Q_{bf}, and Q_{25}, all stream flow is retained in the channel to perform maintenance functions. At flows greater than Q_{25}, only the Q_{25} is recommended for channel maintenance (Figure B-3).

TABLE B-1. Channel maintenance instream flow recommendations (May 1–June 30) to maintain existing channel forming processes and long-term aquatic habitat characteristics in the Granite Creek instream flow segment.

Flow Description	Available Flow (cfs)	Recommended Flow (cfs)
<Spawning Flow	<65	All available flow
Spawning Flow to Q_m	65-773	65
Q_m to Q_{bf} – Quartile 1	774-821	484
Q_m to Q_{bf} – Quartile 2	822-869	725
Q_m to Q_{bf} – Quartile 3	870-918	817
Q_m to Q_{bf} – Quartile 4	919-966	895
Q_{bf} to Q_{25}	966-4770	All available flow
> Q_{25}	≥ 4770	4770

Figure B-3 shows example annual hydrographs (randomly selected average and wet years) with channel maintenance flow recommendations implemented. Dry years are not shown because flows would not exceed the 773 cfs substrate mobilization threshold to initiate channel maintenance flows. In the representative average year, 1989, flow exceeded substrate mobilization flow on 10 days, which would trigger channel maintenance flow recommendations. In the representative wet year, 1986, these recommendations would apply for 30 days in May and June (Figure B-3).

FIGURE B-3. Channel maintenance flow recommendations and hydrographs for the Granite Creek instream flow segment in an average (1989) and a wet (1986) water year.

Implementing these flow recommendations would have to include moderating the abrupt changes that occur at threshold flows with a ramping scheme that includes more gradual changes akin to a natural hydrograph. Such sharp flow increases and decreases evident in Figure B-3 would cause habitat loss through excessive scour and potential trout mortality due to stranding. The Index of Hydrologic Alteration (IHA; Richter et al. 1996) could provide a valuable reference to find suitable rates of change. Daily increases and decreases during runoff measured at the Little Granite Creek gage (HabiTech 2009) could serve as a guide for developing such ramping rate recommendations using the IHA.