



An examination of channel geomorphology, hydraulic characteristics, and fish habitat in Cottonwood Creek on the Montana University Systems Bandy Ranch
by Stephanie Ann Hallock

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Civil Engineering
Montana State University
© Copyright by Stephanie Ann Hallock (2003)

Abstract:

A baseline study was completed in the summer of 2003 on Cottonwood Creek along the portions that flow through the Bandy Ranch. This reach will likely be the host for studies of management practices and corresponding channel change in the future.

This study was initiated after the closure of an irrigation ditch in 2002, raising interest in the immediate and long term impacts on the channel. Data collection focused on fish habitat, channel geomorphology, macroinvertebrate composition, and riparian vegetation. The methods in this study could be repeated in future studies at the ranch.

The riparian health of Cottonwood Creek was established from a variety of field observations. Lack of large woody debris, lack of overhead cover, and lack of deep pools were found to be limiting factors on this stretch of Cottonwood Creek.

Macroinvertebrate data showed that the most upstream reach might be under more stressed conditions compared to the rest of the reaches. Channel geometry has been steady over the period of 1996-2003, while Rosgen classification showed that the creek was in a transition state. Hydraulic modeling was performed, and showed that small changes in flow during low flow periods have little effect on stream physical conditions. A thorough fish assessment was not included in this study, and would complete the baseline data set.

AN EXAMINATION OF CHANNEL GEOMORPHOLOGY, HYDRAULIC
CHARACTERISTICS, AND FISH HABITAT IN COTTONWOOD CREEK ON THE
MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM'S BANDY RANCH

by

Stephanie Ann Hallock

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Science

in

Civil Engineering

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

December 2003


N378
H158

APPROVAL

Of a thesis submitted by

Stephanie Ann Hallock


This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Joel Cahoon  12/1/03
(Signature) Date

Approved for the Department of Civil Engineering

Dr. Brett Gunnink  12/1/03
(Signature) Date

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

Dr. Bruce McLeod  12-8-03
(Signature) Date

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

If I have indicated my intention to copyright this thesis by including a copyright notice page, copying is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for permission for extended quotation form or reproduction of this thesis in whole or in parts may be granted only by the copyright holder.

Signature Stephanie Hallock

Date 12/1/03

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members Joel Cahoon, Clayton Marlow, and Otto Stein for the opportunity to work on this study and for their help with putting together this thesis. I would like to thank Tom McMahon for his advice. I also wish to thank Travis Miller for helping me data collection and macroinvertebrate identification. Finally, I also would like to thank my family and friends for their support over these two years. I couldn't have done it without them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Objectives.....	1
Discussion of paper.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
Why Are We Concerned With Low-Order Streams?.....	3
Fish Population and Habitat.....	4
Irrigation Impacts on the Stream Channel.....	11
Effect of Grazing.....	13
Irrigation Impacts on Stream Biology.....	14
Riparian Vegetation and Slope Stability.....	16
3. BLACKFOOT RIVER WATERSHED.....	24
Watershed Description.....	25
4. SITE DESCRIPTION.....	28
5. METHODS.....	34
Stream Cross-Sections.....	34
Habitat Surveying.....	36
Pocket Pools.....	39
Bank Stability.....	39
Cover.....	39
Large Woody Debris.....	39
Rosgen Classification.....	40
Sediment Composition.....	40
Flow Rate.....	42
Fish Surveying.....	42
Riparian Assessment.....	42
Benthic Macroinvertebrates.....	43
Hydraulic Analysis.....	45
6. RESULTS.....	48
Habitat Surveys.....	48
Summary of Reaches.....	55

TABLE OF CONTENTS-CONTINUED

Channel Geomorphology	64
Sediment Composition	72
Rosgen Classification	76
Riparian Assessment	77
Macroinvertebrate Analysis	78
Hydraulic Analysis	82
7. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	90
Habitat	91
Macroinvertebrates	95
Stream Cross-Sections	96
Hydraulic Modeling	99
Future Work	100
REFERENCES CITED	101
APPENDICES	107
APPENDIX A: Fish Population Data	108
APPENDIX B: Stream Habitat Survey Data	112
APPENDIX C: Greenline Riparian Data	121
APPENDIX D: Visual Basic Code	127

LIST OF TABLES

Table

5.1 Rosgen classification criteria for selected stream types.....	40
5.2 Substrate size classes (Overton et al, 1993).....	41
5.3 Metrics used in macroinvertebrate analysis (adapted from Rothrock et al, 1998; Resh and Jackson, 1993).....	44
6.1 Summary of the habitat units of reach A	50
6.2 Summary of the habitat units of reach B.....	52
6.3 Summary of the habitat units of reach C.....	52
6.4 Summary of the habitat units of reach D	55
6.5 Summary of fast habitats for all reaches	56
6.6 Summary of slow habitats for all reaches	56
6.7 Summary of all habitats for all reaches.....	57
6.8 Physical habitat characteristics of the four reaches.....	57
6.9 Total water surface area and total volume standardized per 100 m of stream.....	58
6.10 Pocket pool data collected for each reach	58
6.11a Pool statistics for Reach A	59
6.11b Pool statistics for Reach B	59
6.11c Pool statistics for Reach C.....	59
6.11d Pool statistics for Reach D.....	60
6.12 Individual pieces of large woody debris observed.....	60
6.13 Total amount of large woody debris observed in the surveyed reaches.....	60

LIST OF TABLES-CONTINUED

6.14 Debris jam data from each surveyed reach	61
6.15 Bank condition for each reach.....	61
6.16 Cover type and total quantity for each reach.....	62
6.17 Reach cover comparison. Values are equated per 100 m of stream.....	63
6.18 Cover comparison for each reach.....	63
6.19 Gini Coefficient data for the six transects on Cottonwood Creek.....	69
6.20 Gini Coefficient data for the first and last years only	70
6.21 The values derived for the width/depth ratio as well as the change in area for the transects.....	71
6.22 Sediment composition summary for each reach	75
6.23 Percent fine grid results to determine % fines.....	75
6.24 Rosgen Classification for Cottonwood Creek on the Bandy Ranch	76
6.25 Stability bank ratings for each of the surveyed reaches	78
6.26 Summary macroinvertebrate statistics for Cottonwood Creek	79
6.27 Macroinvertebrate statistics for Cottonwood Creek (Abbreviations for the Functional Feeding Groups are: CG: collector/gather, SC: scraper/collector P: predator, SH: shredder/collector, FC: filtering collector).....	80
6.28 Summary of EPT macroinvertebrate parameters	81
6.29 Critical shear stress for each reach at the permanent cross-sections. The d50 was found using the bankfull Wolman Pebble Count.....	88
6.30 The critical shear stress relative to the maximum particle size for Different substrate size classes.....	89

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

2.1 Idealized velocity profile for a natural channel.....	8
2.2 Failure of a cantilever bank.....	21
3.1 Blackfoot River Watershed	26
4.1 Aerial map of the Bandy Experimental Ranch.....	29
4.2 Cottonwood Creek Drainage Map(including locations of major diversions)	31
5.1 Fast water habitat types used in stream surveys (Overton et al, 1993)	37
5.2 Slow water habitat types used in the stream surveys (Overton et al, 1993).....	38
5.3 Explanation of the theory behind gradually varied flow.....	46
6.1 The location of the surveyed reaches	48
6.2 Looking downstream towards the beginning of reach A	49
6.3 Looking upstream at the beginning of reach B	51
6.4 Beaver dam remains in reach B.....	51
6.5 Crossing area in reach C (right bank facing upstream).....	53
6.6 High gradient riffle and pool in reach C	53
6.7 Reach C looking towards the beginning of reach D.....	54
6.8 A meander pool in reach D	55
6.9 The locations of the six monumented cross-sections	64
6.10. Cross-section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #1	65
6.11. Cross-section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #2	66

LIST OF FIGURES-CONTINUED

6.12. Cross-section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #3	66
6.13. Cross-section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #4	67
6.14 Cross-section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #5	67
6.15 Cross-section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #6	68
6.16 The location of the surveyed reaches	72
6.17 Particle size distribution for reach A.....	73
6.18 Particle size distribution for reach B	73
6.19 Particle size distribution for reach C	74
6.20 Particle size distribution or reach D	74
6.21 Stability ratings for riparian assessment.....	77
6.22 Water surface profiles at 40, 50, and 60 cfs	83
6.23 Three-dimensional profile of Cottonwood Creek at 50 cfs.....	84
6.24 Channel velocity longitudinal plot of Cottonwood Creek	85
6.25 Froude number variability along Cottonwood Creek.....	86
6.26 Shear stress variability along Cottonwood Creek	87
7.1 Variables impacting channel morphology (from Montgomery et al, 1993)	90

ABSTRACT

A baseline study was completed in the summer of 2003 on Cottonwood Creek along the portions that flow through the Bandy Ranch. This reach will likely be the host for studies of management practices and corresponding channel change in the future. This study was initiated after the closure of an irrigation ditch in 2002, raising interest in the immediate and long term impacts on the channel. Data collection focused on fish habitat, channel geomorphology, macroinvertebrate composition, and riparian vegetation. The methods in this study could be repeated in future studies at the ranch.

The riparian health of Cottonwood Creek was established from a variety of field observations. Lack of large woody debris, lack of overhead cover, and lack of deep pools were found to be limiting factors on this stretch of Cottonwood Creek. Macroinvertebrate data showed that the most upstream reach might be under more stressed conditions compared to the rest of the reaches. Channel geometry has been steady over the period of 1996-2003, while Rosgen classification showed that the creek was in a transition state. Hydraulic modeling was performed, and showed that small changes in flow during low flow periods have little effect on stream physical conditions. A thorough fish assessment was not included in this study, and would complete the baseline data set.

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this thesis is the stream ecosystem in Cottonwood Creek on the Montana University System's Bandy Ranch in the Blackfoot River Watershed. This thesis is not the traditional hypothesis test, but is the examination of a collection of baseline data and corresponding research methods that could be duplicated in future studies in the same location.

Objectives

The primary objectives of this study were to develop a base-line data set of parameters that 1) measure stream ecosystem health in Cottonwood Creek on the Bandy Experimental Ranch and 2) can be used to evaluate the long term changes in channel morphology and in-stream habitat.

Supporting objectives of this study were as follows: 1) examine stream cross-section data on Cottonwood Creek from 1996 to 2003 to identify a possible channel response, 2) gather habitat data to describe the impact of increased late summer flows on habitat quality and distribution in Cottonwood Creek, 3) perform a riparian assessment to quantify current riparian health, and 4) perform macroinvertebrate studies as an indirect measure of water quality.

Description of paper

Due to the non-traditional nature of this thesis, there is an extensive literature review that is a broad overview of many different subjects. The literature review focuses

on concepts important to hydraulic engineering as well as the biological sciences, all of which relate to different aspects of the stream ecosystem (chapter 2). Topics discussed include fish habitat characteristics, irrigation impacts on the stream ecosystem, the relationship between vegetation and bank stability, and an overview of river hydraulics. It is hoped that this background information will not only give the reader an understanding of the complex nature of stream ecosystems but that it will be valuable when future studies are completed.

Other chapters focus on the observations and results of the study. A description of the Blackfoot River Watershed is given in chapter 3 while chapter 4 focuses on the Bandy Ranch itself. Chapter 5 describes the methods used in this study which will be repeated in future work. The baseline data is summarized in Chapter 6. Finally, chapter 7 offers a discussion of the collected data and gives recommendations for the future. These conclusions are broad in scope because of the limited years of data.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Why Are We Concerned With Low-Order Streams?

In recent years, there has been a focus on restoring fish habitat that has been lost or degraded due to human activity. Agriculture, grazing, mining, logging, and recreation all have led to changes in the physical, chemical, and biological condition of many western streams. Small streams are often the most directly impacted by these activities. Such streams have unique geomorphology that results from a combination of “flow conditions, sediment transport, distribution of channel roughness elements, and management activities” (Beschta and Platts, 1986). Channel change is a natural process and streams can undergo this change in subtle ways through the year. Channel change impacts the whole stream ecosystem from riparian vegetation to macroinvertebrate and fish populations. Determining what changes are due to natural conditions and which changes are human caused is the challenge that watershed managers face when making mangement decisions.

The increased demand for water has impacted management practices over the last few decades and has made management of water resources increasingly complex. In the western United States, irrigation is often used to maintain forage for cattle grazing. In 1990, 98% of surface water withdrawals were for irrigation purposes comprising of 9,990 thousand acre-feet of water in the state of Montana (Moore et al, 1996). Many of the same water bodies used for irrigation also contain important habitat for threatened native fish populations. As a result of the awareness of how water management has impacted

these fish populations, instream flow methodologies have been developed to determine minimum flow requirements for waterways depending on their designated use.

According to Colby (1990), the key to preserving fish habitat in arid regions like Montana, where water is heavily diverted, are adequate instream flows.

Some people question the importance of enhancing habitat on small streams. They are more concerned with the fishery on large rivers and believe that money should be focused there. However, small streams play an important role in the life history of native trout species like Bull Trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*) and Westslope Cutthroat Trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki lewisi*). Protecting these smaller tributaries will help maintain a sustainable fishery. Goldman (1994) notes that

“fish are extremely vulnerable to a variety of dangers during their early life stages. Due to their high fecundity, a small change in the proportion of offspring that survive the critical early life stages translates into large difference in the abundance of year classes that can persist over their life span. Survival is positively correlated to body size.”

By increasing the habitat quality and quantity for fry and juvenile trout, there is a higher probability of a greater number of trout reaching adulthood and returning to their birth areas to spawn.

Fish Populations and Habitat

The relationship between fish populations and stream habitat is complex. Trout need spawning, incubation, feeding, and rearing habitats. Many factors influence fish distribution. These factors include chemical properties such as pH and dissolved oxygen, and physical properties such as water temperature, velocity, water depth, cover, and

substrate composition. Competition within and between species along with predation, food availability, and disease also play a role in habitat selection (Leftwich et al, 1997). Each of these factors must be studied if the limiting factor for a given fish population is to be understood. Often stream habitat enhancement projects focus on one aspect, such as cover, while another limiting factor is actually causing a bottleneck in the population.

Habitat forming processes are often impacted by land use and many of these processes that create habitat “operate on time scales of decades or longer” (Roni et al, 2002). It often hard for scientists to study habitat change because of the time involved to observe habitat change as well as the lack of funding to do so. “Several years may also be required for optimum physical conditions to develop after restoration or enhancement, and fish populations may not respond for several more years” (Reeves et al, 1991). Often times fish habitat enhancement projects only change where the fish are located in the channel instead of actually increasing fish biomass as a whole. This is known as redistribution. The only way to detect if habitat change has caused an impact in biomass is to look at the whole drainage and not just a particular section of stream.

Examining the stream ecosystem is essential to habitat enhancement projects. There are many spatial scales that should be considered depending on the study involved. Macrohabitat analysis concerns regional scale, mesohabitat analysis looks at the stream system as a whole, and microhabitat analysis involves the actual habitat present like pools and riffles (Rabeni and Sowa, 1996). Understanding how these spatial scales are interlinked plays a vital role in determining the impact of land management activities on a stream. Fish habitat is a combination of the characteristics of the watershed that create it.

A stream's physical habitat consists of fast and slow water habitat types. Fast water types consist of riffles, glides, and runs. Slow water habitats are pools which can be formed by scour or damming. During low flows, much of the water volume of a stream resides in pools (Beschta and Platts, 1986). During high flow events, pools dissipate energy. These same high flows flush out sediment from riffle areas. Changes in longitudinal profile, sinuosity, roughness, and hydraulic radius all can result from changes in flow, sediment deposition/removal, and structures in the stream (Beschta and Platts, 1986). Many studies have shown that placement of instream structures into a channel cause pool frequency, depth, sediment retention, and woody debris retention to increase (Roni et al, 2002). The addition of instream structures also increases habitat complexity. Beschta and Platts (1986) note that "although generalization is difficult, the effects of sediment availability and streamside land use seem to be more important than possible flow changes brought about by management practices" in impacting habitat formation.

The spatial distribution of pools and riffles is important and can have impacts on fish distribution. Pool-riffle morphology is common in many streams. It has been observed that deep pools with low velocities and plenty of cover support stable fish populations (Beschta and Platts, 1986). For the most part, older trout prefer deeper water. Correlations have been made between yearling and adult biomass with pool volume and depth (Horan et al, 2000). However, good quality pools might still not be enough to support fish populations. For example, young-of-the-year fish quite frequently choose lower quality pools to rear in until they are large enough to compete with the larger fish

that are present in the deeper pools. Riffles provide food and spawning areas for salmonids. Salmonids often select spawning areas that are not in the “best” riffle habitats in order to provide their young with high quality rearing areas and thus increase their survival (Beschta and Platts, 1986). The surface area and the lower amount of fines in the bed material in riffle areas cause these areas to be highly productive in terms of macroinvertebrate production. However, though not a permanent barrier, riffles can also be barriers to fish passage under certain conditions. Low flows produce the greatest difference between stream habitats. Long riffle reaches become barriers because they “may significantly reduce daily excursions between habitat patches and limit the ability of fish to track variability in food resources and predator densities” (Lonzarich et al, 2000). Because of the variations in habitat use, it has been found that a variety of habitats, such as both shallow and deep pools, are needed to support a healthy fishery. Complexity is the key to fish diversity, and diversity leads to a sustainable fish population. Discharge interacts with the physical and biological aspects of the channel to create this complexity.

Flow in natural channels is three-dimensional. Variations in time and space make water flow complex; yet understanding the velocity patterns in a channel is required to understand the distribution of organisms in the channel. Flow patterns must be considered if fish habitat management plans are to be implemented. Because of this complexity, an “average” water velocity is used in hydraulic calculations. In open channels, average velocity is around 85% of the surface velocity at 0.6 of the depth from the surface (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998; Julien 1995). This can be verified using the

Prandtl-Von Karmen log velocity profile for turbulent flow (Julien, 1995). An example of an idealized velocity profile is shown in figure 2.1.




Figure 2.1. Idealized velocity profile for a natural channel.

Another relationship between water velocity and depth is the Reynolds number.

This is a dimensionless quantity that is often used to describe fluid flow:

$$\text{Re} = \frac{VD}{\nu} \quad (2.1)$$

where;

Re= Reynolds number,

V= velocity (m/s),

D= characteristic length (m),

ν = kinematic viscosity of the fluid (m^2/s).

Reynolds numbers below 2000 indicate laminar flow and values greater than 2000 indicate turbulent flow. These two flow regimes create vastly different habitat settings for aquatic organisms. Reynolds number can also be interpreted as an indicator of the

various lift and drag forces experienced by an aquatic organism. According to Giller and Malmqvist (1998), "both the movement of the fluid and the movement of the animal will govern the Reynolds number." Thus, small macroinvertebrates and protozoa that live close to the stream bed have low Reynolds values because of the low velocities there. Organisms that have low Reynolds values are more subject to viscous forces than inertial forces. Macroinvertebrates live initially at low Re (1-10) areas and have Reynolds numbers higher than 1000 (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998). Fish and other large organisms are more subject to inertial forces and have higher Reynolds values. Trout, for example, have Reynolds numbers ranging from 50,000-200,000 (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998). In order to hold its position in the channel, a fish must use enough energy to overcome the shear stress it is experiencing (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998). Thus each species of aquatic organism reacts in different ways to flow conditions and because of this, changes in flow conditions influence the composition and structure of a stream community.

It can best be summed up as: "the reason why we find certain species in a particular aquatic habitat has to do with the ability of these organisms to utilize and survive under the special set of biotic and abiotic conditions that characterize the habitat" (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998).

Velocity and the drag, lift, and shear forces experienced by fish and macroinvertebrates are more important biologically than the range of discharges (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998). Velocity is considered to be the greatest limiting factor for various fish lifestages. Velocity is involved in influencing community structure, stream carrying capacity, reducing effects of predation on younger fish, and the choosing of

spawning sites (Utah State, 1976). Most cobble and gravel bed streams have hydraulically rough flow patterns and flow close to the bed can be complex due to irregularities. In many cases, high velocities can occur close to the bed. Rocks and other materials present on the bed cause flow separation downstream and create a dead zone where the current is lessened. These areas are depositional and are also resting areas for organisms from the current (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998). Depth is the second most important factor in stream habitat. Depth helps maintain pool and riffle quality, wetted areas for spawning, fish passage both up and downstream, and helps maintain food producing riffles (Utah State, 1976).

As velocity of water increases, so too does the magnitude of shear stress. Therefore, flood events help shape the channel due to the large shear stress they exert on the stream bed and banks. Particle size and the amount of bed load are also related to shear stress and velocity because shear stress is proportional to the square of the velocity (Giller and Malmqvist, 1998). The variation in flow and shear stress helps create the habitat template of streams.

One common formula used to describe the relationship between velocity, area, slope, and roughness to flow rate in an open channel is Manning's Equation (Chow 1959):

$$Q = \frac{C}{n} AR^{\frac{2}{3}} S^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (2.2)$$

where;

Q = flow rate (m³/sec),

C = 1.00 for SI units and 1.486 for English units,

n = Manning's roughness coefficient,

A = cross-sectional area (m^2),

R = hydraulic radius (m),

S = slope (m/m).

Mannings equation was derived for uniform flow conditions (i.e. that the depth, area, and velocity in a reach are constant and that the energy line, water surface, and bed slopes are equal). For natural streams, where these parameters change, the standard step method, as detailed in the methods section in this thesis, can be used with Manning's equation to predict water surface profiles that result from the interaction of discharge with the channel characteristics.

Irrigation Impacts on the Stream Channel

Irrigation diversions can alter flow regimes and sediment transport capacity, in turn impacting channel morphology. Sediment deposition can occur below a diversion if the stream flow is reduced without a reduction in sediment loading. This sediment provides substrate for vegetation to establish in areas that were previously inundated. Channel bed friction increases and further promotes sediment deposition and thus a reduction in channel size (Bohn and King, 2000). As the width decreases, there is also a "loss of lateral aquatic habitat and complexity, which has important implications for fish and macroinvertebrate populations" (Ryan, 1997). Variations in flow due to irrigation demands can also impact the channel. Wohl and Carline (1996) found that recruitment in salmonid numbers may decrease due to variable flow rates in degraded streams. In

regards to flow reduction, surface velocity is the hydraulic variable that is most influenced by irrigation withdrawals (Reiser and White, 1990).

Still, it is hard in some ways to predict channel response to irrigation diversions. This is because in many cases, water is not diverted during higher critical flows which shape the channel about every 1.5 years (Ryan, 1997). Diverting during discharges that are below bankfull may not produce any “noticeable” change to the channel. Ryan (1997) notes that diversion impacts depend on the total amount of water diverted, how the peak and sustained flows have changed, and the time that the diversion has been operating. During dry years, lower peak flows can impact the channel morphology but these changes are often “removed” during extreme flow events of wetter years. It is also can be hard to link certain changes in channel dimensions to irrigation diversions because sediment transport from upstream sources, riparian vegetation, and large woody debris are just a few of the many hydraulic controls that might be causing the channel change. Another factor that makes channel prediction difficult is the direct manipulation of the channel by irrigators themselves. Irrigators can alter the channel by straightening the channel, adding riprap to the banks, and by removing large woody debris and other instream features to improve irrigation efficiency. “The wide variety of channel types, the adjustment of individual channels to local factors, and potential time lags between perturbation and channel response” as well as direct human impacts make it hard to predict the reasons for channel change (Montgomery et al, 1993).

Complexity plays an important role in the persistence of fish populations. Horan et al (2000) mention that an isolated population needs more area to survive in a stream

segment that lacks complexity versus a highly complex one. Complexity influences the “size, structure, distribution, and stability of populations” (Horan et al, 2000). Diversity in water depth, velocity, and substrate adds complexity to a stream ecosystem. Hydraulic and structure variation also increase the ability of a stream to support life. During extreme events, complexity enables a population to persist where it would fail otherwise. It is also thought that predation is less in complex habitats because the ability of predators to catch prey is reduced (Horan et al, 2000). It has been found that an increase in cover can increase salmonid abundance. In fact, some fish prefer overhead cover to instream cover (Horan et al, 2000).

Effect of Grazing

Overgrazing is one land use that impacts complexity. Some of the results of over grazing included upland erosion, loss of riparian vegetation, breakdown of streambanks, and a lower water table. Streams also have poorer instream structure and an overabundance of nutrients in overgrazed pastures (Meehan, 1991). As a result, fish populations decrease or move elsewhere. Cattle concentrate in riparian areas during certain times of the year to feed on high quality forage. If the area is overgrazed for extended periods, small trees and shrubs may be eliminated from the riparian area (Maloney et al, 1999). According to Maloney et al (1999), “improvements in vegetation and stream channel morphology have generally taken 10 years or more after exclusion of cattle”. They also note that protecting streams from grazing, by fencing for example,

increases the amount of stream cover, increases the quality of riparian vegetation, and improves channel morphology.

Overgrazing can also cause a decrease in biomass, vigor, and a change in composition of the riparian vegetation (Kauffman and Krueger, 1984). Cattle grazing changes the composition and density of plant species in the riparian zone. One study found that shrubs provided 75% of cover, in an area that was devoid of shrub cover 10 years previously, when the cattle excluded from the area (Kauffman and Krueger, 1984). Because of the impacts that cattle have on the riparian zone, grazing management is very important in minimizing fish habitat degradation. Kauffman and Krueger (1984) note that "aquatic ecosystems can be restored through intensive livestock management at a lower cost than through installation of instream improvement structures".

Irrigation Impacts on Stream Biology

Though physical changes may be hard to see, the result of lower flow regimes due to irrigation does have an impact on the chemical and biological characteristics of the stream. Temperature, dissolved oxygen, nutrient transport are some factors impacted by lower flows. Water temperature can increase as the result of irrigation diversions (Rockford, 1998). Nutrient transport is reduced because flow is reduced. The reduction in velocity due to flow reduction leads to a reduction in intersediment velocity flowing through the spawning gravels. As a result, dissolved oxygen levels are lowered. Freezing in the redds can also be caused by low flows, especially in areas that have high sediment concentrations (Reiser and White, 1990). Lower flow rates can cause water temperature

to increase. High temperatures are of concern because they stimulate fish metabolism and have a negative effect on swimming ability and feeding rate (Horan et al, 2000). Higher temperatures also make it harder for species like Bull trout to compete with introduced species like Brown trout. It should also be noted that different life stages of many aquatic species are "triggered by seasonal fluctuations in light, nutrient delivery, and water flow" (Ryan, 1997).

Species like Bull trout and Westslope Cutthroat trout require certain instream flows in order to maintain their populations. It is believed that the minimum instream flow to maintain sustainability is 30% of the average annual flow for the whole year (Moore et al, 1996). If a channel is diverted heavily enough, fish populations can become isolated and migration can be stopped. Irrigation diversions reduce cover, spawning area, and rearing capacity of the stream (Reiser and White, 1990). Trout respond to these reductions by moving to more suitable habitat but deposited eggs obviously cannot respond and are left to deal with these reductions.

Irrigation diversions often create barriers to fish movement during low flows. These barriers have caused decreases in fish populations due to the reduction in the number of fish able to migrate downstream or return upstream to spawn. Horan et al (2000) note that "bull trout also appear to be sensitive to fragment size and will be vulnerable to extinction if fragmentation continues to limit their range, especially in small headwater streams." Many irrigation diversions on small streams utilize horizontal boards that span the stream and are anchored by supports on the bank. Water backs up behind the dam and is funneled into a ditch. During times when water is not diverted, the

boards are removed and water flows freely through the structure. Removal of these dams has been noted to increase “migratory fish usage of previously disjunct areas” (Schmetterling et al, 2002). In order to increase fish passage through these structures, denil fish ladders or other fishway structures can be installed at the diversion. Fish species and size both play a role how well these structures aid in fish passage (Schmetterling et al, 2002). Another alternative to increase fish passage is for the complete removal of the structure.

Managing streams for fish passage is difficult because the time of migration and the time of spawning vary from species to species. Westslope trout migrate and spawn during spring high flows. Diversion dams often have little impact on fish movement at this time because water is not being diverted. This is often not the case for fall spawners like Bull Trout. Bull trout enter tributaries during the summer months when irrigation diversions are active and then migrate downstream after spawning.

Riparian Vegetation and Slope Stability

Geomorphologic and hydrologic processes are the primary drivers of riparian ecosystems but slope, elevation, water quality, bed sediment, and streamside vegetation also influence the riparian zone. Riparian areas are open systems with large amount of energy and nutrient exchanges between the stream ecosystem and the upland ecosystem (Kauffman and Krueger, 1984). These areas have higher diversity and productivity then the adjacent uplands. “It is believed that, on land, the riparian/stream ecosystem is the single, most productive type of wildlife habitat, benefiting the greatest number of

species” (Kauffman and Krueger, 1984). Riparian vegetation provides insects and organic material for the organisms residing within the stream. In fact, up to 90% of the organic matter that supports headwater streams comes from the surrounding vegetation (Kauffman and Krueger, 1984). Riparian vegetation helps buffer a stream from excess sediment inputs. These riparian areas also serve as travel corridors for big game as they move between their summer and winter ranges.

Land use can impact riparian vegetation in negative ways. It has been observed that disturbances like trampling can cause a riparian vegetation to change to plant species that have shallower and weaker roots (Winward, 2000). These species are not adapted to withstand the erosive forces of high flows and erode easily. Stabilizer species, on the other hand, have root masses that are deep and fibrous as well as strong crowns which enables these plants to buffer the bank against water shear stress. They also catch sediment which helps rebuild eroding banks. It is said that these “species play a significant role in attaining and maintaining proper functioning of riparian and aquatic ecosystems” (Winward, 2000). Geyer willow is an example of a stabilizer plant species. Consequently, knowing the species composition of a riparian zone can indicate the health of the system and streambank stability.

Riparian vegetation is influenced by factors upstream which may cause shifts in community type due to shifts in propagule delivery, to change in the water table or channel form. This must be taken into account when trying to determine the impacts that adjacent land use has on riparian vegetation. Riparian species such as alder,

cottonwoods, birch, and willow have become adapted to colonizing disturbed areas or newly developed gravel or sand bars. Some grasses and sedges also colonize these areas. Water sources, valley slope, elevation, climate, and substrate characteristics all lead to the development and function of a riparian system. Land use can alter the water table, discharge level, and sediment supply, ultimately impacting plants directly which in turn causes human induced changes to the plant communities. Water level and sediment size combine to favor certain species over others. For example, willows prefer areas that are dominated by silts and clays while cottonwoods prefer areas that are sandy. Sedges and willows colonize areas that have ground water depths from 0.2 m to 0.4 m from the surface while cottonwoods can handle drier conditions and grow in areas with ground water depths of 0.6 m (Law et al, 2000).

Riparian ecosystems are unique because they are the interface between land and water. These ecosystems are driven by water flow. Establishment of vegetation initiates bank building through sediment entrapment as well as protection during high flows. Variation in discharge truncates vegetative succession, regularly resetting the "succession trajectory". As a result, succession in riparian areas are unpredictable because disturbances vary in magnitude and frequency. Vegetation is known as the great integrator. A stream ecosystem gains stability by having a diversity of functional groups. As a result, even if a population is wiped out, another population can take its place and there is no net loss in biomass or species richness. Bank erosion is a natural process that is the response of the channel to its conditions (Leopold et al, 1964). However, excess erosion can cause vast alteration in stream morphology. Streams with unstable banks

tend to more shallower and wider than streams that have more armored banks.

Landowners often place rock riprap on eroding streambanks to prevent erosion.

However, rock riprap often increases near-bank velocities due to its smooth face and thus smaller roughness. Erosion of the channel bed and downstream banks is enhanced and scour around the riprap may enhance bank erosion at the site (Lee et al 1997).

Understanding how bank erosion as well as bank building happens is important in evaluating channel change

In Montana, the soil may be unsaturated during certain times of the year. In this case, the soil has increased cohesion due to matric suction as described by (Simon et al, 2000):

$$c_a = c' + (\mu_a - \mu_w) \tan \phi^b = c' + \psi \tan \phi^b \quad (2.3)$$

where;

c_a = apparent cohesion (kPa),

c' = effective Cohesion (kPa),

μ_a = pore-air pressure (kPa),

μ_w = pore-water pressure (kPa),

θ^b = 10 to 20 degrees, describes increase in shear strength due to an increase in matric suction,

ψ = matric suction (kPa).

However, when water levels decrease very rapidly bank instability is promoted.

This is due to the loss of water pressure since the water level in the channel decreases.

(ASCE, 1998). After water levels have decreased and the banks have time to dry out and recover, cohesion increases.

Vegetation can be very effective at protecting streambanks during extreme conditions. Beshta and Platts (1986) note that during flood periods, bank vegetation becomes a “mat” that reduces velocity and this reduction in velocity causes sediments to settle. As these sediments begin to settle, the channel will narrow and deepen as the bank is built up. Besides protecting banks during high flow periods, vegetation can also be beneficial during winter low flows. Degraded streams often are very susceptible to anchor ice formation. Vegetation can help reduce ice cover; trees and shrubs can reduce the erosive impact of floating ice during melting events (Beshta and Platts, 1986). Bank vegetation is essential to maintaining a dynamically stable stream channel.

Vegetation can promote bank stability by adding strength to the soil via their roots that in turn increases the resistance to failure (FISRWG, 1998). This is viewed by many to be the most important way that plants enhance bank stability. For example, one study showed that the tensile strength of soil with roots present was 10 times greater than soil samples with no roots (Lawler et al, 1997). This addition of tensile strength is important because soil tends to be weak in tension and stronger in compression (Simon and Collison, 2002). Plant roots are the opposite being stronger in tension and weaker in compression. Combining soil with vegetation helps increase the soils tensile strength and thus adds strength to the streambank. Shear stresses in the soil are then transferred to tensile stresses in the roots. The semi-continuous root system of plants transfers the load from high stress regions to regions of lower stress (Abernathy and Rutherford, 2001).

Tractive forces also develop between the soil and the root fibers to add additional strength between the fibers and the surrounding matrix. Because of this, the spatial density of the roots is also important in soil strength.

As soil depth increases, the strength of the roots decreases. Most of the reinforcement by plant roots are concentrated in the top 20 cm of the bank and a sharp boundary occurs below (Simon and Collison, 2002). Beyond the root zone failure planes are not reinforced. Knowing the distribution of strength with depth is important in predicting the effect of roots on stability. If the bank is taller than the root zone, reinforcement might not be effective since bank failure can occur underneath. This is often the case with cantilever banks. Riparian vegetation can strengthen cantilevered banks via root reinforcement. However, bank failure due to flow erosion and tensile failure occur below the root zone. These root strengthened cantilevers fail by beam or shear (ASCE, 1998). Thorne and Tovey (1981) developed an equation to predict stable widths for a cantilever bank (described in figure 2.2):




Figure 2.2. Failure of a cantilever bank.

The stable bank width is;

$$b = \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_t t^2 + \sigma_c c^2}{\gamma h}} \quad (2.4)$$

where;

b = Stable bank width (m),

σ_t, σ_c = Tensile and Compressive Strengths (kN/m^2),

t = Block height under tensile stress (m),

c = Block height under compressive stress (m)

h = Total block height (m),

γ = Saturated bulk density (kN/m^3).

The size and density of plant roots impacts their mechanical effect on the soil.

The tensile strength of the roots depends on the species. Abernathy and Rutherford (2001) found that root tensile strength can be expressed as a non-linear function of root diameter raised to a species specific exponent. Strength within a species depends on the environment, seasonality, root orientation and diameter. Tests have shown that as the root mass increases, the shear strength increases linearly (Wu et al, 1988). How the root density is distributed then can be assumed to exert a strong influence over how the root reinforcement is distributed (Abernathy and Rutherford, 2001). Bank stability is less impacted by the differences in tensile strength of interspecies roots compared to interspecies differences in root distribution. A parameter that has been developed to measure density is the root-area-ratio (Abernathy and Rutherford, 2001):

$$\frac{A_r}{A_w} = \frac{\sum n_i a_i}{A_w} \quad (2.5)$$

where;

A_r = sum of the cross-sectional area of the roots intersecting the profile wall (m^2),

A_w = the wall's total cross-sectional area (m^2),

n_i = number of roots in size-class i ,

a_i = average cross-sectional area of the roots in size-class i (m^2).

High concentrations of flexible, long roots per unit volume of soil favor soil strength. Grasses have a high root area ratio which gives them their strength instead of stronger roots (Simon and Collison, 2002). It has been found that roots with a diameter greater than 20 mm do not contribute significantly to soil strength (Abernathy and Rutherford, 2001). These roots instead act as anchors.

BLACKFOOT RIVER WATERSHED

The Blackfoot River Watershed in central Montana has a diversity of land uses, including logging, grazing, mining, crop production, and recreation, that have all impacted fish and wildlife populations to some extent. Bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout are of specific interest to fisheries biologists of the Blackfoot watershed due to their current population. Westslope cutthroat trout are listed as a species of special concern. Rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), brown trout (*Salmo trutta*), and brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) also are trout species that occupy the Blackfoot. Fisheries biologists have noted that the numbers and size of sport fish in the Blackfoot River have declined over the last couple decades (Rothrock et al, 1998). Declines in benthic macroinvertebrate populations have also occurred. Habitat assessment of 19 principal tributaries of the Blackfoot in 1988 and 1989 revealed significant habitat degradation (Pierce et al, 1997). Further studies from 1990-1996 showed 26 of 33 additional streams to be impaired. As a result, local groups including landowners, federal and state agencies, and non-profit groups like Trout Unlimited, have come together to try to restore lost habitat, reduce non-point source pollution, remove migration barriers, and increase instream flows. The Bandy Ranch, located by Ovando, MT is a participant of this effort and is the focus of this thesis.

Bull trout populations have declined in the Blackfoot watershed due to spawning and rearing habitat degradation, competition, hybridization with brook trout, and irrigation practices (Swanberg, 1997). Bull trout are the largest native piscivore in the

Blackfoot river and they have a high fecundity and diverse age structure. Fluvial bull trout rear in 2nd-3rd order tributaries during their first 3-4 years and then migrate downstream. At age 5-7 they are sexually mature. These fish spawn in September or October (Swanberg, 1997). Both spawners and non-spawners use tributaries over the summer to avoid warm temperatures in the Blackfoot River. These fish spawn every year or every other year during their lifetime. Bull trout require clear, cold, complex, and connected habitat. They prefer cold water less than 15 C. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has listed Bull Trout as a threatened species under the Endangered species act (Federal Register, June 10, 1998).

Watershed Description

The Bandy Ranch is part of the Blackfoot River watershed. The Blackfoot River flows from the top of the continental divide westward 212 kilometers (132 miles) to the Clark Fork River by Missoula, MT. Figure 3.1 shows a land use map of the watershed. The watershed is composed of 6,070 square kilometers (1.5 million acres) with 49% of the watershed being federal lands. Other major land owners include the state of Montana, Plum Creek Timber Company, and private owners. This area is relatively undeveloped with ranching and logging being the main economic uses. Glacial activity during the Pleistocene era has helped shape the landforms of the region. Upland communities include grasslands, pine forests, and sagebrush steppe. Vegetation includes ponderosa pine (*Pinus ponderosa*), Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga monziessi*), cottonwood (*Populus*




Figure 3.1. Map of the Blackfoot River Watershed (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks).

trichocarpa), aspen (*Populus tremuloides*), and willow (*Salix spp.*). Mean annual precipitation is 400 mm in Ovando. Typically, only a 40 frost-free day growing season occurs (Rothrock et al, 1998). On a historical note, the Lewis and Clark expedition passed through the area in July 1806.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The Bandy Experimental Ranch is located 64 km (40 miles) northeast of Missoula, Montana. About 200 head of cattle are raised on the ranch's 12.9 km² (3,200 acres). The ranch has 3.4 km² (850 acres) of irrigated/dryland hay, 4.65 km² (1,150 acres) of native range, and 4.9 km² (1200 acres) of forested land (see figure 4.1). Grazing is shifted throughout the year so that the different pastures have time to recover from grazing and provide vegetation for elk and deer.

The location of the ranch makes it a unique place. It is located close to the Bob Marshal Wilderness area. Next door to the ranch is the Blackfoot/Clearwater Game range. The ranch contains important elk, deer, sandhill crane, and red-tailed hawk habitat. Grizzly bears have also have been spotted on the ranch proper. This interface between wildlife and human activity lets researchers examine how to manage the ranch to promote both cattle and wildlife.

Two creeks run through the ranch property, Shanley Creek and Cottonwood Creek, which ultimately drain into the Blackfoot River. Flows in upper Shanley Creek are diverted into the Bandy Reservoir. Water is released from this reservoir during the summer months to flood irrigate portions of the ranch. Trout species found in these creeks include brown, western cutthroat, rainbow, and bull trout. Bull trout are present in the upper reaches of Cottonwood Creek, but have not been observed in Shanley Creek in recent years. Therefore, much of the research done by Montana State involves field reconnaissance to find ways to maintain a cold water fishery while still diverting water

for irrigation purposes. A center pivot was added to the ranch in 2001 in order to improve irrigation and conserve water. It is believed that improving water management will increase instream flows and thus improve fish habitat. It will also make it easier for fish to migrate to spawning sites upstream.




Figure 4.1. Aerial map of the Bandy Experimental Ranch (reach labels indicated).

Shanley Creek is a second-order stream that runs 14.5 km (9 miles) from its headwaters to confluence with Cottonwood Creek on the Bandy Ranch. Base flows are approximately $.06 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$ (Pierce et al, 1997). Timber harvest, livestock grazing, and hay production are land uses in this watershed. Shanley Creek ranked 21 of 83 streams surveyed for restoration priority by fisheries biologists (Pierce et al, 2002). Shanley creek is heavily diverted with 3 diversions and one irrigation pump, along 2.57 km (1.6 miles) from its confluence with Cottonwood.

Cottonwood Creek, a tributary of the Blackfoot River, has been described by fisheries biologists as moderately impaired (Pierce et al, 1997). The creek flows 25.8 km (16 miles) from the headwaters to the confluence of the Blackfoot River, changing from a high gradient confined channel to a pool-riffle channel once it exits the canyon. Near this interface, it starts to lose water and becomes intermittent. Irrigation diversions further reduce flows in the creek (figure 4.2). Fisheries Biologists have ranked Cottonwood as 5 out of 83 for prioritized restoration (Pierce et al, 2002). Nine miles from the confluence with the Blackfoot, Cottonwood begins to gain groundwater and becomes a gaining stream. Beavers are present in this middle section of the creek and influence the channel. Three spring creeks bring water into the creek between stream kilometer 10.3 and 12.07. Populations of rainbow and brown trout inhabit lower reaches of the creek in low densities. Brown trout and brook trout dominate the middle reaches in moderate numbers. Cutthroat trout and bull trout dominate the upper reaches, bull trout survive precariously (Pierce et al, 1997).




Figure 4.2. Cottonwood Creek Drainage Map (including location of major diversions)

Two major irrigation diversions are present on the Cottonwood creek at kilometers 8 and 19.3 (Pierce et al, 1997). The diversion at kilometer 8.0 is on the Bandy Ranch and is known as the Boyd Diversion. In the past, below the diversion at kilometer 19.3, the creek dried out in low flow years. Because of this, bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout have been isolated in this area resulting in fish kills. Also, both major diversions were identified as barriers to fish passage upstream. The upstream diversion

ditch, at kilometer 19.3, was inefficient at carrying water, and though $.23 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$ (8 cfs) was diverted, only 28% of this flow reached the irrigation pump (Pierce et al, 1997).

Denil fish ladders were added to both major diversions in 1991. Paddle-wheel driven fish screens with 1/8 size screens were also installed on both diversions to reduce entrainment of young of the year fish. The upper diversion ditch was also lined with an impervious liner to improve efficiency. During the irrigation season, 8,663 acre feet of salvage water is being leased to increase instream flows (Pierce et al, 1997). It is believed that by increasing instream flows in the parts of the creek that traditionally were intermittent, that bull trout and cutthroat trout populations will increase and that riparian communities will also be improved. Fish sampling completed in September 2001 downstream of the diversion at kilometer 19.3 showed significant increases in cutthroat trout populations and slight changes in bull trout populations. In 2001, 7.7 fish/ 30.5 m (100 ft) was the catch per unit effort while in 1997, only .7 fish/ 30.5 m (100 ft) for young of the year (YOY) cutthroat trout were found. Age 1+ cutthroat found increased from 2.5 to 14.3 fish/ 30.5 m (100 ft). YOY bull trout were recorded in 2001 but not 1997.

Watershed management projects on Cottonwood Creek also include rotational grazing systems, culvert replacement, conservation easements, and removal of stream-side livestock corrals. Simplified habitat and reduced riparian health still limit fish populations in the middle reaches.

Cottonwood Creek flows through about 1.61 km (1 mile) of ranch property from approximately 7.2 km (4.5 miles) upstream of the confluence with the Blackfoot.

Cottonwood Creek confluences with Shanley Creek at kilometer 9.0. The lower denil

fishladder on Cottonwood Creek is located on the Bandy Ranch between the confluence with Shanley Creek and the withdrawal location of the center-pivot pump. This ladder is 6.1 meter long and 0.59 meters high. The ladder has a slope of 9.6% and a mean velocity range of 12 to 72 cm/s (Schmetterling et al, 2002). At the lower property boundary, water is pumped out of the creek to the center pivot. There is an old dam structure still in place that is not in use. A diversion located at the confluence of Cottonwood Creek and Shanley Creek that supplied water to wheel lines in the hay pasture was closed in 2002. This diversion, prior to closure, diverted approximately $.14 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$ (5 cfs) from the channel. The diverted water traveled 1.6 km across the ranch property losing $.113 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$ of water between the point of diversion and the wheel line. This field is now irrigated by a 402 m (1320 ft) center pivot and the water is supplied via a $2.84 \text{ m}^3/\text{min}$ (750 GPM) pump that takes water out of the creek at the edge of the property. The ranch now leases the $.113 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$ of formally diverted water to Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks. It is expected that since this water remains in the channel there will be an impact on stream morphology as well as fish habitat directly downstream.

METHODS

Both short term and long term monitoring is required to evaluate the effects of structural modification to the channel due to the large variability in abundance of both juvenile and adult salmonids (Beschta et al, 1986; Roni et al, 2002). The purpose of this study is to develop a baseline data set, and data was collected in July and August of 2003. This data will serve as the starting point for the next 10 years of monitoring that will be required to detect a fisheries and riparian response to changes in management. Hydraulic, fish habitat, riparian vegetation, and macroinvertebrate data were collected to get the overall picture of the status of Cottonwood Creek on the Bandy Ranch, the methods for collection of each of these data sets are described below.

Stream Cross-Sections

There are six monumented cross-sections located on Cottonwood Creek on the Bandy Ranch. Data for these cross-sections was collected previously from 1996 to 2000 twice per year, and from 2002 to 2003 once per year. Multiple annual measurements were taken at different times of the year to coincide with different grazing strategies. One set of measurements was completed before cows had access to the creek and measurements were also taken following grazing in late summer or early fall. Only data from pre-grazing observations were used to examine channel change.

Stakes were used to mark the end of the cross-sections, which were located near the bankfull edges. Each transect was oriented perpendicular to water flow. A

measuring tape was stretched level above and perpendicular to the channel and connected to the two stakes. Measurements from the channel bottom to the tape were completed every 10 cm using a stadia rod starting from the right bank facing upstream. For each cross-section, the water's edge on both banks was recorded. Bankfull depth and width were also found following Rosgen (Rosgen, 1996):

Bankfull width/depth ratio, net percent change in area, and the Gini coefficient were calculated from the channel measurements to determine channel change. These parameters are described below.

Absolute percent change in area measures the cumulative change in channel form:

$$|\Delta A\%| = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k |(Y_i \text{ before} - Y_i \text{ after})|}{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \text{ before}} * 100 \quad (5.1)$$

where;

$|\Delta A\%|$ = absolute percent change in area,

Y_i = the distance from the stream bed to the tape (cm),

k = number of data points.

The Gini coefficient ranges from 0 to 1 and is a way to quantify change independent of stage height and cross-sectional area.

$$G = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^k |Y_i - Y_j|}{2k^2 \bar{Y}} \quad (5.2)$$

where;

G = Gini coefficient,

$Y_i - Y_j$ = differences between all pairs of depths (cm),

\bar{Y} = average of all the differences (cm).

Values close to 0 occur in channels that have low channel diversity in depth while values closer to one occur for more channels that have high depth diversity. The difference between one year and the next indicates the direction of change; if the difference is negative the channel is becoming less diverse in terms of depth, if it is positive the channel is becoming more depth diverse.

Habitat Surveying

Habitat surveys were completed on Cottonwood Creek on August 5-7, 2003. The surveys were taken according to the U.S. Forest Service's R1/R4 Fish and Fish Habitat Procedures. Further information was collected using techniques recommended by Platts et al (1983) and Overton et al (1993). Four reaches were chosen for surveying. The most downstream reach, Reach A, was located directly above the Boyd Diversion Dam (figure 3.1). The starting point of the reach was monumented cross-section #3. Each of the other reaches also began at a monumented cross-section so that Reach D corresponded to cross-section #6. These reaches were surveyed for 100 meters upstream of the permanent cross-section.

A variety of parameters were measured to get an overall picture of the various habitats present in each of the four reaches. It should be noted that these habitats are to some extent stage dependent (Montgomery et al, 1993) and would be slightly different if

measured at different times of the year, say late September. Another factor that has to be considered is that the R1/R4 method is subjective and habitat delineation can be influenced depending on the observers experience and bias (Overton et al, 1993).

Habitats were delineated according to habitat type (see figures 5.1, 5.2). These habitat types were categorized according to average velocity, cause of formation, and location in channel. Once the habitat was identified, measurements were taken for length, mean width, and mean depth. The habitat length was measured along the thalweg. Bankfull height and width were estimated but not for all habitat units. Mean width was determined by taking multiple width measurements along the channel (approximately 2 for every 4.6 m). A tape was stretched across the channel at these points and depth measurements were taken at 20%, 40%, 60%, and 80%. Average width was found by averaging all of the width measurements taken for the habitat unit.




Figure 5.1. Fast water habitat types used in the stream surveys (Overton et al, 1993).




Figure 5.2. Slow water habitat types used in the stream surveys (Overton et al, 1993).

Average depth was determined by first averaging the individual cross-section depths (a value of 0 was included for each measurement to get a representation of the channel bank). The resulting depth values were then averaged to get the overall average depth. For pool habitat types, the maximum depth, crest depth, and average depth (mean of the maximum depth and crest depth) of the thalweg were first identified and the width cross-sections were taken perpendicular to these points.

Pocket Pool

In fast water habitats, pools that were between 10 and 30% of the wetted width were recorded as pocket pools.

Bank Stability

A streambank was assumed to be unstable if slumping, tension cracking, or breakdown was occurring, or if less than 50% of the bank was covered with vegetation or debris and the bank angle was steeper than 80 degrees.

Cover

Cover was defined as the vegetation and undercut banks that shaded the "wetted" portion of the channel (Platts et al, 1983). Vegetative cover was found by measuring from the edge of the water surface (perpendicular to the channel) to the farthest point along the wetted width that was covered by vegetation (multiple measurements were taken if necessary) as well as the length of the vegetation to get the total area of vegetative cover for each bank. Undercut banks were recorded if they were at least 5 cm deep and within 0.1m of the water surface (Overton et al, 1993). The depth and length of each undercut was recorded.

Large Woody Debris

Large woody debris were counted if a piece was longer than 3 m or $2/3$ the wetted width, and were 0.1m in diameter $1/3$ of the distance from the base. The number and volume of debris jams were also recorded for the entire reach.

Rosgen Classification

Stream gradient was found by using an auto level and a stadia rod held at the water surface (Platts et al, 1983). Sinuosity, the ratio of channel length to straight line distance between two points along the stream, was found from field observation and aerial maps. Platts et al (1983) and others found sinuosity by using a channel distance of 20 times the bankfull width. Entrenchment as well as the bankfull width/depth ratio was computed in order to determine the Rosgen classification for each unit. Table 5.1 shows the characteristics of Rosgen stream types expected at the Bandy Ranch.

Table 5.1. Rosgen classification criteria for selected stream types.

<u>Stream type</u>	<u>Entrenchment ratio</u>	<u>W/D ratio</u>	<u>Sinuosity</u>	<u>Slope</u>
B	1.4-2.2	>12	>1.2	.02-.039
C	>2.2	>12	>1.4	<.02

B stream types have moderate slope, width/depth ratios and entrenchment ratios. They occur in narrow valleys that have gentle slopes. Scour pools and rapids are predominate. For C streams, riffle/pool bed morphology dominate with well-defined meandering channels that are only slightly entrenched. Rosgen (1996) uses these parameters along with sediment composition and flow characteristics to refine stream classification.

Sediment Composition

Wolman pebble counts were completed for each of the four surveyed reaches (Wolman, 1954). This method gives the percentage of occurrence of a certain size particle

on the channel bed surface where other geotechnical methods give a volumetric distribution or, in other words, they use total weight of a size class instead of number of particles in that size class to develop sediment distribution curves (Bunte and Abt, 2001). Starting downstream of the permanent transect, the creek was traversed from bankfull edge to bankfull edge moving upstream. At each step, a sediment particle was chosen at random and measured along the intermediate axis. The sediment particle was then deposited downstream. This continued until 100 particles were counted. These particles were divided into the substrate classes in table 5.2

Table 5.2. Substrate size classes (Overton et al, 1993).

Substrate Class	Size classes (mm)
Fines	<2
Small gravel	2-8
Gravel	Aug-64
Small cobble	64-128
Cobble	128-256
Small boulder	256-512
Boulder	>512
Bedrock	Solid Rock

Because the Wolman pebble count can underestimate the percentage of fines, a second technique was used to refine the sediment distribution (Platts et al, 1983). A surface fines grid was used to differentiate fines. The grid was made of 320 mm square Plexiglas with a 7 mm by 7mm grid drawn atop it, the lines being 40 mm apart (Krueger, 2002; Tom McMahon, personal communication). Each grid line was 2 mm wide. Non-fines were sediment that were visible from under the line intersections. The number of non-fines was divided by 49 to get an estimate of the portion of non-fines for the entire

sample. Subtracting this value from 1 gave the portion of fines in the sample. Pool tail outs and shallow riffle areas were chosen for this test. Deeper riffle sections were not tested because it was too hard to see the fines grid.

Flow Rate

Flow rate was determined by using the standard USGS methodology (Rantz et al, 1982). A flow meter was used to take measurements at .6 times the water depth measured downward from the water surface. The channel was broken into a minimum of 12 sections to improve accuracy.

Fish Surveying

Fish surveying was not completed on the four reaches for this study due to a lack of resources, but archived data are included in Appendix B from previous studies completed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks for different sections along Cottonwood Creek.

Riparian Assessment

A riparian assessment was completed for each reach following the Greenline Riparian Assessment method (Winward, 2000). This method examines the percent composition of “disturbance type vegetation” and “natural type vegetation” of the target riparian area. A measuring tape was laid along the bankfull edge of the channel for 110.6 m (363 ft) starting on the right bank and proceeding downstream to the start of each reach at its permanent cross-section. The bank was then paced at an average of .91

m (3 ft) per step. The top 3-5 plant species were identified at each step. This was completed on both banks. The cows had not been allowed to graze in this area since October 2002.

Benthic Macroinvertebrates

Seasonal variability and summer adult insect emergence are two factors that impact use of benthic macroinvertebrates to detect impairment of a stream (Richards, 1996). Because of this, benthic macroinvertebrates were chosen to be sampled at the 4 Cottonwood reaches during late August. The use of riffles for macroinvertebrate analysis can maximize microhabitat variability (Rothrock et al, 1998). Samples were collected using a standard D-frame net with a 1 mm mesh. This net was placed on the substrate and the substrate upstream of the net was vigorously kicked. Sampling was done for one minute working across the channel and upstream. Collected samples were preserved in a jar that contained 95% ethanol. A total of three samples were taken in each reach so that 12 samples in all were collected for the entire study reach. Pool tailouts and riffle habitat units were chosen randomly for sampling. Pool habitats were not sampled due to their depth and limited sampling time. Organisms were taken to the Montana State University Fish Lab, placed in Whirlpack standup bags, and preserved in a mixture of Kahles Solution and water. The Kahles solution consisted of 180 ml water, 40 ml glacial acetic acid, 220 ml formalin, and 560 ml 95% alcohol. The samples were rinsed and put in 70% ethanol when identification took place. The macroinvertebrates were picked, sorted, identified to the family level, and then counted by family with the

aid of a dissecting microscope. Species level identification was not completed because identification to the family level required less experience, time, and provided a higher degree of precision (Barbour et al, 1999).

Metrics that were determined include taxa richness, total abundance, EPT richness, EPT abundance, Taxonomic group composition and percent dominant taxa, and were summarized with the Hilsenhoff Biotic Index (Rothrock et al, 1998). These metrics are explained in table 5.3.

Table 5.3. Metrics used in the macroinvertebrate analysis (from Rothrock et al, 1998, Resh and Jackson, 1993).

Total Richness: Total number of different taxa in a sample. The general trend is that richness decreases as water quality becomes poorer.

Total Abundance: Total number of organisms in the samples.

EPT Richness: Total number of family taxa from the Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera orders. The members of these three orders, for the most part, are sensitive to pollution.

Taxonomic Group Composition and Percent Dominant Taxa: Percentage of individuals in each taxonomic group and the taxa with the greatest percentage of individuals. A community might be experiencing stress if there are only a few dominant taxa present.

Hilsenhoff's Biotic Index (HBI): Values are scaled from 0 to 10 for each family dependent their tolerance to pollution. Higher values indicate higher tolerance to pollution.

Ordinal Relative Abundance (EPT: Chironomidae ratio): This ratio looks at the proportion of Chironomidae to EPT abundance. A ratio less than 1 indicates that there is an imbalance between the groups and that environmental stress may be occurring. The abundance of Chironomidae generally increases with increasing organic enrichment.

Hydraulic Analysis

To examine the channel morphology of Cottonwood Creek in depth, a detailed survey of Reach C and Reach D was completed. These two cross-sections were chosen because they were adjacent to one another and because of their differences in geomorphology. Cross-section elevation and water surface data was collected using an autolevel. Distances between the cross-sections were measured using steel tapes. Flow rate was measured at the beginning of Reach C. This information was then placed into HEC-RAS to develop a water-surface profile plot for the reach.

The Hydrologic Engineering Center's River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) was designed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to allow the user to "perform one-dimensional hydraulic calculations for a full network of natural and constructed channels" (US Army Corps of Engineers, 1997). Water surface profiles for steady, gradually varied flow can be found using this software for subcritical, supercritical, and mixed flow regimes. The standard-step method is used to determine water surface profiles by utilizing the energy equation and the concept of gradually varied flow. Figure 5.3 shows the theory behind gradually varied flow. Head losses between two adjacent cross-sections result from friction losses or contraction/expansion losses. If flow is subcritical, the standard-step method works in the upstream direction starting from an initial known water surface elevation (Chow, 1959). If the initial water surface elevation is not known, an assumed elevation at a distant section may be used. The velocity is calculated from the desired flow rate and cross-sectional area. From this the velocity head is determined and the head losses are computed. The water surface profile is then

found by identifying the depth that makes the current total head minus the previous total head + head loss equal to zero.




Figure 5.3. Explanation of the theory behind gradually varied flow.

The energy equation is:

$$\frac{V_1^2}{2g} + d_1 + z_1 = \frac{V_2^2}{2g} + d_2 + z_2 + h_e \quad (5.3)$$

where;

h_e = energy losses (m),

z = elevation head above a datum (m),

V = mean velocity (m/s),

d = water depth (m),

The energy losses can be found by:

$$h_e = SL + C \left| \frac{V_1^2}{2g} - \frac{V_2^2}{2g} \right| \quad (5.4)$$

where;

C = coefficient of expansion or contraction

L = reach length (m)

Elevation and station data for each cross-section, the distances between each cross-section (including the right bank, left bank, and thalweg distances), values for Manning's roughness coefficient, values for contraction/expansion losses, flow regime, and a known boundary condition are all inputted into HEC-RAS before steady-flow analysis can be performed. The water surface elevation of the most downstream reach is a typical boundary condition. Boundary conditions can also be assumed including the normal depth or the critical depth.

RESULTS

Habitat Surveys

Four approximately 100 m long reaches were surveyed for habitat assessment on Cottonwood Creek below its confluence with Shanley Creek (figure 6.1). These reaches were all located within the Riparian Pasture of the Bandy Ranch. This pasture is grazed during August and September. Data collected for each reach is located in the appendix.




Figure 6.1. The location of the surveyed reaches.

Reach A

Reach A was located at 47.04.159° N and 113.15.930° W. This reach is directly upstream of the Boyd dam diversion structure. Willows dominate the left bank (facing upstream) while sedges and grasses dominate the right bank. Rock riprap has been placed along a meander in this reach to reduce erosion. This reach had the most habitat units, 9 total, of any of the surveyed reaches. Pools dominate the upper end while riffle habitat dominates the lower end (table 6.1). Eight pocket pools were counted for the entire reach. Figure 6.2 gives a general overview of reach A.



Figure 6.2. Looking downstream towards the beginning of reach A.

Table 6.1. Summary of the habitat units of reach A.

Habitat Number	Habitat Type	Total Length (m)	Mean Wetted Width (m)	Mean Depth (cm)	Total Volume (m ³)	Width Depth Ratio
1	LGR	15.50	7.30	24.07	27.23	30.33
2	HGR	12.00	6.40	22.30	17.13	28.70
3	LGR	10.50	6.35	28.70	19.14	22.13
4	SLM	14.00	7.37	45.13	46.55	16.32
5	LGR	6.50	6.70	25.60	11.15	26.17
6	SLM	22.60	7.23	35.33	57.76	20.47
7	SLM	17.00	7.57	38.40	49.40	19.70
8	DMW	9.00	8.10	34.80	25.37	23.28
9	SLM	34.50	7.13	37.67	92.70	18.94
Entire reach		141.60	7.13	32.44	346.41	

Reach B

Reach B is a predominantly riffle reach located upstream of Reach A (47.04.266° N, 113.15.946° W). Figure 6.3 is a picture taken along this section of Cottonwood Creek. Along the left bank (facing upstream) at the start of reach B is a bare cut bank. There are two pool habitat units in reach B. One of the pool habitats actually consists of two small pools that are adjacent to one another. A beaver dam complex is responsible for creating these two pools along with scouring along the bank. The other pool habitat is at the upstream end of the reach. This pool is formed due to a confluence of two braided channels. The mean wetted width of this channel was 10.6 m and mean depth was 22.72 cm. This pool might not be representative of Cottonwood Creek above Reach B.



Figure 6.3. Looking upstream at the beginning of reach B.



Figure 6.4. Beaver dam remains in reach B.

Table 6.2. Summary of the habitat units of reach B.

Habitat Number	Habitat Type	Total Length (m)	Mean Wetted Width (m)	Mean Depth (cm)	Total Volume (m ³)	Width Depth Ratio
1	LGR	84.00	6.63	23.32	129.75	28.41
2a	SLM	8.30	4.73	31.13	12.22	15.19
2b	SUV	9.00	3.40	28.13	8.61	12.09
3	LGR	8.90	6.20	24.20	13.35	25.62
4	SMO	6.30	10.60	22.72	15.17	46.65
Entire reach		107.85	6.31	25.90	179.11	

Reach C

This reach begins at monumented cross-section #5 (47.04.481° N, 113.15.819° W) and ends at monumented cross-section #6. This reach is also dominated by riffle habitats (table 6.3) and has a crossing area (figure 6.5) that is used by cattle and wildlife. One weakly developed pool was identified for this reach. A high gradient riffle section is directly downstream due to a change in slope. Rock riprap has been placed along portions of the right bank (figure 6.6).

Table 6.3. Summary of the habitat units of reach C.

Habitat Number	Habitat Type	Total Length (m)	Mean Wetted Width (m)	Mean Depth (cm)	Total Volume (m ³)	Width Depth Ratio
1	LGR	74.70	8.55	20.77	132.65	41.17
2	HGR	6.10	10.75	17.90	11.74	60.06
3	SMW	6.10	8.17	25.00	12.46	32.68
4	LGR	29.60	8.90	22.70	59.80	39.21
Entire reach		116.50	9.09	21.59	216.65	



Figure 6.5. Crossing area in reach C (right bank facing upstream).



Figure 6.6. High-gradient riffle and pool in reach C. Note the rock riprap on the banks.

Reach D

Reach D is the farthest upstream reach of the study at 47.04.525 °N, 113.15.760 °W. This reach is dominated by meander pools that average 36.26 cm deep (table 6.4). This reach also has some heavily rip-rapped banks (figure 6.8). The sinuosity in this reach is the highest of the reaches due to a sharp meander. Ponderosa pines are encroaching into the riparian zone on the right bank (see figure 6.7).



Figure 6.7. Reach C looking towards the beginning of reach D.



Figure 6.8. A meander pool in reach D. The left bank is heavily riprapped.

Table 6.4. Summary of the habitat units of reach D.

Habitat Number	Habitat Type	Total Length (m)	Mean Wetted Width (m)	Mean Depth (cm)	Total Volume (m ³)	Width Depth Ratio
1	SLM	28.70	9.81	31.87	89.73	30.78
2	LGR	20.80	7.97	26.40	43.76	30.19
3	SLM	17.60	6.93	31.53	38.46	21.98
4	SLM	27.00	5.88	46.80	74.30	12.56
5	SLM	34.80	7.08	34.84	85.84	20.32
Entire reach		128.90	7.53	34.29	332.09	

Summary of the Reaches

Tables 6.5-6.7 display hydraulic geometry data found for fast, slow, and all habitat types for all reaches. These values correspond to a flow rate of approximately 1.56 m³/s.

For fast habitat types, reach B and C both had very similar water volumes, 70.7 m³, while reach A had the smallest volume with 18.66 m³. Average depths ranged from 20.46 cm to 26.40 cm while average width ranged from 6.41 m to 7.97 m with an average width for all reaches of 7.62 (table 6.5). Areas were different because habitat length varied between the reaches.

Table 6.5. Summary of fast habitats for all reaches.

Specific Reach	Avg. Length (m)	Avg. Width (m)	Avg. Depth (cm)	Avg. Area (m ²)	Avg. Volume (m ³)
Reach A	11.13	6.69	25.17	75.04	18.66
Reach B	46.45	6.41	23.76	297.74	70.74
Reach C	36.80	9.40	20.46	345.92	70.78
Reach D	20.80	7.97	26.40	165.78	43.76
Creek	28.79	7.62	23.95	221.12	50.99

As with fast habitat types, the average pool volume for reach B and C are approximately equal (table 6.6). The average area for these two reaches is also similar. These two reaches had predominately riffle habitats while the other two reaches had more pools. Reach D has the highest average pool area and volume at 200.83 m² and 72.82m³ respectively.

Table 6.6. Summary of slow habitats for all reaches.

Specific Reach	Avg. Length (m)	Avg. Width (m)	Avg. Depth (cm)	Avg. Area (m ²)	Avg. Volume (m ³)
Reach A	19.42	7.48	38.27	145.26	55.59
Reach B	7.47	6.24	27.33	46.61	12.74
Reach C	6.1	8.17	25	49.84	12.46
Reach D	27.03	7.43	36.26	200.83	72.82
Creek	15.01	7.33	31.72	110.64	38.40

The average volume for all four reaches was greater for riffle habitats than for pool habitats. For fast habitats, the average volume was 50.99 m³ while for slow habitats the average volume was 38.40 m³. This is due to the difference in average length for fast habitats, 28.79 m, and slow habitats, 38.4 m.

Table 6.7. Summary of all habitats for all reaches.

Specific Reach	Avg. Length (m)	Avg. Width (m)	Avg. Depth (cm)	Avg. Area (m ²)	Avg. Volume (m ³)
Reach A	15.73	7.13	32.44	112.71	38.49
Reach B	26.96	6.31	25.90	149.66	35.82
Reach C	29.13	9.09	21.59	254.38	54.16
Reach D	25.78	7.53	34.29	194.89	66.42
Creek	24.40	7.52	28.56	177.91	48.72

Table 6.8 shows the total length, area, and volume for each surveyed reach. The total habitat volume for the four reaches was 1074.26 m³ for a total length of 494.85 m. This corresponds to 2.17 m³ of water volume per meter length of creek. Total volume was highest in reach A and reach D because of their pool habitats. For reach C, % water area, 27.1%, was higher than for reach D, 25.95% and about equal to reach A, 27.02%.

Table 6.8. Physical habitat characteristics of the four reaches.

Specific Reach	Total Length (m)	Total Area (m ²)	Total Volume (m ³)	% Water Area (m ²)	% Water Volume (m ³)
Reach A	141.60	1014.42	346.41	27.02	32.25
Reach B	107.85	748.32	179.11	19.93	16.67
Reach C	116.50	1017.54	216.65	27.10	20.17
Reach D	128.90	974.44	332.09	25.95	30.91
Creek	494.85	3754.71	1074.26	100.00	100.00

In order to standardize the reaches so that water area and volume for each can be compared values, the values were calculated per 100 m of stream (Table 6.9). As

expected, reach A and reach D had about 1/3 more water volume than reach B and C due to their pool habitats. Reach C had the highest % water area due to its wide, uniform channel shape.

Table 6.9. Total water surface area and total water volume per 100 m of stream.

Specific	Total	Total	% Water	% Water
Reach	Area per	Volume per	Area	Volume
	100 m	100 m		
Reach A	716.39	244.64	23.57	28.64
Reach B	693.85	166.07	22.83	19.44
Reach C	873.42	185.97	28.73	21.77
Reach D	755.96	257.63	24.87	30.16
Creek	758.76	217.09	100.00	100.00

Table 6.10 shows the number of pocket pools for the fast water habitats. Reach C had the most pocket pools mainly because of the HGR section as well as the presence of boulders throughout the reach.

Table 6.10. Pocket pool data collected for each reach.

Individual	Total	# per 100 m
Reach		
A	8	5.65
B	15	13.91
C	27	19.07
D	1	0.71

Table 6.11a-d display the pool characteristics for each reach. Residual volume is found by subtracting the maximum depth from the tail depth. As a result, this value is independent of discharge. Most of the pools were caused by meanders. Reach A and D

had similar values for the average residual depth, 20 cm. The pool identified in reach C only had a residual depth of 3.2 cm. This probably should not have been classified as a pool.

Table 6.11a. pool statistics for Reach A.

Habitat Number	Habitat type	Average Max Depth (cm)	Average Crest Depth (cm)	Residual Depth (cm)	Residual Volume (m ³)
4	SLM	51.40	40.60	10.80	11.14
6	SLM	53.60	16.40	37.20	60.81
7	SLM	46.00	34.60	11.40	14.66
8	DMW	41.80	20.80	21.00	15.31
9	SLM	47.00	23.60	23.40	57.59
Entire reach		47.96	27.20	20.76	29.66

Table 6.11b. Pool statistics for Reach B.

Habitat Number	Habitat type	Average Max Depth (cm)	Average Crest Depth (cm)	Residual Depth (cm)	Residual Volume (m ³)
2a	SLM	34.50	26.50	8.00	3.14
2b	SUV	36.30	21.40	14.90	4.56
4	SMO	26.16	21.40	4.76	3.18
Entire reach		32.32	23.10	9.22	12.60

Table 6.11c. Pool statistics for Reach C.

Habitat Number	Habitat type	Average Max Depth (cm)	Average Crest Depth (cm)	Residual Depth (cm)	Residual Volume (m ³)
3	SMW	27.00	23.80	3.20	1.59
Entire reach		27.00	23.80	3.20	1.59

Table 6.11d. Pool statistics for Reach D.

Habitat	Average Max	Average Crest	Residual	Residual	
Number	Habitat type	Depth (cm)	Depth (cm)	Depth (cm)	Volume (m ³)
1	SLM	39.20	22.40	16.80	47.30
3	SLM	40.60	18.40	22.20	27.08
4	SLM	58.20	37.60	20.60	32.70
5	SLM	53.80	30.20	23.60	58.15
Entire reach		47.95	27.15	20.80	168.20

Tables 6.12 and 6.13 displays the large woody debris data collected for the study areas. The number and volume of woody debris jams (i.e. beaver dams, etc) were also counted (table 6.14).

Table 6.12. Individual pieces of large woody debris observed.

Individual Reach	Individual Pieces		
	Length (m)	Diameter (cm)	% Submerged
A	7.2	40	95
	3.5	25	90
B	0	0	0
C	4	24*	40
	4	13	40
	8.6	26*	65
D	4	34	90

* Located in the channel but on the bank as well.

Table 6.13. Total amount of large woody debris observed in the surveyed reaches.

Individual Reach	Total	Per 100 m
	A	2
B	0	0
C	3	2.58
D	1	0.78

Table 6.14. Debris jam data from each surveyed reach.

Individual Reach	Aggregates			
	Length (m)	Width (cm)	Height (cm)	% Submerged
A	0	0	0	0
B	6	135	65	15
C	6	130	50 ^a	30
	2.7	90	50	35
	4	200	70	25
D	0	0	0	0

^a 30% in water

Table 6.15 displays the bank conditions observed. There was some debate over what constitutes a stable bank. If the bank was slumped into the creek, but the roots were holding it in place, the bank was assumed to be stable. During high flow events this might not be the case. This data should not be used for any conclusions to habitat condition due to the biases involved.

Table 6.15. Bank condition for each reach.

	Individual Reach			
	A	B	C	D
Length unstable bank, left (m)	1	1	1	0
Length unstable bank, right (m)	4.5	0.5	1	0.1

A summary of the amount and type of cover for the surveyed reaches is shown in table 6.16. Reach D has the most cover area, 224.75 m². Reach length does play a factor in the area of cover, but reach D still had more cover area than reach A which was 20 m longer. Reach C and D has similar amounts of overhanging cover. Table 6.17 evaluates the amount of cover in terms of 100 m in order to minimize the impacts of reach length on total cover quantity.

A cover comparison for each reach is shown in table 6.18. 65.92% of the total cover for the creek was on the left bank facing upstream. Sedges and grasses dominate the right side of the bank while shrubs dominate the left bank and add overhanging cover to the creek (cattle have access to both sides). The left bank also contained more undercut areas, though the difference between the two banks wasn't as great, 59.41% versus 40.59%. Reach B had no undercutting on the left bank. The ratio of cover to surface area ranged from 18.15% to 25.16% where the creek total was 21.7%.

Table 6.16. Cover type and total quantity for each reach.

Specific Reach	Area of Cover	Vegetation (m ²)	Undercut (m ²)	Total cover (m ²)
Reach A	Left Bank	125.36	7.24	132.61
	Right Bank	46.95	4.60	51.55
	Total Reach	172.31	11.85	184.16
Reach B	Left Bank	137.35	0.00	137.35
	Right Bank	48.17	2.75	50.91
	Total Reach	185.52	2.75	188.26
Reach C	Left Bank	146.28	2.50	148.78
	Right Bank	67.53	1.24	68.76
	Total Reach	213.80	3.73	217.54
Reach D	Left Bank	110.86	7.44	118.30
	Right Bank	103.30	3.15	106.45
	Total Reach	214.16	10.59	224.75
Total Creek	Left Bank	519.85	17.18	537.03
	Right Bank	265.94	11.73	277.67
	Total Creek	785.79	28.91	814.70

Table 6.17. Reach cover comparison. Values are per 100 m of stream.

Specific Reach	Area of Cover	Vegetation (m ²) per 100 m	Undercut (m ²) per 100 m	Total cover (m ²) per 100 m
Reach A	Left Bank	88.53	5.12	93.65
	Right Bank	33.16	3.25	36.41
	Total Reach	121.69	8.37	130.06
Reach B	Left Bank	127.35	0.00	127.35
	Right Bank	44.66	2.55	47.21
	Total Reach	172.01	2.55	174.56
Reach C	Left Bank	125.56	2.14	127.70
	Right Bank	57.96	1.06	59.02
	Total Reach	183.52	3.20	186.73
Reach D	Left Bank	86.00	5.77	91.77
	Right Bank	80.14	2.44	82.58
	Total Reach	166.14	8.21	174.36

Table 6.18. Cover comparison for each reach.

% Cover Comparison	Reach A	Reach B	Reach C	Reach D	Creek Total
% cover left bank	72.01	72.96	68.39	52.64	65.92
% cover right bank	27.99	27.04	31.61	47.36	34.08
% undercut LB/overall undercut	61.16	0.00	66.89	70.26	59.41
% undercut RB/overall undercut	38.84	100.00	33.11	29.74	40.59
% Vegetation LB/overall veg.	72.75	74.04	68.42	51.77	66.16
% Vegetation RB/overall veg.	27.25	25.96	31.58	48.23	33.84
% Cover/Surface Area	18.15	25.16	21.38	23.06	21.70

Channel Geomorphology

The locations of the six monumented cross-sections are shown in figure 6.9.




Figure 6.9. The locations of the six monumented cross-sections.

The cross-section data used for the Gini comparisons of each transect are shown in figures 6.10 through 6.15. Gini coefficients were calculated for each of the six transects. Two different year ranges were examined (3 years compared). The first year range was before the ditch was closed at the confluence of Cottonwood and Shanley

Creeks. All the data used was collected before cattle were let into the riparian pasture. Data sets were also chosen so that there were the same number of measurements for each transect for the three years being compared. A computer program used by the Animal and Range Department was initially used to determine the gini coefficient, width/depth ratio, and change in area. A Visual Basic program in Microsoft Excel was also written that would perform the same calculations (shown in Appendix D). Both programs gave the same results and were used in the data analysis.




Figure 6.10. Cross-Section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #1.




Figure 6.11. Cross-Section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #2.




Figure 6.12. Cross-Section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #3.




Figure 6.13. Cross-Section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #4.




Figure 6.14. Cross-Section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #5.




Figure 6.15. Cross-Section profiles for three different years for monumented transect #6.

The Gini coefficient is independent of cross-sectional area and datum height (Olson-Rutz and Marlow, 1992). Table 6.19 shows the Gini coefficients found for each of the monumented transects. Transect 1 showed negative changes in Gini for both year ranges. The average Gini coefficient for the year 2003 for the Creek was 0.180. If transect 1 and 2 are ignored, the average gini value is 0.211. Reach 1 had Gini values ranging from 0.075 to 0.093. For the other transects, Gini values ranged from 0.16-0.228.

The greatest negative percent change in the Gini coefficient occurred from 1997-2002 for transect 5. The same transect had the greatest positive percent change, during 2002-03 for all transects in all year ranges. This indicates that transect 5 was first becoming more irregular in depth and now it is becoming more uniform in depth. Both

transects 1 and 4 had negative percent change for both year ranges. This expansion of the channel is evident from field observations. For example, transect 4 has bare, vertical banks that have exposed roots and tension cracks. Sloughoff of the left bank facing upstream has been occurring (see figure 6.13).

Table 6.19. Gini Coefficient Data for the six transects on Cottonwood Creek

Transect ID	Year	Gini Coefficient	Gini Difference	% Change in Gini
1	1996	0.093		
	2000	0.081	-0.012	-14.815
	2003	0.075	-0.006	-8.000
2	1997	0.169		
	2002	0.173	0.004	2.312
	2003	0.16	-0.013	-8.125
3	1997	0.232		
	2002	0.221	-0.011	-4.977
	2003	0.228	0.007	3.070
4	1998	0.216		
	2000	0.207	-0.009	-4.348
	2003	0.183	-0.024	-13.115
5	1997	0.223		
	2002	0.189	-0.034	-17.989
	2003	0.207	0.018	8.696
6	1998	0.226		
	2002	0.235	0.009	3.830
	2003	0.226	-0.009	-3.982

Gini coefficient comparisons examining just the first and last years were also calculated for each transect (table 6.20). There was no change in the Gini coefficient between 1998 and 2003 for transect 6. Transects 1 and 4 had the greatest change with -24% and -18% respectively. These changes are large enough to indicate possible substantial channel change. It cannot be concluded that significant change has happened

in the other transects because their change in Gini coefficient was small. Though the Gini coefficient was the same for 1998 and 2003 for transect 6, width-depth ratios for those two years were slightly different, being 28.508 and 31.379 respectively.

Table 6.20. Gini coefficient comparisons for the first and last years only.

Transect ID	Year	Gini Coefficient	Gini Difference	% Change in Gini
1	1996	0.093		
	2003	0.075	-0.018	-24.000
2	1997	0.169		
	2003	0.16	-0.009	-5.625
3	1997	0.232		
	2003	0.228	-0.004	-1.754
4	1998	0.216		
	2003	0.183	-0.033	-18.033
5	1997	0.223		
	2003	0.207	-0.016	-7.729
6	1998	0.226		
	2003	0.226	0.000	0.000

Table 6.21 displays the width/depth ratio differences and change in area for the six cross-sections. The change in width/depth ratio was largest for cross-section 6. This further indicates that the channel in this area, as well as cross-section 4, has been experiencing the most change. Absolute percent change in area was highest for both year range comparisons for reach 6. Reach 5 had an absolute percent change of 15.7 between 1997 and 2002. The change in Gini for this time frame for reach 5 was -18%. During this time, cross-section 5 was becoming more uniform in depth. Between 2002 and 2003 the cross-section showed smaller change evident by small values in Gini coefficient as well as absolute percent change.

Table 6.21. The values derived for the width/depth ratio as well as the change in area for the transects.

Transect ID	Year	Width/Depth	Width/Depth	Change in area (%)	
		Ratio	Ratio Difference	Net Percent	Absolute
1	1996	5.811			
	2000	5.79	-0.021	0.363	4.840
	2003	6.141	0.351	-5.715	6.945
2	1997	11.471			
	2002	11.672	0.201	-1.725	3.726
	2003	11.669	-0.003	0.027	3.992
3	1997	15.851			
	2002	17.256	1.405	-8.147	8.662
	2003	16.908	-0.348	2.059	3.784
4	1998	18.356			
	2000	21.792	3.436	-15.768	15.941
	2003	19.086	-2.706	14.179	15.164
5	1997	12.416			
	2002	13.385	0.969	-7.239	15.712
	2003	13.082	-0.303	2.318	6.863
6	1998	28.508			
	2002	37.456	8.948	23.888	23.888
	2003	31.379	-6.077	-19.367	19.951

Sediment Composition

Figures 6.17 to 6.20 show the particle size distributions obtained from the Wolman Pebble Counts for the each monumented transect located within Reach A through Reach D (figure 6.16 shows the location of the reaches).




Figure 6.16. The location of the surveyed reaches.




Figure 6.17. Particle size distribution for reach A.




Figure 6.18. Particle size distribution for reach B.




Figure 6.19. Particle size distribution for reach C.




Figure 6.20. Particle size distribution for reach D.

A summary of the d50 sediment size as well as the percentage of fines obtained from the Wolman pebble count is shown in Table 6.22. The results of the percent fines grid test (table 6.23) are similar to the percent fines found using the pebble count for reach A and D. The differences between the percent fines for the two tests in regards to the B and C reaches may be due to the fact there was more riffle habitat to sample from, in regards to the fines grid test, then for the other two reaches. The pebble count was located just downstream of the permanent cross-sections while the fines test was completed randomly in riffle habitats that were around 1 foot deep.

Table 6.22. Sediment composition summary for each reach.

	d50 (mm)	% Fines
Reach A	28.00	19.64
Reach B	6.50	28.70
Reach C	14.00	32.00
Reach D	27.00	14.71

Table 6.23. Percent fine grid results to determine % of fines.

Reach	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Average	% fines
A	17	8	10	11.67	23.81
B	7	10	10	9.00	18.37
C	8	7	16	10.33	21.09
D	5	9	8	7.33	14.97

Rosgen Classification

Table 6.24 shows the Rosgen Classification for Cottonwood Creek at cross-sections 4 through 6. Stream types were found to be C4 for cross-sections 3 and 6 and B4 for 4 and 5. The slope for cross-section #4 (Reach B), was equivalent to the slope of reach six because 30.48 m (100 ft) downstream of the cross-section there was a pronounced meander even though the surveyed reach was not very sinuous. For cross-section #3 only 16.8 m (55 ft) downstream was used for calculating slope due to the diversion dam structure downstream. None of the slopes fit into the Rosgen classification for C and B types, so the entrenchment ratio and the W/D ratio were used to determine the stream type. The subcategory 4 refers to the dominant sediment size being gravel. Because the stream is in a transition state, it does not fit all the characteristics of a specific Rosgen stream type. A reference reach will need to be surveyed, downstream of the Boyd diversion dam, to determine what the "natural" Rosgen classification type should be (Ron Pierce, personal communication).

Table 6.24. Rosgen Classification for Cottonwood Creek on the Bandy Ranch

Cross-Section ID	Stream Type	Entrenchment ratio	W/D ratio	Sinuosity	Slope (%)
3	C4	2.5	19.63	1.33	0.78
4	B4	1.6	31.58	1.2	0.53
5	B4	1.2	27.23	1	0.76
6	C4	N/A	21.76	2.1	0.52

Riparian Assessment

For the Greenline Riparian Assessment, stability ratings are determined by multiplying each community type's stability class by the community type's percent composition for the site. Stability class values were obtained from Winward (2000). These values were then summed and compared to the stability rating listed below (figure 6.21).

Stability Rating	
0-2	=Very Poor (Very low)
3-4	=Poor (low)
5-6	=Moderate
7-8	=Good (high)
9-10	=Excellent (very high)

Figure 6.21. Stability ratings for riparian assessment.

For community types that were not listed, stability class was found by averaging the stability ratings for each major species of the community. Table 6.25 displays a summary of the stability ratings for the surveyed reaches. To view individual community types and their percent composition for each reach, please refer to Appendix C.

The left bank of Reach A had the highest stability rating of the four reaches. The left bank for Reach A was dominated by willows and carex species that helped give it a higher rating than the other banks. The average stability ratings were 6.37 and 6.19 for the left and right banks respectively. These ratings rate between moderate and high according to figure 6.21.

Table 6.25. Stability bank ratings for each of the surveyed reaches.

	Stability Rating	
	Left Bank	Right Bank
Reach A	7.25	5.73
Reach B	5.70	6.84
Reach C	5.83	6.23
Reach D	6.69	5.95
Average	6.37	6.19

Macroinvertebrate Analysis

Macroinvertebrate data was collected for each of the four reaches in riffle habitats and pool tailouts. Each specimen collected was identified to the family level. Tables 6.26 through 6.28 summarize the macroinvertebrate data that was collected.

For each of the reaches there were 6 different orders present. A seventh order, Plannera, was later identified but not included in the metrics because it was not counted for some of the samples. Family richness varied from 14 to 22. Reach D had the highest family richness while Reach A had only 14 families present. Trichoptera was the dominant order taxon for Reach A and B while upstream Diptera was dominant. Chironomidae had the greatest % composition of all the families for three of the four reaches. The EPT richness consisted of the number of different EPT families present in each reach.

The total abundance metric was simply the total number of specimens found in the samples. These values were not standardized for the whole reach. The % EPT composition is lowest in Reach D, 39.83%, and increases downstream. Reach D is dominated by Diptera.

The HBI (Hilsenhoff Biotic Index) values are listed for most of the families present (table 6.26). Chironomidae have a HBI index of 10 indicating that it is very pollutant tolerant. The wide range of functional feeding groups in this family allows it to adapt to stressed conditions. The HBI values for the Plecoptera families are 2, indicating that species in these families are sensitive to pollution. Trichoptera families have a range of HBI values from 0 to 6.

Table 6.26. Summary macroinvertebrate statistics for Cottonwood Creek.

Parameter	Reach A	Reach B	Reach C	Reach D
Richness				
<i>Order</i>	6	6	6	6
<i>Family</i>	14	16	20	22
<i>EPT</i>	10	10	13	13
Total Abundance				
Total Abundance	1635	1584	1370	1632
EPT Abundance	960	846	683	650
% EPT Composition				
% EPT Composition	58.72	53.41	49.85	39.83
Dominant Taxa				
<i>Order Taxon</i>	Trichoptera	Trichoptera	Diptera	Diptera
<i>% Composition</i>	28.75	34.60	33.87	42.77
<i>Family Taxon</i>	Chironomidae	Elmidae	Chironomidae	Chironomidae
<i>% Composition</i>	22.94	23.61	32.77	41.05

Table 6.27. Macroinvertebrate statistics for Cottonwood Creek (Abbreviations for the Functional Feeding Groups are: CG: collector/gather, SC: scraper/collector, P: predator, SH: shredder/collector, FC: filtering collector).

Taxon <i>Order</i>	<i>Family</i>	HBI	Functional Feeding Group	% Composition			
				Reach A	Reach B	Reach C	Reach D
Ephemeroptera				26.73	17.74	14.89	17.22
	Baetidae	4	CG, SC	22.14	12.31	9.05	10.17
	Ephemerellidae	1	CG,SC,P	4.34	5.37	5.69	6.92
	Heptageniidae	4	SC, CG	0.24	0.06	0.00	0.00
	Leptophlebiidae	2	CG, SC	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.12
Plecoptera				3.24	1.07	2.19	1.72
	Perlodidae	2	P,SC,CG	2.75	1.07	1.75	1.53
	Perlidae	2	P	0.49	0.00	0.07	0.00
	Nemouridae	2	SH, CG	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.18
Coleoptera				11.99	23.61	13.72	15.50
	Elmidae	4	CG,SC,SH	11.99	23.61	13.72	15.38
	Dytiscidae			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.12
Diptera				28.62	22.85	33.87	42.77
	Chironomidae	10	CG,F,P,SH,S	22.94	21.15	32.77	41.05
	Simuliidae	6	FC,SC	5.44	1.39	0.66	0.37
	Tipulidae	3	SH,CG,P	0.24	0.25	0.22	0.92
	Pelecorhynchidae	1	P,SH	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.18
	Psychodidae	4	CG,SC	0.00	0.00	0.22	0.25
Trichoptera				28.75	34.60	32.77	20.89
	Brachycentridae	1	CG,F,SH,SC	9.48	4.48	4.16	6.25
	Rhyacophilidae	0	P,CG,SC	7.65	5.30	5.11	3.37
	Hydropsychidae	4	FC,P	6.36	7.20	9.71	3.31
	Glossosomatidae	0	SC,CG	3.55	16.22	12.63	5.27
	Odontoceridae			1.59	0.69	0.15	0.49
	Limnephilidae	3	SH,CG,SC,P	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.92
	Polycentropodidae	6	FC,P,SH	0.00	0.69	0.44	0.18
	Sericostomatidae			0.00	0.00	0.58	1.10
Mollusca				0.67	0.13	2.55	1.90
	Sphaeriidae	8	FC	0.67	0.13	2.48	1.78
	Gastropoda			0.00	0.00	0.07	0.12

Table 6.28. Summary of EPT macroinvertebrate parameters.

<i>Order</i>	<i>EPT Taxon Family</i>	<i>% EPT Composition</i>			
		Reach A	Reach B	Reach C	Reach D
Ephemeroptera		45.52	33.22	29.87	43.23
	Baetide	37.71	23.05	18.16	25.54
	Ephemerellidae	7.40	10.05	11.42	17.38
	Heptageniidae	0.42	0.12	0.00	0.00
	Leptophlebiidae	0.00	0.00	0.29	0.31
Plecoptera		5.52	2.01	4.39	4.31
	Perlodidae	4.69	2.01	3.51	3.85
	Perlidae	0.83	0.00	0.15	0.00
	Nemouridae	0.00	0.00	0.73	0.46
Trichoptera		48.96	64.78	65.74	52.46
	Brachycentridae	16.15	8.39	8.35	15.69
	Rhyacophilidae	13.02	9.93	10.25	8.46
	Hydropsychidae	10.83	13.48	19.47	8.31
	Glossosomatidae	6.04	30.38	25.33	13.23
	Odontoceridae	2.71	1.30	0.29	1.23
	Lemnephilidae	0.21	0.00	0.00	2.31
	Polycentropodidae	0.00	1.30	0.88	0.46
	Sericostomatidae	0.00	0.00	1.17	2.77
% Baetide of Ephemeroptera		82.84	69.40	60.78	59.07
% Hydropsychidae of Trichoptera		22.13	20.80	29.62	15.84
Ordinal Relative Abundance (EPT: Chironomidae ratio)		2.56	2.53	1.52	0.97

The most common EPT families were Baetide, Ephemerellidae, Brachycentridae, Rhyacophilidae, Hydropsychidae, and Glossosomatidae. According to table 6.27, the EPT: Chironomidae ratio was above one for each reach except for Reach D. This indicates that reach D possibly might be under stressed conditions (refer to table

5.3). The total number of organisms in the Plecoptera order was only around 5% of the EPT groups. Reach A had similar distributions between Tricoptera and Ephemeroptera.

Hydraulic Analysis

Twenty cross-sections were surveyed in reach C and D to get hydraulic data. Water surface levels were also recorded at each. The data was placed in HEC-RAS to gather steady flow hydraulic profile data. The flow rate at the day of surveying was calculated to be $1.41 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (50 cfs). Figure 6.22 shows water surface profiles for $1.41 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ as well as for $1.13 \text{ m}^3/\text{sec}$ (40 cfs) and $1.7 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (60 cfs). To develop the profiles for 1.13 and $1.7 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$, the lower boundary condition was chosen to be the normal depth. While figure 6.22 shows the longitudinal profile of the reach, figure 6.23 shows a three-dimension representation at $1.42 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$. From this, it can be seen how the upper portion of the study area has severe meandering, and thus deeper water depth, while the lower end has lower sinuosity and a wider, shallower flow area.




Figure 6.22. Water Surface Profiles at 1.13, 1.42, and 1.70 m³/s.

The upper end of the study site was chosen to be the beginning of Reach D.

However, this location was at the start of a pool and upstream of this pool there was a channel constriction and meander. This impacted the hydraulic parameters calculated by HEC-RAS for the uppermost upstream cross-sections. Reach D began at just downstream of cross-section 7.

The velocity profile along the main channel is displayed in figure 6.24. As with the depth measurements, the velocities at the ends of the area are impacted by boundary conditions. Channel velocities were highest at 1.70 m³/s cfs and lowest at 1.13 m³/s. The crossing area was located at the third cross-section and this area had the slowest velocities of reach C. Cross-sections 8 and 9 had the slowest velocities, .381 m/s of




Figure 6.23. Three-dimensional profile of Cottonwood Creek at 50 cfs.

Reach D. These cross-sections corresponded to portions of a meander pool that was 12.2 m across. The 10th cross-section was only 10.36 m wide. This is why the velocity there is around .91 m/s instead.




Figure 6.24. Channel velocity longitudinal plot of Cottonwood Creek.

Froude numbers for the creek are shown in figure 6.25. The froude number corresponding to the only high-gradient riffle habitat (5th cross-section from 0 channel distance) in the study area was 0.63. Froude numbers follow the general trend as channel velocity.




Figure 6.25. Froude number variability along Cottonwood Creek

Figure 6.26 displays channel shear stress for each cross-section of Cottonwood Creek. Values range from 1.4 N/m^2 to 23.4 N/m^2 . Shear stress was lowest in the pools as is to be expected due to the lower velocities there. The locations of cross-section #5 and #6 are marked on the figure. The average shear stress for the three different discharges at for these two cross-sections is about 16.7 N/m^2 .




Figure 6.26. Shear stress variability along Cottonwood Creek.

The shear stress displayed in figure 6.26 was derived using the following equation:

$$\tau = \gamma RS \quad (6-2)$$

where;

τ = average shear stress over the wetted perimeter (N/m^2),

R = hydraulic radius (m),

γ = unit weight of water, (N/m^3),

S = friction slope (slope of the energy grade line).

This calculation of shear stress does not include the whole channel, just the channel that has active flow.

If the critical value of the Shields parameter is constant (i.e. turbulent flow over a rough boundary) there is a linear relationship between median particle diameter (d_{50}) and the amount of shear stress required to initiate motion (Julien, 1995; Sturm 2001):

$$\tau_{oc} = 4d_{50} \quad (6-1)$$

where;

τ_{oc} = critical shear stress (N/m^2),

D_{50} = median particle size (m).

Table 6.26 shows the shear stress required to move the bankfull d_{50} determined at the monumented cross-sections using the Wolman Pebble Count. The critical shear stress for these two sections were 8.8 N/m^2 and 16.95 N/m^2 respectively. HEC-RAS can also be used to determine the shear stress at different points along an individual cross-section.

Table 6.26. Critical shear stress for each reach at the permanent cross-sections. The d_{50} was found using the bankfull Wolman Pebble Count.

Reach	d_{50} (mm)	τ_{oc} (N/m^2)
Reach A	28.00	17.58
Reach B	6.50	4.08
Reach C	14.00	8.79
Reach D	27.00	16.95

Table 6.27 displays the critical shear stresses for some of the size classes used in the methods. It takes 250 times more shear stress to move a small boulder versus a clay or silt particle.

Table 6.27. The critical shear stress relative to the maximum particle size for different substrate size classes.

	d50 (mm)	T_{oc} (N/m ²)
Fines	2	1.26
Small Gravel	8	5.02
Gravel	64	40.18
Small Cobble	128	80.36
Cobble	256	160.71
Small Boulder	512	321.43

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

As mentioned previously, detecting and determining the causes for changes in channel morphology can be a difficult task. Channel morphology is a combination of local conditions and “the spatial context within the drainage network” (Montgomery et al, 1993). Figure 7.1 summarizes the different variables that combine to give a channel its shape.




Figure 7.1. Variables impacting channel morphology (taken from Montgomery et al, 1993)

According to Pierce et al (2002), the main impairments to the fish in the areas of the Bandy Ranch “include 1) lack of complex fish habitat (instream wood), 2) livestock induced stream bank degradation, 3) riparian vegetation suppression, and 4) whirling disease”.

Habitat

The habitat analysis gave the following conclusions: reach A had the highest ratio of pool to riffle habitat. Reaches B and C were dominated by riffles while reach D has the greatest length of pools. For each reach, there was little large woody debris and limited shade cover (refer to preceding paragraphs). None of the pools were found to have a maximum depth greater than 1 m (which is one definition of a large pool).

For identifying habitat types, there is bias involved. For example, one pool was identified for Reach C. This pool was weakly developed and other people might not have identified it as a pool habitat. It also should be noted that the habitat units depend somewhat on discharge and water stage (Montgomery et al, 1993). During high flow events, habitat units are less defined. This should be considered when, in the future, habitat data is compared to this data set from 2003.

Complexity due to large woody debris is limited in this portion of Cottonwood Creek. For the entire study areas there was only 6 individual pieces of large woody debris observed. There was also only four debris aggregates recorded, three of which were in reach C. The most stable of these aggregates was a beaver dam in reach B. The other aggregates might possibly wash out during high flow events. There was one dammed pool created by an individual piece of large woody debris in Reach A. An aggregate of woody debris formed the weakly developed pool in reach C. From this data, it is seen that there is a lack of woody debris thus reducing channel complexity and the creation of large and pools.

Cover is also a limiting factor on Cottonwood Creek. There was only an average of 21.7% of cover versus surface area for the four reaches. Reach A had the least amount of cover intensity. Along with this, the left bank of reach A had the highest stability rating of all the banks while the right bank of reach A had the lowest overall stability rating (table 6.25). Reach A had an average stability rating for both banks of 6.49 which was the highest reach average. Reach A was 141.6 m in length while the greenline distance is only 110.64 m. This probably had an influence in the results.

Comparing the cover and stability ratings for reach B yields interesting results. For this reach, the right bank has a higher stability rating than the left bank (table 6.25). Inversely, the right bank has about 2.5 times less cover (per 100 m) than the left bank. Most of this cover was in the form of overhanging vegetation and not undercut banks (table 6.17). Similar results were seen for reach C.

The riparian vegetation provides moderate bank support. It is believed that previously existing cantilever banks had failed due to excess stress from the weight of cows and wildlife (refer to equation 2.4). This is probably why the left bank of reach C had no undercut banks. The greatest amount of undercut intensity was present in the left bank of reach D but this was associated with a ponderosa pine, a tree that is not adapted to a riparian environment but that is providing the best undercut fish habitat in all the surveyed areas. It would be interesting to compare actual vegetation species to amount of cover instead of just stability ratings. There might be more to infer from such an approach.

Reduction in the quantity and quality of streamside vegetation as well as overhanging banks are two of the major factors leading to the decline in native trout in the west (Maloney et al, 1999). Previous studies have shown that streams with less than 75% surface shade can exceed stream temperature standards for rainbow trout for the whole watershed (Maloney et al., 1999). Though limited studies have been completed concerning bull trout and cover, a study by Swanberg (1997) found that 80% of the bull trout prespawners (trout about to spawn) were directly associated with some sort of cover and prespawner was found to be more than 3 m from cover. Large woody debris accounted for over half of the cover used. He also found that bull trout resided in pools more often than in glides or riffle habitats (Swanberg, 1997). Thus cover limitation is one factor that is impacting Bull trout distribution in Cottonwood Creek. Bull trout are not able to compete with fish species like Brown trout that are more temperature tolerant even though the creek has a lot of recharge from the Rocky Pasture that might be keeping temperatures more mild. Previous studies on Cottonwood Creek (refer to the appendix) show bull trout residing around river mile 12 though a 12.7 inch bull trout was found at river mile 4.7. Though this is speculation, it might be that the only way to increase the bull trout distribution in Cottonwood Creek is to get rid of the non-native species, especially brook trout which can hybridize with bull trout and produce sterile offspring. This is not a realistic option due to the sport fishery supporting the economy in this area.

In reach A and D, rock rip rap has been placed on the outside bank of meander bends. Because of this, the channel has not been able to erode these banks and form deep undercuts. Instead, water is deflected and the greatest scouring occurs directly

downstream of the rip-rapped areas. Removal of the rip-rap in these sections would cause natural channel forming processes to occur.

The lack of complexity in Cottonwood Creek is an issue that also needs to be addressed. Jakober and others (1998) found that "bull trout appear particularly susceptible to loss of habitat complexity." Bank beaver dams that previously existed in the channel have been removed to improve water conveyance. Two side by side pools in reach B result from a beaver dam. Increasing large woody debris will increase complexity. Most of the pools surveyed were formed by meander scour. One dam pool in reach A was formed by a piece of large woody debris. Introducing more large woody debris or letting a few beaver dams remain in the channel would increase habitat area.

Complexity is important during base flows in the fall and winter. Bull trout prefer habitats in winter that are low velocity, deep, have overhead cover, and offer lateral concealment (Jakober et al., 1998). When surface ice forms, bull trout and cutthroat trout prefer areas with less submerged cover. Submerged LWD, beaver ponds, undercut banks, and deep pools all are needed to support resident bull trout and westslope cutthroat trout fish populations during the fall and winter months (Jakober et al., 1998). To increase the numbers of native fish, these habitat requirements need to be addressed during these critical times of the year. According to Swanberg (1997), in 1997, the estimate for adult Bull Trout in the Blackfoot River was less than 500. Therefore improving tributary habitat is very important.

Macroinvertebrates

Cottonwood Creek, at its confluence with Shanley Creek, was found to be slightly impaired in 1996 and 1998 by Bollman (1998). Though no direct impairment rating can be assigned to individual reaches in this study, some general patterns emerged. For instance, it was found that ordinal relative abundance and percent EPT composition increases heading downstream while family richness decreased heading downstream. The percent composition of Baetide in the Ephemeroptera order increased heading downstream. Reach D appeared to have the most water quality impairment of the surveyed reaches. It had a Chironomidae: EPT ratio of .97 and 41% of the organisms present belong to one order, Diptera while the EPT composition was only 40%. Table 4.3 indicates that these values are indicators that the organisms in reach D are in a stressed state. Interestingly though, the family richness is highest in this reach even though it is dominated by a few families. Reach A appears to be the least impaired of the four reaches. Here, the EPT ratio is 59% and the Chironomidae: EPT ratio is 2.56. Reach B also appears to similar water quality as Reach A. The high percentage of pools in Reach D is probably a factor because it limited the amount of riffle habitat and also increased the amount of fine sediment present in the reach due to settlement in the pools.

Identifying to the family level has saved time and reduced taxonomic error but the only way water quality designations can be made is to key out to the species level or perform a chemical analysis. Even among the EPT groups, individual species have different tolerances to pollution and stressed conditions.

Stream Cross-Sections

It is likely that the ditch closure did not impact the channel morphology of Cottonwood Creek. Montgomery et al (1993), observed that “although they may be important biologically, changes in low-flow conditions are generally unimportant for channel morphologic response.” The changes in channel form are thus probably due to the flow regimes during the years of the study. The Blackfoot River at Potomac had medium to high spring flows in 1996, 1997, 1999, and 2002 but low peak flows the other years (USGS 2003). This difference in peak flows is assumed to be similar to flow patterns in Cottonwood Creek.

It appears that the lack of high streamflow during the spring caused sediment to build up in the main channel during the middle years of the study. This can be seen in transects 3-6 (figures 6.12-6.15) which show an interesting pattern in that the second year of comparison had shallower depths than in 2003. Now, the creek is in the process of moving this sediment downstream. This might explain how come the difference in Gini coefficient was 0 for transect #6 over the entire study time. Transects 1 and 2, however, do not show this pattern (figures 6.10 and 6.11). Transect #1 had substantial changes in Gini coefficient but less substantial changes in absolute percent area. Transect #4 also had substantial changes in Gini coefficient and had notable change in absolute percent area as well. The change in Gini coefficient was negligible for the other transects.

Sediment composition results hint at the possibility of impacts from drought conditions though these results might not be applicable to the channel as a whole. The percent fines test gave an indication of the percent fines in the pool tailouts and shallow

riffle areas while the pebble count gives an indication of fines just for the individual cross-sections. From the Wolman pebble count, reach B and C percent fines around 30% while reach A and D had lower percentage of fines. From this, it appears that sediment is being flushed downstream from reach D to the lower reaches. However, the cross-sections where the Wolman pebble count was completed as well as the riffle areas used for the percent fines grid test were not totally representative in reach A and D. For example, cross-section #6 is located in a low gradient riffle section but the rest of the reach is mostly pools. The same can be said for reach A which had the most variety of habitats. The only instance when both the Wolman pebble count and the grid test were the similar was for reach D. This might have been due to its limited riffle habitat; the pools upstream of this section are major depositional zones for sediment and thus the percent fines are lower than in the other reaches. There is bias in both methods which confound the results. The Wolman pebble count tends to underestimate the percentage of fines due to bias in the selection of particles while the fines grid introduces bias due to the fact that it can only be used shallow water (Krueger, 2002; Bunte and Abt, 2001).

As mentioned in the introduction, responses to stream enhancements can take years to occur (Reeves et al, 1991). Cottonwood Creek may not even have begun to fully respond to the management practices, including the ditch closure, that have occurred in past year and, as mentioned previously, spring flow patterns are probably erasing any change occurring from these practices. It is also hard to quantify the amount of impact caused by grazing on the channel since these impacts were 1) not measured and 2)

probably also modified by spring flow patterns. This data set shows how slow channel change can be.

Cottonwood Creek has been diverted on the Bandy Ranch since before the 1940's. The length and time of diversion impacts how the diversion changes the channel. The impact from grazing, rock riprap on meander bends, and land use further up in the watershed are preventing Cottonwood Creek from having more sinuosity as well as a lower width/depth ratio. It might be interesting to see how the channel would change if the riprap was removed.

As mentioned in the literature review, irrigation can increase water temperature and decrease water quality due to surface water flow. Nitrate and other compounds can also be introduced to the water as it is diverted. By closing the ditch, the water is not exposed to elevated temperatures or nutrients from the fields. Having more water in the creek also helps stream temperature remain cool during the summer months. Since cover is limiting, water depth might be a way to help improve temperature. This is especially important for Bull Trout who have lower temperature tolerances than other species.

Introduced species like brown trout can out compete bull trout because they are more thermal tolerant. The distribution of native species like Bull trout and Westslope cutthroat trout in the headwaters with non-native species residing in lower reaches is now a common occurrence and is changing the life history of the species (Nelson, 1999). Temperature, slope, cover, and competition are impacting these species. Improving habitat might not be enough to completely restore the bull trout population in Cottonwood Creek.

Hydraulic Modeling

Increasing the total discharge in the channel is believed to help increase fish habitat by increasing the available habitat area due to increased depth and wetted width. From figure 6-22, it can be seen that the water depth does not change much even with a change in $.56 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (20 cfs). The $.142 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ (5 cfs) that is being returned to Cottonwood Creek therefore, does not have much impact on the total water area present except during extreme low flow years when the water depth is very shallow.

The hydraulic modeling in HEC-RAS was used to show how the change in flow rate during summer flows will not alter the channel. The bankfull d50 and the wetted perimeter d50 are different due to the higher percentage of fines on the bank versus the main channel. By observation, the wetted perimeter d50 at $1.42 \text{ m}^3/\text{s}$ was approximately 152.4 mm. According to table 6.27, the shear stress would have to be approximately 95.7 N/m^2 for the median bed particle to move at low flows. Since the highest average shear stress for Reach C and Reach D was 23.93 N/m^2 (figure 6.26), there will be no modification of the bed at these low flows. Even for the pool habitats that have finer sediment, the shear stresses are not high enough to move fines completely out of the pool. At high flows, however, smaller particles are moved due to the increase in shear. Since cross-section #4 (table 6.26, reach B), had the smallest mean bankfull d50, the shear stress required to initiate motion is smaller than the other cross-sections. This probably explains why there has been some change in Gini coefficient for cross-section #4.

Future Work

More data should be collected to further complete this baseline data set. Fish counts should be done next summer to get data specific to the surveyed reaches. Former studies completed by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks have not focused in areas upstream of the Boyd diversion to the confluence with Shanley Creek. Also, there is water temperature data that is being currently recorded by temperature sensors in locations within Cottonwood Creek. The data from these sensors should be examined to further get an idea of water quality and the probable interaction of groundwater flow on stream temperatures. Another future task will be to develop a Rosgen reference site (as mentioned in the results section) to have a basis for comparison. Further water conservation practices should also be implemented to conserve instream flows and increase water depth.

LITERATURE CITED

LITERATURE CITED

- Abernathy, B. and I.D. Rutherford. 2001. The distribution and strength of riparian tree roots in relation to riverbank reinforcement. *Hydrological Processes*. 15: 63-79.
- ASCE Task Committee on Hydraulics, Bank Mechanics, and Modeling of River Width Adjustment. 1998. River Width Adjustment I: Processes and Mechanisms. *Journal of Hydraulic Engineering* 124(9): 881-902.
- Beschta, R.L. and W. S. Platts. 1986. Morphological features of small streams: significance and function. *Water Resources Bulletin*. 22(3): 369-379.
- Bohn, C.C. and J.G. King. 2000. Stream channel responses to streamflow diversion on small streams of the Snake River Drainage, Idaho. *Forest Service. Research Paper RMRS-RP-20*.
- Bunte, K. and S.R. Abt. 2001. Sampling surface and subsurface particle-size distributions in wadable gravel and cobble-bed streams for analyses in sediment transport, hydraulics, and streambed monitoring. *U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-74*.
- Chow, V.T. 1959. *Open Channel Hydraulics*. McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc.
- The Federal Interagency Stream Restoration Working Group. 1998(revised 2001). *Stream Corridor Restoration: Principles, Processes, and Practices*. Government Publication. ISBN-0-934213-59-3.
- Heimbuch D.G. and H.T. Wilson. 1997. Estimating fish abundance in stream surveys by using double-pass removal sampling. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*. 126: 795-803.
- Horan, D.L., J.L. Kershner, C.P. Hawkins, and T.A. Crowl. 2000. Effects of habitat area and complexity on Colorado River cutthroat trout density in Uinta Mountain streams. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*. 129: 1250-1263.
- Kauffman, J.B. and W.C. Krueger. 1984. Livestock impacts on riparian ecosystems and streamside management implications: a review. *Journal of Range Management*. 37(5): 430-437.
- Krueger, R. C. 2002. Correlations among environmental features, *Myxobolus Cerebralis* infection prevalence in oligochaetes, and salmonid infection risk in the Madison River, Montana. Montana State University, Master's Thesis.

LITERATURE CITED-CONTINUED

- Law, D. J., C. B. Marlow, J. C. Mosley, S. Custer, and B. Lernard. 2000. Water table dynamics and soil texture of three riparian plant communities. *Northwest Science* 74(3): 233-241.
- Lawler, D. M., C. R. Thorne, and J. M. Hooke. 1997. Bank Erosion and Instability. *Applied Fluvial Geomorphology for River Engineering and Management*. C.R. Thorne, R.D. Hey, and M.D. Newson, editors, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. 137-173.
- Lee, J.M., A. Nahajski, and S. Miller. 1997. Riverbank Stabilization Program. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*. 123(5): 292-294.
- Leopold, L.B., M.G. Wolman, and J.P. Miller. 1964. *Fluvial Processes in Geomorphology*. W.M. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, CA.
- Lonzarich, D.G., M.R. Lonzarich, and M. L Warren, Jr. 2000. Effects of riffle length on the short-term movement of fishes among stream pools. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries Aquatic Sciences*. 57:1508-1514.
- Maloney, S. B., A. R. Tiedemann, D. A. Higgins, T. M. Quigley, and D. B. Marx. 1999. Influence of stream characteristics and grazing intensity on stream temperatures in eastern Oregon. *U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report*. PNW-GTR-459.
- Moore, M. R., A. Mulville, and M. Weinberg. 1996. Water allocation in the American west: endangered fish versus irrigated agriculture. *Natural Resources Journal*. 36(2): 319-357.
- Montgomery, D.R. and J.M. Buffington. 1993. Channel classification, prediction of channel response, and assessment of channel condition. *Washington State Timber/Fish/Wildlife Agreement*, Report TFW-SH10-93-002. 84 pp.
- Nelson, M. L. 1999. Evaluation of the potential for "resident" bull trout to reestablish the migratory life form. Montana State University, Masters thesis.
- Olson-Rutz, K. M. and C. B. Marlow. 1992. Analysis and interpretation of stream channel cross-sectional data. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*. 12:55-61.

LITERATURE CITED-CONTINUED

- Overton, C. K., M. A. Radko, and R. L. Nelson. 1993. Fish habitat conditions: using the northern/intermountain regions' inventory procedures for detecting differences on two differently managed watershed. *United States Forest Service General Technical Report INT-300*.
- Overton, C. K., S.P. Wollrab, B. C. Roberts, and M.A. Radko. 1997. R1/R4 (Northern/Intermountain regions) fish and fish habitat standard inventory procedures handbook. *United States Forest Service General Technical Report INT-GTR-346*.
- Peters, D. 1990. *Inventory of fishery resources in the Blackfoot River and major tributaries*. Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, Missoula.
- Pierce, R., D. Peters, and T. Swanberg. 1997. *Blackfoot River Restoration Project Progress Reports*. Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks, Missoula.
- Platts, W. S., W. F. Megahan, and G. W. Minshall. 1983. Methods for evaluating stream, riparian, and biotic conditions. *U.S. Forest Service General Technical Report INT-138*.
- Reiser, D. W., and R. G. White. 1990. Effects of streamflow reduction on Chinook salmon egg incubation and fry quality. *Rivers*. 1(2): 110-118.
- Rantz, S. E., and others. 1982. Measurement and computation of streamflow: volume 2. *Computation of discharge*, U. S. Geological Survey Water Supply Paper 2175.
- Richards, D. C. 1996. The use of aquatic macroinvertebrates as water quality indicators in mountains streams of Montana. Masters Thesis. Montana State University.
- Roni, P., T. J. Beechie, R.E. Bilby, F. E. Leonetti, M. M. Pollock, and George R. Pess. 2002. A review of stream restoration techniques and a hierarchical strategy for prioritizing restoration in Pacific Northwest Watershed. *North American Journal of Fisheries management*. 22:1-20.
- Rosgen, David. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Wildland Hydrology. Pagosa Springs, Colorado.

LITERATURE CITED-CONTINUED

- Rothrock, J. A., P. K. Barten, and G. L. Ingman. 1998. Land use and aquatic biointegrity in the Blackfoot River watershed, Montana. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 34(3): 565-581.
- Ryan, Sandra. 1997. Morphologic response of subalpine streams to transbasin flow diversions. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 33(4): 839-854.
- Schmetterling, D., R. Pierce, and B.W. Liermann. 2002. Efficacy of three denil fish ladders for low-flow fish passage in two tributaries in the Blackfoot River, Montana. Management brief. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*. 22: 929-933.
- Simon, A. and A.J. C. Collison. 2002. Quantifying the mechanical and hydrologic effects of riparian vegetation on streambank stability. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms* 27: 527-546.
- Sturm, Terry. 2001. *Open Channel Hydraulics*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Swanberg, T.R. 1997. Movements of and habitat use by fluvial bull trout in the Blackfoot River, Montana. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*. 126: 735-746.
- Thorne, C.R. and N.K. Tovey. 1981. Stability of composite river banks. *Earth Surface Processes and Landforms*. 6: 469-484.
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1997. *HEC-RAS River Analysis System*. Hydrologic Engineering Center.
- U.S.G.S. Water Resources of Montana. 2003. Surface water data for Montana web site. Web address: <http://nwis.waterdata.usgs.gov/mt/nwis/sw>.
- Utah State University. 1976. *Methodologies for determination of stream resource flow requirements: an assessment*. Western Water Allocation, Office of Biological Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

LITERATURE CITED-CONTINUED

Winward, A.H. 2000. *Monitoring the Vegetation Resources in Riparian Areas*. Rocky Mountain Research Station. General Technical Report RMRS-GTR-47.

Wu, T.H. Beal, and C. Lan. 1988. In-situ shear test of soil-root systems. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*. 114(12): 1376-1394.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FISH POPULATION DATA

Figure A.1. Cottonwood Creek Fish Population Estimates from data collected by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks .
 (Blackfoot River Restoration Project Progress Reports, 1990, 1997, 2001)

River Mile	Location	Date	Section Length (ft)	Species	Size Class	Probability of		
						Capture	Total Estimate	Estim/100'
4.7	15 N, 13 W, 8 D	7/28/1992	240	LL	<4.0	0.86	16.3+/-1.5	6.8+/-0.6
					4.0-8.0	0.8	50+/-4.2	20.8+/-1.8
					>8.0	0.53	28.1+/-15.1	11.7+/-6.3
5.5	15 N, 13 W, 8 D	7/28/1992	300	LL	4.0-8.0	0.43	49.0+/-35	20.4+/-11.7
					>8.0	0.5	48+/-23.5	16.0+/-7.8
7.5	15 N, 13 W, 5 C	7/23/1991	285	CT	>3.5	0.54	6.0+/-3.5	2.1+/-1.2
				EB	<4.0	0.47	131+/-20	45.8+/-6.9
					>4.0	0.6	39.0+/-5.3	13.6+/-1.9
				LL	<4.0	0.38	71+/-26	24.8+9.2
>4.0	0.38	23+/-14.6	8.0+/-5.2					
12	16 N, 14 W, 24D	10/3/2000	500	All	<4.0	0.7	66.9+9.2	13.4+1.8
					>4.0	0.22	202.5+/-276.1	40.5+/-55.2

Figure A.2. Cottonwood Creek fish surveying data collected by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks.
 (Blackfoot River Restoration Project Progress Reports, 1990, 1997, 2001)

River Mile	Date	Length (ft)	Species Present	Total Number Captured	Length range (in)	Mean Length (in)	(#/100' in 1st Pass)	
							CPUE	YOY CPUE
0.1	8/29/2000	465	CT	1	13	13	0.2	0
			RB	23	1.5-8.5	2.6	4.9	4.1
4.4	6/23/1992	150	LL	11	4.3-11.6	6.7	7.3	0
4.7	7/28/1992	240	DV	1	12.7	12.9	0	0
			EB	6	6.1-9.1	7.2	0.8	0
			LL	86	2.5-21.3	6.7	28.8	5.8
			MWF	1	2.7	2.7	0.4	0
4.9	7/28/1992	150	LL	10	4.3-9.6	7.2		
5	7/7/1992	225	EB	1	6.2	6.2	0.4	0
			LL	18	2.0-14.3	7.9	6.2	0.9
			MWF	3	15.2-15.6	15.5	1.3	0
5.5	7/28/1992	300	CT	1	9.6	9.6	0	0
			EB	1	7	7	0.3	0
			LL	70	2.2-18	8.4	15	0
7.00	11/7/1991	180	CT	2	1.8-5.3	3.6	0	0
			EB	9	3.3-7.9	5.6	2.2	0.6
			LL	10	2.4-15.2	6.3	3.9	1.1
7.5	5/1/1991	690	CT	2	2.2-12.4	7.4	0.3	0.1
			EB	29	1.3-7.9	4.9	4.2	1.2
			LL	17	2.6-14.3	7.2	2.5	0.9

Figure A.2. Cottonwood Creek fish surveying data collected by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks.
 (Blackfoot River Restoration Project Progress Reports, 1990, 1997, 2001)

River Mile	Date	Length (ft)	Species Present	Total Number Captured	Length range (in)	Mean Length (in)	(#/100' in 1st Pass)	
							CPUE	YOY CPUE
7.5	7/23/1991	285	CT	6	3.5-11.8	5.5	1.1	0.4
			EB	117	1.2-8.1	4	27.7	20
			LL	72	1.2-13.5	2.8	12.3	9.5
			SCUL	Common				
12	6/8/1992	1125	CT	160	1.9-9.0	4.2	14.2	7
			DV	36	3.0-6.7	3.8	3.2	2.1
			EB	3	6.6-10.2	8.2	0.3	0
			LL	1	8.4	8.4	0.1	0
12	7/30/1997	470	DV	5	2.3-5.3	4.3	0.4	0
			CT	18	2.7-8.9	5.6	2.6	0.6
			EB	7	4.1-5.0	4.6	0.9	0
			DV*EB	2	6.0-6.2	6.1	0.4	0
			Scul Tailed Frog	present present				
12	10/1/1998	470	CT	38	2.1-11.7	5.1	5.7	2.3
			DV	2	2.8-4.8	5.3	0	0
			EB	1	5.3	5.3	0.2	0.2
12	10/3/2000	500	DV	5	2.7-9.3	5.5	0.8	0.2
			CT	144	1.6-10.2	4.6	16.4	9.2
			EB	9	4.4-8.8	6.3	1.2	0
			SCUL	abundant				
12.5	12/24/2000	470	DV	11	3.4-7.4	5	2.3	0.4
			CT*	38	2.6-9.7	5.6	8.1	1.5
			EB	1	7.4	7.4	0.2	0

APPENDIX B

STREAM HABITAT SURVEY DATA

Comments

Reach in general every 15 ft, we tried to take at 2 width measurements
These reaches have stable right banks (looking upstream) when the cows aren't in, but the cows do add cause bank instability due to trampling when they are present

Habitat in particular

- 1 Beginning of reach, just upstream of Boyd diversion dam. Channel form is probably impacted by this dam
- 4 Rock riprap on the right bankbend. Old beaver pond on the left?
- 7 Scour also caused by a LWD at beginning of habitat
- 8 Combined two measurements to get the max average depth because the values were so close
- 9 beaver dam remains, saw a frog

Bandy Ranch Stream Habitat and Fish Population Survey Data

Location: Cottonwood Creek, Reach B
Description: Clayton Cross-Section #4
Date: 8/6/2003 **Weather:**
Gradient:

SMO Scour middle, due to confluence of channels
 SLM Scour lateral meander
 LGR low gradient riffle
 HGR High gradient riffle
 DMW Dammed, main channel caused by wood
 SUV Scour, underscour due to a beaver dam

HU Number	1	2a	2b	3	4				
Habitat Type	LGR	SLM	SUV	LGR	SMO				
Length (m)	84	8.3	9	8.9	6.3				
Avg. Width (m)	6.6	4.7	3.4	6.2	10.6				
Avg. Depth (cm)	23.3	31.1	28.1	24.2	22.7				
Fast Type									
Pocket Pools #	13	N/A	N/A	2	N/A				
Slow Type									
Max Depth (cm)	N/A	62	59	N/A	62				
Crest Depth (cm)	N/A	10	26	N/A	20				
Avg. Max Depth (cm)	N/A	34.5	36.3	N/A	26.16				
Avg. Crest Depth (cm)	N/A	26.5	21.4	N/A	21.4				
Surface fines%									
Substrate Comp.									
Left Bank Length (m)	88								
Righth Bank Length (m)	88								
Unstable left (m)	1	0	0	0	0				
Unstable right (m)	0.5	0	0	0	0				
Bare bank total (m ²)	2								

Comments

Reach in general This reach is dominated by one long riffle habitat and two pools units that are very complex.

Habitat in particular

- 2 This habitat consisted of two pool habitats adjacent to one another, one caused by a narrowing of the channel above due to a beaver dam and meander while the other was caused by underscouring of the dam as well as a small side channel flowing into it
- 4 This habitat is very wide because it is a "confluence" of braided channels above it.

Comments

Reach in general

Habitat in particular

- 1 Occasional boulders create pocket pools and white water area
- 2 Rock rip rap on right bank
- 3 Rock rip rap on right bank. This is a not very developed pool, but will continue to build as debris gets trapped behind the wood and roots that are causing it.

Comments

Reach in general

Rip rap for the entire reach is about 115 ft
Severe meandering in this section

Habitat in particular

- 1 need to get the information on the shading caused by the Ppine
- 2 3/4 of the LGR there is a large pocket pool on the left bank caused by tree roots and meander
- 3 actually saw a fish
- 4 Extensive rock rip rap on right bank
- 5 At the beginning of this habitat, there is a channel constriction as well as some large wood that are contributing to the pool, but the meander is still the dominate cause for the length

APPENDIX C

GREENLINE RIPARIAN DATA

Table C.1. Greenline Assessment for Reach A.

Community Types (Right)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Phlpra/Fespra/Taroff/Poaspp	7	4	0.29
Agrrrep/Circan/Phlpra	2	5	0.08
Carutr/Plhpra/Poapal	15	5	0.82
Carutr/Plhpra/Carneb/Poapal	5	6	0.34
Carutr/Scirpus/Phlpra/Fespra	20	6.5	1.30
Agrsto/Phlpra/Broine/Carneb	14	5	0.69
Poapra/Fespra/Carneb/Agtra	4	5.75	0.22
Glyceria/Carex	4	8	0.31
Alninc/Amel/Ribes	2	6	0.15
Agrsto/Poa/Carutri/Carmic	15	4	0.62
Salgey/mesic graminoid	8	8	0.62
Salboo/mesic graminoid	4	8	0.31
Total	100		5.73

Community Types (Left)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Glyceria/Salgey/Carurt	5	8	0.42
Salgey/Corsto/mesic gram	12	9	1.04
Agrsto/Carex/Ribes/Phaaruu	12	6	0.69
Alninc/Salgey/mesic gram	7	8	0.57
Carutr/Phlpra/Poa/Agrsto	15	5	0.71
Phaaruu	1	9	0.08
Salgey/mesic gram/Ribes	31	8	2.48
Salboo/Corsto/Ribes/Roswoo/Alninc	12	8	0.92
Alninc/Ribes/mesic gram	3	7	0.19
Fespra/Phlpra/Poa	4	4	0.15
Total	100		7.25

Table C.2. Greenline Assessment for Reach B.

Community Types (Right)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Salgey/Ribes/mesic gram	46	7	3.20
Carutr/Agrsto/Equis	2	6	0.14
Salboo/Alninc/Ribes/mes gram	17	7	1.18
Carutr/Carneb/Phlpra/Junbal	14	6.5	0.94
Alninc/Ribes	2	6	0.14
Salboo/Salgey/mes gram	5	8	0.39
Phlpra/Junbal/Fespra	13	6	0.84
Total	100		6.84

Community Types (Left)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Carutr/Agrsto/Glyceria	6	6	0.35
Salgey/Ribes/Alninc/mes gram	8	7	0.58
Carmic/Carutr/Scirpus/Carneb	9	7	0.66
Scirpus/Agrsto/Carmic	3	6	0.16
Alninc/Salgey/Ribes	4	7	0.29
Aloaeq/Agrsto/Scirpus	13	4	0.54
Fespra/Poapal/Phlpra/Carex	51	5	2.67
Phlpra/Achmil/Junbal	3	5	0.18
Salboo/mesic gram	3	8	0.27
Total	100		5.70

Table C.3. Greenline Assessment for Reach C.

Community Types (Right)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Carutr/Phlpra/Agrsto/Carneb	64	6	3.98
Alninc/Roswoo/Ribes/mesic gram	29	6	1.75
Alninc/Salgey/ Agsto/Carutr	4	7	0.25
Salgey/Agrsto/Carneb/Carutr	2	6	0.11
Glyceria	2	8	0.14
Total	100		6.23

Community Types (Left)	% Community Type	Class	Index
Agrsto/Carutr/Phlpra/Carneb/Carmic	28	6	1.61
Salgey/Agrsto/Phlpra/Carmic	9	5	0.42
Alninc/Roswoo/Ribes/mesic gram	58	6	3.48
Glyceria/Agsto/Carmic/Carutr	5	6	0.32
Total	100		5.83

Table C.4. Greenline Assessment for Reach D

Community Types (Right)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Carutr/Agrsto/Scirpus	26	6	1.54
Phlpra/Agrsto/Carmic/Carneb	36	6	2.17
Salgey/mesic gram	10	8	0.76
Corsto/Alninc/mesic gram	5	8	0.38
Agrsmi/Phlpra/Agrsto/Fespra/Carmic	21	4	0.84
Salgey/Phaarn	3	9	0.26
Total	100		5.95

Community Types (Left)	% Community Type	Stability	
		Class	Index
Salgey/mesic gram	17	8	1.38
Carutr/Agrsto/Phaarn/Carneb	15	7.5	1.16
Carutr/Agrsto/Scirpus/Phlpra/Carneb/Carmic	54	6	3.22
Glyceria/Phaaru	3	8.5	0.23
Alninc/mesic gram	5	7	0.32
Alninc/Roswoo/Ribes	4	6	0.23
Pinpon	1	5	0.05
Fespra	2	6	0.11
Total	100		6.69

Table C.5. Key to the Greenline Community Types.

Abbreviation	Scientific Name	Common Name
Phlpra	<i>Phleum pratense</i>	Timothy
Fespra	<i>Festuca pra</i>	Festue
Taroff	<i>Taraxacum officinale</i>	Dandylion
Poapal	<i>Poa pratensis</i>	Kentucky Bluegrass
Agrep	<i>Agropyron repens</i>	Quickgrass
Circan	<i>Cirsium arvense</i>	Canada thistle
Carutr	<i>Carex utriculata</i>	Carex
Scirpus	<i>Scirpus acutus</i>	Hardstem Bulrush
Carneb	<i>Carex nebrascensis</i>	Nebraska
Agrsto	<i>Agrostis stolonifera</i>	Spreading Bentgrass
Broine	<i>Bromus inermus</i>	Smooth brome
Glyceria	<i>glyceria spp.</i>	Manna Grass
Carex	<i>Carex</i>	Carex
Alninc	<i>Alnus incana</i>	Speckled Alder
Amel	<i>Alnus incanata</i>	Thornleaf Alder
Ribes	<i>Ribes</i>	Gooseberry
Mesic Graminoid		
Phaaru	<i>Phalaris arundinacea</i>	Reed Canary Grass
Roswoo	<i>Rosa woodsii c.t.</i>	Woods Rose
Equis	<i>Equisetum</i>	Equisetum
Junbal	<i>Juncus balticus</i>	Baltic Rush
Achmil	<i>Achilea millefolium</i>	Yarrow
Aloaeq	<i>Alopecurus aequalis</i>	Short-awn Foxtail
Agrsmi	<i>Agropyron smithii</i>	Western Wheat Grass
Corsto	<i>Cornus stolonifera</i>	Dog Wood

APPENDIX D

VISUAL BASIC CODE FOR THE GINI COEFFICIENT AND PERCENT CHANGE
CALCULATOR

Figure D.1. Visual Basic Code for a program that determines the gini coefficient from a data set. This was developed to supplement the program written for the Animal & Range Department.

```
Sub ginicalc()
```

```
'this program calculates the gini coefficient using cross-section data
```

```
Dim num_ind As Integer, i As Integer, j As Integer
```

```
Dim sum As Double, onesum As Double, Gcalc As Double
```

```
Dim width_depth As Double, chan_width As Double, meanyrone As Double
```

```
Dim data_range As Range, ulrow As Integer, ulcol As Integer
```

```
'number of individuals
```

```
Set data_range = Application.InputBox("Pick the top most cell that contains your data set  
to be analyzed.", "data location", , , , Type:=8)
```

```
ulrow = data_range.Row 'upper left row
```

```
ulcol = data_range.Column 'column
```

```
'number of values
```

```
num_ind = Worksheets("GINI").Cells(13, 2).Value
```

```
'array for each year
```

```
ReDim yearone(num_ind) As Double
```

```
ReDim Gini(num_ind, num_ind) As Double
```

```
'loop to fill in each array
```

```
For i = 1 To num_ind
```

```
    yearone(i) = Worksheets("GINI").Cells(ulrow + i - 1, ulcol).Value
```

```
Next i
```

```
'loop to calculate the mean of the values
```

```
For i = 1 To num_ind
```

```
    onesum = onesum + yearone(i)
```

```
Next i
```

```
meanyrone = onesum / num_ind
```

```
'width/depth calculation
```

```
chan_width = num_ind * 10 'this assumes that there are 10 cm between each  
measurement
```

```
width_depth = chan_width / meanyrone
```

```
sum = 0
```

Figure D.1. Visual Basic Code for a program that determines the gini coefficient from a data set. This was developed to supplement the program written for the Animal & Range Department.

```
'loop to perform gini calculations
i = 1
n = 2
While i < num_ind + 1
  For j = n To num_ind
    Gini(j, i) = Abs(yearone(i) - yearone(j))
    sum = Gini(j, i) + sum
    'Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 10 + j, i).Value = Gini(j, i)
  Next j

  i = i + 1
  n = n + 1 'this is added to avoid repeat calculations
Wend

'calculate gini coefficient
Gcalc = (2 * sum) / (2 * num_ind ^ 2 * meanyrone)

'output to sheet
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 3, ulcol - 1).Value = "Sum of
differences="
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 3, ulcol).Value = sum
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 4, ulcol - 1).Value = "Mean"
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 4, ulcol).Value = meanyrone
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 5, ulcol - 1).Value = "Gini Coefficient"
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 5, ulcol).Value = Gcalc
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 6, ulcol - 1).Value = "Width/Depth ratio"
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 6, ulcol).Value = width_depth

End Sub
```

Figure D.2. Visual Basic code to a program that determines the absolute percent change in area between two cross-section data sets. This was developed to supplement the program written for the Animal & Range Department.

```

Sub absolute_area()

'Absolute percent change in area
Dim area2 As Range, ul2row As Integer, ul2col As Integer, i As Integer, j As Integer
Dim num_ind As Integer, sum1 As Double, sum2 As Double, net_change_in_area As Double
Dim ab_change_in_area As Double, sum3 As Double

'number of values
num_ind = Worksheets("GINI").Cells(13, 2).Value

ReDim areachange(num_ind) As Double
ReDim abchange(num_ind) As Double

Set area1_range = Application.InputBox("Pick the top most cell that contains your first
data set to be analyzed.", "data location", , , Type:=8)
ulrow = area1_range.Row 'upper left row
ulcol = area1_range.Column 'column

Set area2_range = Application.InputBox("Pick the top most cell that contains your
second data set to be analyzed.", "data location", , , Type:=8)
ul2row = area2_range.Row 'upper left row
ul2col = area2_range.Column 'column

'array for each year
ReDim yearone(num_ind) As Double
ReDim yeartwo(num_ind) As Double

'loop to fill in each array and do calculations
sum1 = 0
sum2 = 0
sum3 = 0

For i = 1 To num_ind
    yearone(i) = Worksheets("GINI").Cells(ulrow + i - 1, ulcol).Value
    yeartwo(i) = Worksheets("GINI").Cells(ul2row + i - 1, ul2col).Value
    areachange(i) = (yearone(i) - yeartwo(i))
    abchange(i) = Abs(yearone(i) - yeartwo(i))

```

Figure D.2. Visual Basic code to a program that determines the absolute percent change in area between two cross-section data sets. This was developed to supplement the program written for the Animal & Range Department.

```
sum1 = sum1 + areachange(i)
sum2 = sum2 + yearone(i)
sum3 = sum3 + abchange(i) 'absolute change
Next i

net_change_in_area = sum1 / sum2 * 100
ab_change_in_area = sum3 / sum2 * 100

Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 8, ulcol).Value = "Net Percent Change"
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 8, ulcol + 2).Value = net_change_in_area

Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 9, ulcol).Value = "Absolute Percent
Change"
Worksheets("GINI").Cells(num_ind + ulrow + 9, ulcol + 2).Value = ab_change_in_area

End Sub
```

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY - BOZEMAN



3 1762 10392127 4