

**FINAL REPORT**

**KEMMERER FIELD OFFICE REVIEW OF  
POTENTIAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS IN THE  
KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
PLANNING AREA**

Prepared for

Bureau of Land Management  
Kemmerer Field Office  
312 Highway 189 North  
Kemmerer, Wyoming 83101

Prepared by

Jonas Consulting  
785 North Canyon Terrace Drive  
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

December 2, 2002

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
<b>I</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....1</b>
A.	Public Involvement and Coordination.....1
<b>II</b>	<b>PROCESS .....2</b>
A.	Step I. Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria Review and Tentative Classification.....3
1.	Eligibility Criteria.....3
a.	Free Flowing.....3
b.	Outstandingly Remarkable Values .....3
2.	Tentative Classification.....5
a.	Wild Waterway Areas .....5
b.	Scenic Waterway Areas .....5
c.	Recreational Waterway Areas .....6
3.	Results of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Review for the Kemmerer RMP Planning Area.....6
B.	Step II: Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Review .....7
1.	Suitability Factors .....7
2.	Results of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Review for the Kemmerer RMP Planning Area.....8
C.	Step III: Management of Public Lands That Meet the Suitability Factors..8
ATTACHMENT A	-Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Review: Kemmerer Resource Management Plan Planning Area..... A-1
ATTACHMENT B	- Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands Within the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan Planning Area Determined to Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria.....B-1
ATTACHMENT C	- Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Review: Kemmerer Resource Management Plan Planning Area.....C-1
ATTACHMENT D	- Management of BLM-Administered Public Lands Within the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan Planning Area That Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Factors..... D-1

# **KEMMERER FIELD OFFICE REVIEW OF POTENTIAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS IN THE KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA**

December 2, 2002

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

As part of the planning effort for developing the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan (RMP), the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) planning team members initiated a Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) review of all BLM-administered public land surfaces (public lands) along waterways within the Kemmerer RMP planning area. This review was to determine if any of these public lands meet the WSR eligibility criteria and suitability factors, as identified in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) of 1968, as amended.

### **A. Public Involvement and Coordination**

Wyoming BLM staff met with representatives of various Wyoming State agencies, including the governor's office, in January 1991 and June 1993. These meetings were specifically designed to produce a mutual understanding of the WSR review process, and of the WSR eligibility criteria and suitability factors BLM uses in the process. This included agreement on necessary refinements of these criteria and factors, specific to Wyoming, and their statewide application on public lands. The eligibility criteria and suitability factors, including minor refinements agreed to at that time, are still consistent with the later-released BLM Manual Section 8351, WSR Policy and Program Direction for Identification, Evaluation, and Management (May 19, 1992, as amended on December 22, 1993).

The State of Wyoming has disagreed with giving any consideration to reviewing waterways that do not contain water year-round (i.e., intermittent and ephemeral waterways). The Wyoming BLM recognizes that position but is obligated to follow the BLM Manual Section 8351 requirement to include intermittent and ephemeral waterways in the review.

The BLM State Director's policy and guidance for conducting the BLM WSR review process in Wyoming was issued December 31, 1992. Minor editorial refinements to this policy and guidance were made on June 2, 1993, to make the wording more consistent with BLM Manual Section 8351. The policy and guidance were further refined on February 12, 1998. This latest refinement primarily dealt with the need to conduct WSR reviews in light of the current RMP planning process. The current BLM direction for land use planning is that there will no longer be

a “plan life” or certain cycle period for revising RMPs, and new RMP starts are essentially a thing of the past. Rather, RMPs are to be kept current on a frequent basis through regular maintenance and amendment actions. In this light, the initial WSR review was conducted separate from the RMP planning process to expedite the review process, resulting in a stand-alone WSR review report that will support the land use plan update efforts currently underway in the Kemmerer Field Office.

The results of this WSR review will be part of the Management Situation Analysis activities for Kemmerer RMP modification effort (i.e., maintenance, amendment, or revision). The public will be given the opportunity to comment on these WSR review results during the normal scoping process and throughout the environmental analysis and planning process for the RMP planning effort. Reports and recommendations to Congress for inclusion of BLM administered public lands in the WSR National System will be based on waterways meeting established eligibility and suitability criteria; professional judgment; and broad participation via public education, sentiment, and involvement. Public involvement is required by law, regulations, and as deemed necessary by the BLM, Wyoming State Office, Division of Resource Policy and Management.

## **II. PROCESS**

The definitions of the key terms, “waterway/river” and “public lands,” as used in this WSR review process are defined below:

- C ***Waterway/River:*** A flowing body of water or estuary or a section, portion, or tributary thereof, including rivers, streams, creeks, runs, krills, rills, and small lakes. For purposes of this review, a waterway is not required to have water in it year-round and may be ephemeral or intermittent.
  
- C ***Public lands:*** BLM-administered public land surfaces along waterways within an RMP planning area. Those “split estate lands,” where the land surface is state or privately-owned and the federal mineral estate is administered by the BLM, are not included in these reviews. Other references to segments, parcels, corridors, and waterways all represent public lands, which are the basis for this review.

The BLM WSR review in the Kemmerer RMP planning area includes a three-step process:

1. Determining if public lands along waterways meet the WSR eligibility criteria to be tentatively classified as wild, scenic, or recreational.

2. Determining if any of those public lands that meet the eligibility criteria also meet the WSR suitability factors.
3. Determining how public lands which are determined suitable for designation will be managed.

## A. Step I. Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria Review and Tentative Classification

### 1. Eligibility Criteria

To meet the eligibility criteria, a waterway must be “free-flowing” and, along with its adjacent land area, must possess at least one “outstandingly remarkable value.” As part of the eligibility review, BLM planning team members reviewed all waterways in the Kemmerer RMP planning area to see if they contained any public lands that meet the eligibility criteria. Only those portions of waterways flowing through public lands were considered. The following are the guidelines used in applying the eligibility criteria on public lands in the Kemmerer RMP planning area.

- a. **Free Flowing** : Free-flowing is defined in the WSRA as “existing or flowing in natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modification of the waterway.” The existence of small dams, diversion works, or other minor structures at the time the waterway is being considered shall not automatically disqualify it for possible addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). A waterway need not be “boatable or floatable” in order to be eligible; there is no “minimum flow” requirement.
- b. **Outstandingly Remarkable Values:** The public lands must also possess at least one outstandingly remarkable value to be eligible for further consideration. Outstandingly remarkable values relate to scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar resource values.

The term “outstandingly remarkable value” is not precisely defined in the WSRA; however, these values must be directly waterway related. The criteria for outstandingly remarkable values used for the review of public lands in the Kemmerer RMP planning area are as follows:

- C **Scenic:** The landscape elements of landform, vegetation, water, color, and related factors result in notable or exemplary visual features and/or attraction. Additional factors such as seasonal variations in vegetation, scale of cultural modifications, and length of time negative intrusions are viewed can also be considered when analyzing scenic values. Scenery and visual attractions may be highly diverse over the majority of the public lands involved, are not common to other waterways in the geographic region, and must be of a quality to attract visitors from outside the area.

- C **Recreational:** Recreational opportunities on the public lands are unique enough to attract visitors from outside the area. Visitors would be willing to travel long distances to use the waterway resources on the public lands for recreational purposes. Waterway related opportunities could include, but are not limited to, sightseeing, wildlife observation, camping, photography, hiking, fishing, hunting and boating.

Interpretive opportunities may be exceptional and attract visitors from outside the area. The waterway may provide settings for national or regional commercial usage or competitive events.

- C **Geologic:** The public lands provide an example(s) of a geologic feature, process, or phenomenon that is rare, unusual, or unique to the area. The feature(s) may be in an unusually active stage of development, represent a “textbook” example and/or represent a unique or rare combination of geologic features (e.g., erosional, volcanic, glacial, or other geologic structures).

- C **Fisheries:** The fishery values of the waterway or waterway segment on public lands may be judged on the relative merits of either fish populations or habitat, or a combination of these conditions.

Populations: The waterway or waterway segment(s) on public lands is a contributor to one of the top producers of resident and/or indigenous fish species, either nationally or regionally. Of particular significance may be the presence of wild or unique stocks, or populations of federally listed or candidate threatened and endangered species. Diversity of species is also an important consideration.

Habitat: The waterway or waterway segment(s) on public lands is a contributor to exceptionally high quality habitat for fish species indigenous to the region. Of particular significance is habitat for federally listed or candidate threatened and endangered species.

- C **Wildlife:** Wildlife values on public lands may be judged on the relative merits of either wildlife populations or habitat, or a combination of these conditions.

Populations. The public lands are contributing to populations of resident or indigenous wildlife species important in the area or nationally. Of particular significance are species considered to be unique or populations of federally listed or candidate threatened and endangered species. Diversity of species is also an important consideration.

Habitat. The public lands are contributing to exceptionally high quality habitat for wildlife species important to the area or nationally, or should provide unique habitat or a critical link in habitat conditions for federally listed or candidate threatened and endangered species. Contiguous habitat conditions should be such that the biological needs of the species are met. Adjacent habitat conditions should be such that the biological needs of the species are met.

C **Cultural:** The public lands contain examples of outstanding cultural sites which have unusual characteristics relating to prehistoric use. Sites may be important in the area or nationally for interpreting prehistory, may be rare and represent an area where culture or cultural period was first identified and described, may have been used concurrently by two or more cultural groups, or may have been used by cultural groups for rare or sacred purposes.

C **Historical:** The public lands contain a site(s) or feature(s) associated with a significant event, an important person, or a cultural activity of the past that was rare, or unusual in the area.

Note: Eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, by itself, is not sufficient justification for being considered outstandingly remarkable.

C **Similar Values:** Other values may include significant hydrological, paleontological, botanical, scientific, or ecological resources as long as they are waterway related.

## 2. Tentative Classification

At the same time that eligibility determinations are made, public lands that meet the eligibility criteria are also given a tentative classification (wild, scenic, or recreational) as required by the WSRA. Tentative classification is based on the type and degree of human developments associated with the public lands and adjacent lands involved at the time of the review. Actual classification is a congressional legislative determination.

The tentative classifications, as used by BLM in Wyoming, are further defined as follows:

- a. **Wild Waterway Areas:** Wild waterway areas are those where the waterways or sections of waterways on public lands are free of impoundments and generally inaccessible except by trail, with watersheds or shorelines essentially primitive and waters unpolluted. These represent vestiges of primitive America. Wild

means undeveloped; roads, dams, or diversion works are generally absent from a quarter mile corridor on both sides of the waterway .

- b. Scenic Waterway Areas:** Scenic waterway areas are those where the waterways or sections of waterways on public lands are generally free of impoundments, with shorelines or watersheds still largely primitive and shorelines largely undeveloped, but accessible in places by roads. Scenic does not necessarily mean the public lands have scenery as an outstandingly remarkable value; however, it means the public lands may contain more development (except for major dams or diversion works) than a wild waterway segment and less development than a recreational waterway segment. For example, roads may cross the waterway in places but generally do not run parallel to it. In certain cases, however, if a parallel road is unpaved and well screened from the waterway by vegetation, a hill, or other obstruction, it could qualify for scenic waterway area classification.
- c. Recreational Waterway Areas:** Recreational waterway areas are those where the waterways or sections of waterways on public lands are readily accessible by road or railroad, may have some development along their shorelines, and may have undergone some impoundment or diversion in the past. Parallel roads or railroads and the existence of small dams or diversions can be allowed in this classification. A recreational waterway area classification does not imply that the waterway or section of waterway on public lands will be managed or prioritized for recreational use or development.

### **3. Results of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Review for the Kemmerer RMP Planning Area:**

On December 7, 2001, BLM planning team members for the Kemmerer RMP met to conduct a WSR eligibility review for the Kemmerer RMP planning area. Because of the broad interpretation of the “free flowing” criteria, all the waterways that cross public lands within the review area were accepted as free-flowing. Using an interdisciplinary approach, these waterways were further reviewed to determine whether any of the public land parcels along their courses contained any outstandingly remarkable values as described in the eligibility criteria guidelines. Of the 201 waterways reviewed in the planning area (see Attachment A; Table A1), 188 were found to have no outstandingly remarkable values and were dropped from further consideration, while 13 were determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Four of these 13 waterway review

segments actually include the main waterway segment and at least one tributary that together were reviewed as “waterway units.” They are the Bridger Creek, Pine Creek, Raymond Creek and Smiths Fork River “units.” The other nine waterways involving public lands determined to meet the eligibility criteria are Bear River, Blacks Fork River, Coal Creek, Dempsey Creek, Emigrant Creek, Fontenelle Creek, Hams Fork, Huff Creek, and Slate Creek (South Fork).

Attachment A (WSR Eligibility Review) reflects the results of the review and eligibility determination for the public lands considered and includes maps showing public lands involved. Attachment B/Table B1 (Identification and Tentative Classification of Public Lands that Meet the WSR Eligibility Criteria) is a detailed summary of the WSR eligibility review. Attachment B/Table B1 also shows the tentative classification (either wild, scenic, or recreational) given to each of the public land parcels that meet the eligibility criteria.

## **B. Step II: Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Review**

### **1. Suitability Factors**

All of the public lands within the Kemmerer RMP planning area found to meet the eligibility criteria and tentatively classified (i.e., wild, scenic, or recreational) were further reviewed to determine if they meet the WSR suitability factors. Some factors considered in the suitability determinations included, but were not limited to:

- Factor 1:** Characteristics which do or do not make the public lands involved a worthy addition to the NWSRS.
- Factor 2:** Current status of landownership (including mineral ownership) and land and resource uses in the area, including the amount of private land involved, and any associated or incompatible land uses.
- Factor 3:** Reasonable foreseeable potential uses of the public lands involved and related waters which would be enhanced, foreclosed, or curtailed if the area were included in the NWSRS, and the values which may be foreclosed or diminished if the public lands are not protected as part of the NWSRS.
- Factor 4:** Public, state, local, tribal, or federal interests in designation or non-designation of any part of all of the waterway involved, including the extent to which the administration of any or all of the waterway, including the costs thereof, may be shared by state, local, or other agencies and individuals.
- Factor 5:** Estimated cost of acquiring necessary lands, interests in lands, and administering the area if it is added to the NWSRS. Section 6 of the WSRA outlines policies and limitations of acquiring lands or interests in land by donation, exchange, consent of owners, easement, transfer, assignment of rights, or condemnation within and outside established river boundaries.
- Factor 6:** Ability of the BLM to manage and/or protect the public lands involved as part of the NWSRS, or by other mechanism (existing and potential) to protect identified values other than WSR designation.
- Factor 7:** Historical or existing rights which could be adversely affected. In the suitability review, adequate consideration will be given to rights held by

other landowners and applicants, lessees, claimants, or authorized users of the public lands involved.

**Factor 8:** Other issues and concerns if any.

## **2. Results of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Review for the Kemmerer RMP Planning Area**

The WSR suitability determinations for the Kemmerer RMP planning area were derived by screening the public lands determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria against the above eight suitability factors. This screening was conducted by BLM planning team members for the Kemmerer RMP on March 20, 2002.

The public land parcel along the reviewed segments of Huff Creek and the Raymond Creek unit (includes Raymond Creek and South Fork of Raymond Creek, Trail Creek, Cougar Hollow, Yellow Pine, and Green Canyon) previously determined to meet the eligibility criteria were also determined to meet the suitability factors.

All other public land parcels determined to meet the eligibility criteria did not meet the suitability factors and were dropped from further consideration. The primary suitability factors involved in the non-suitability determination are factors 1, 2, 3, and 6, which indicated (1) the public lands involved did not contain characteristics which made them worthy additions to the NWSRS; (2) the public lands involved are land locked by private lands and are inaccessible to the public, and obtaining public access to the public lands would not be likely; (3) there exist potential use conflicts along the review segments (i.e., oil and natural gas drilling and development, ski area expansion) which could occur if the public lands are included in the NWSRS; and/or (4) the public lands cannot be managed as part of the NWSRS because of potential management conflicts with the interspersed (up and downstream) and adjacent private lands.

Attachment C (Wild and Scenic Suitability Review) is a detailed summary of the suitability review of the waterway segments containing public lands determined to meet the eligibility criteria and the suitability determinations made for the public lands involved.

### **C. Step III: Management of Public Lands That Meet the Suitability Factors**

Under the requirements of the WSRA, any need to provide temporary or interim protection of the WSR values on suitable areas before the Kemmerer RMP is completed must be addressed. Proposed interim management prescriptions have thus been developed by the BLM for the public lands determined to meet both the WSR eligibility criteria and suitability factors (i.e., for

public lands along Huff Creek and the Raymond Creek unit) and are presented in Attachment D (Management Public Lands within the Kemmerer RMP Planning Area That Meet the WSR Suitability Factors). These prescriptions will be applied immediately as well as be presented in the Kemmerer RMP for public review and include management objectives, management actions, and appropriate allocations of land and resource uses that will maintain or enhance the outstandingly remarkable values and tentative WSR classification identified on the public lands involved.

After public review of the interim management prescriptions presented in the Kemmerer RMP, public lands determined to meet the suitability factors will then be managed under the BLM's land use plan management decisions indefinitely. At some time in the future, it is possible the Secretary of the Interior may direct the BLM to participate in the development of WSR Study Reports. The results and documentation of the BLM WSR reviews for the Kemmerer RMP planning area would be used in developing any such reports.

**ATTACHMENT A**

**WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY REVIEW:  
KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA**

## **WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY REVIEW: KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA**

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-administered public land surfaces (public lands) along 201 waterways in the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan (RMP) planning area were reviewed for Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) eligibility (see Table A1). Public lands along 188 of these waterways were found not to meet the eligibility criteria and dropped from further consideration. Public lands along 13 waterways or waterway units were determined to meet the eligibility criteria and are presented below in Section II.

### **I. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT DURING THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY REVIEW.**

On December 7, 2001, BLM planning team members for the Kemmerer RMP made preliminary WSR eligibility determinations for public lands along waterways within the Kemmerer RMP planning area. Table A2 provides the names and contact information for those individuals who attended the WSR eligibility review in the Kemmerer Field Office on that date. At this time, these determinations have not been submitted to the public for review and comment. The public will be given the opportunity to comment on the eligibility review results during the normal scoping process and throughout the environmental analysis and planning process for the Kemmerer RMP planning effort. Any comments made by the public concerning the determinations made in this review will be taken into consideration and documented in the RMP planning process. This WSR eligibility review may be modified if deemed necessary as a result of public comments.

### **II. RESULTS OF THE WSR ELIGIBILITY REVIEW OF PUBLIC LANDS ALONG WATERWAYS IN THE KEMMERER RMP PLANNING AREA**

#### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG BEAR RIVER DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

##### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Bear River reviewed is 1.16 miles long. It is located below Woodruff Narrows Reservoir, Lower Narrows, in the S½ of section 20, T. 18 N., R. 120 W. Within the segment of waterway, the river flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Bear River through this public land parcel is 1.16 miles, which is the

entire length of the waterway segment reviewed. This public land parcel attracts visitors from outside the region for fishing, camping, and eagle watching opportunities. The area is an important winter roost for bald eagles, with as many as 70 birds counted using the roost.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along Bear River that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A1 shows the public lands involved.

## **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG THE BLACKS FORK RIVER DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of the Blacks Fork River reviewed is 2.95 miles long. It begins in the W<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 18 and ends in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 6; T. 13 N., R 116 W. Within the segment of waterway, the river flows through two public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of the Blacks Fork River through these public land parcels is 1.77 miles (approximately 60.0 percent of the segment length reviewed). This public land parcel consists of a unique landscape with a variety of vegetation that provides brilliant fall colors. The area is a regional “hot spot” for fishing. Wyoming Game and Fish Department (WGFD) obtained an easement through private land for public access to the public lands for recreational fishing purposes. The unique mixture of plant species on public lands includes spruce, fir, cottonwood, aspen, dogwood, and riparian flowering plants that are not otherwise found in the surrounding area, which usually consists of sage brush and scattered aspen groves.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along the Blacks Fork River that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A2 shows the public lands involved.

## **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG BRIDGER CREEK UNIT (INCLUDES BRIDGER CREEK AND A SHORT TRIBUTARY SECTION OF NORTH BRIDGER CREEK) DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Bridger Creek reviewed is 4.76 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 12, T. 19 N., R 120 W. and ends in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 16, T. 20 N., R. 120 W. The tributary segment of North Bridger Creek reviewed is 4.69 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 17, T. 20 N., R. 119 W. and ends at the confluence with Bridger Creek in the E<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 22, T. 20 N., R. 120 W. The reviewed segment of Bridger Creek flows through two public land parcels

determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Bridger Creek through these public land parcels is 3.67 miles (approximately 77.1 percent of the segment length reviewed). The tributary segment of North Bridger Creek flows through one of the public land parcels for a total of 4.69 miles. The public land parcels include an interpretive site overlooking a pristine historical landscape that conveys the same scenery viewed during the middle 19<sup>th</sup> century western migration. The reviewed section of Bridger Creek was part of the main route of the Oregon National Historic Trail and contains a number of well-preserved ruts that are considered the best in the area.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along the Bridger Creek unit that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A3 shows the public lands involved.

### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG COAL CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

#### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Coal Creek reviewed is 3.92 miles long. It begins in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 25 and ends in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 27; T. 28 N., R. 119 W. Within the segment of waterway, the creek flows through three public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Coal Creek through these public land parcels is 2.96 miles (approximately 75.5 percent of the waterway reviewed). The public land parcels provide good access to an important fishing area that attracts people from outside the area, as well as for hunting and primitive camping. The waterway segment provides important habitat for the Bonneville cutthroat trout, which is a Wyoming State sensitive species.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along Coal Creek that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A4 shows the public lands involved.

### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG DEMPSEY CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

#### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Dempsey Creek reviewed is 2.09 miles long. It begins in the center of section 30 and ends in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 33; T. 24 N., R. 117 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through two public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Dempsey Creek through these public land parcels is 1.24 miles (approximately 59.3 percent of the segment length reviewed). The public lands overlook a pristine historical

landscape that conveys western migration during the mid-19th century. The location of the best-preserved section of the Dempsey/Hockaday Trail, which is a shortcut of the Oregon/California National Historic Trail, is located along the reviewed waterway segment.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along Dempsey Creek that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A5 shows the public lands involved.

## **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG EMIGRANT CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Emigrant Creek reviewed is 6.45 miles long. It begins in the N½ of section 9, T. 23 N., R. 115 W. and ends in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 30, T. 23 N., R. 114 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through two public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Emigrant Creek through these public land parcels is 6.15 miles (approximately 95.3 percent of the segment length reviewed). The area is the location of the Slate Creek cutoff of the Emigrant National Historic Trail used from 1851 to the end of the Nineteenth Century. Emigrant inscriptions listed in the National Register of Historic Places, Emigrant caves, and campsites are also located on public lands. Current plans are underway to construct an interpretive site that overlooks the historic landscape and includes a large, scenic butte as a backdrop.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along Emigrant Creek that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A6 shows the public lands involved.

## **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG FONTENELLE CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Fontenelle Creek reviewed is 10.31 miles long. It begins in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 21, T. 25 N., R. 115 W. and ends in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>of section 2, T. 24 N., R. 115 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through five public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Fontenelle Creek through these public land parcels is 6.08 miles (approximately 59.0 percent of the segment length reviewed). These public land parcels run parallel, then cut through Absarko Ridge to a V-shaped valley and then through an impressive 1,500-foot cut at Fontenelle Gap. The creek is a destination fishing stream and the associated public lands are a popular hunting area.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along Fontenelle Creek that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A7 shows the public lands involved.

## **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG HAMS FORK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Hams Fork reviewed is 0.13 miles long. It begins below Kemmerer Reservoir in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 25 and ends in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 36, T. 23 N., R 117 W. Within this segment of waterway, the river flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Hams Fork through this public land parcel is 0.13 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway segment reviewed. The public lands include a popular fishing area that attracts anglers from outside the region. The fishing opportunities are unique as anglers are allowed year-round fishing due to the waterway segment not freezing over in the winter because it is located directly below a reservoir. This quality of the waterway also attracts a variety of water fowl and is thus a popular recreation area for duck hunters.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along Hams Fork that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A8 shows the public lands involved.

### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG HUFF CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Huff Creek reviewed is 7.12 miles long. It begins between the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 21 and the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 22, T. 27 N., R. 119 W. and ends in the center of section 27, T. 28 N., R. 119 W. Within this segment of waterway, Huff Creek flows through three public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. With the exceptions of the public lands directly associated with the roadway that exists alongside the creek, the review segment is located within the Raymond Mountain Wilderness Study Area (WSA). The length of Huff Creek through the three public land parcels is 6.02 miles (approximately 84.6 percent of the segment length reviewed). The public lands consist of a narrow river valley with spectacular views of the Sublette Mountain Range. The section of waterway reviewed is an important Bonneville cutthroat stream. The public lands also contain critical habitat for the endangered Canada lynx.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along Huff Creek that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A4 shows the public lands involved.

### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG PINE CREEK UNIT (INCLUDES PINE CREEK AND SHORT SEGMENTS OF TWO UNNAMED TRIBUTARIES) DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Pine Creek reviewed is 3.68 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 26 and ends in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 34; T. 25 N., R. 118 W. The segment of unnamed tributary is 1.38 miles long. It begins in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 3, T. 24 N., R. 118 W., and ends at its confluence with Pine Creek in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 35; T. 25 N., R. 118 W. The segment of Pine Creek flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of the creek through this public land parcel is 3.68 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway segment reviewed. The unnamed tributary flows through two public land parcels for a total of 1.32 miles, approximately 95.7 percent of the tributary segment length reviewed. The segment of Pine Creek reviewed has exceptionally clear water with a number of pools and cascades and flows through a spectacular canyon. The tributary consists of numerous cascades flowing down a densely forested hillside. Plant diversity within the entire waterway unit is exceptional and includes mountain maple, cottonwoods, and aspens that provide brilliant fall colors. Visitors are afforded easy access to the public lands via a paved country road (Pine Creek Road) and a dirt, BLM-managed road, both of which run adjacent to Pine Creek. The public lands offer year-round fishing as well as picnicking, camping, hiking, and hunting opportunities, and are adjacent to Pine Creek Ski Area which is managed by Lincoln County. The public lands within the ski area are leased to the county by BLM and include a small portion of the waterway corridor along the review segments of Pine Creek and the unnamed tributary. The public lands also contain critical habitat for the endangered Canada lynx.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the one public land parcel along Pine Creek and the two public land parcels along the unnamed tributary that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A9 shows the public lands involved.

**PUBLIC LANDS ALONG THE RAYMOND CREEK (INCLUDES RAYMOND CREEK, SOUTH FORK OF RAYMOND CREEK, TRAIL CREEK, COUGAR HOLLOW, YELLOW PINE, AND GREEN CANYON) DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

**Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of Raymond Creek reviewed is 4.10 miles long. It begins in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 28, T. 27 N., R. 119 W and ends in the N<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 6, T. 26 N., R. 119 W. The segment of the South Fork of Raymond Creek is 2.33 miles long. It begins in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 9 and ends at the confluence with Raymond Creek in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 6; T. 26 N., R. 119 W. The segment of Trail Creek is 1.43 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 34 and ends at the confluence with Raymond Creek in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 33; T. 27 N., R. 119 W. The segment of Cougar Hollow is 0.97 miles long. It begins in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 35 and ends at the confluence with Trail Creek in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 34; T. 27 N., R. 119 W. The segment of Yellow Pine is 1.39 miles long. It begins in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 3, T. 26 N., R. 119 W., and ends at the

confluence with Trail Creek in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 33, T. 27 N., R. 119 W. The segment of Green Canyon is 1.04 miles long. It begins in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 9 and ends at the confluence with Raymond Creek in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 9; T. 26 N., R. 119 W. All segments of the waterway unit reviewed flow through the Raymond Mountain WSA, which includes one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility requirements. The length of Raymond Creek through this public land parcel is 3.15 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway segment reviewed. The combined length of the various tributaries through this public land parcel is 7.16 miles. The public lands include a pristine canyon with colorful rock formations, faulting, and folding, with brilliant fall colors and views of the Sublette Mountain range. Visitors are provided opportunities for solitude and a variety of recreational activities, such as hiking, backpacking, horseback riding, hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing. The waterway unit provides important habitat for the Bonneville cutthroat trout. The genetically pure strain of the species was originally used as a brood stock by WGFD. The public lands also contain critical habitat for the endangered Canada lynx.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details of the public land parcel along the Raymond Creek unit that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A10 shows the public lands involved.

#### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG SLATE CREEK (SOUTH FORK) DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

##### **Segment of Waterway Reviewed**

The segment of South Fork of Slate Creek reviewed is 1.32 miles long. It begins in the N<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 7 and ends in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 8; T. 22 N., R. 114 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of the South Fork of Slate Creek through this public land parcel is 1.32 miles long, which is the entire length of the waterway reviewed. The public lands include a deep, narrow canyon with colorful geological features that is unique to the area. It is also the location of a benchmark cultural site which includes a stratified campsite that had 8,000 years of continuous use.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along the South Fork of Slate Creek that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A11 shows the public lands involved.

#### **PUBLIC LANDS ALONG THE SMITHS FORK RIVER UNIT (INCLUDES THE SMITH FORK RIVER AND SHORT TRIBUTARY SEGMENTS OF WEST AND DRY FORKS OF SMITHS FORK RIVER AND HOBBLE, PORCUPINE, AND TRESPASS CREEKS) DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.**

## Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Smiths Fork River reviewed is 14.79 miles long. It begins in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 3, T. 28 N., R. 118 W. and ends in the S<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 33, T. 27 N., R. 118 W. The segment of the West Fork of Smiths Fork River reviewed is 1.34 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 4 and ends at the confluence with Smiths Fork River in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 10; T. 28 N., R. 118 W. The segment of the Dry Fork of Smiths Fork River reviewed is 7.84 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 4 and ends at the confluence with Smiths Fork River in the SW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 33; T. 28 N., R. 118 W. The tributary segment of Hobble Creek reviewed is 1.21 miles long. It begins in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 34 and ends at the confluence with Smiths Fork River in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 33; T. 28 N., R. 118 W. The tributary segment of Porcupine Creek reviewed is 0.69 miles long. It begins in the NE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 27 and ends at the confluence with Smiths Fork River in the N<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> of section 27; T. 28 N., R. 118 W. The tributary segment of Trespass Creek reviewed is 0.97 miles long. It begins in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 3 and ends at the confluence with Smiths Fork River in the NW<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of section 10; T. 28 N., R. 118 W. Within this segment of the waterway unit reviewed, Smiths Fork River flows through seven public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility requirements. The length of the river through these public land parcels is 4.97 miles (approximately 33.6 percent of the waterway reviewed). The West Fork of Smiths Fork River and Porcupine and Trespass Creeks flow through one public land parcel each, while the Dry Fork of Smiths Fork River flows through four public land parcels and Hobble Creek flows through two public land parcels. Combined, the tributary sections flow through 7.84 miles of public lands (approximately 65.1 percent of the tributary segment lengths reviewed). The public lands include forested river and creek valleys with large willow bottoms and spectacular views of mountain peaks to the north. The entire area is known by anglers for its trophy brown trout and provides excellent camping and hunting opportunities. The entire waterway unit also provides important habitat for Bonneville cutthroat trout.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on each of the public land parcels along the Smith Fork River and associated tributaries that meet the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A12 shows the public lands involved.

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
1042 PI Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Albert Creek	Yes	None	No
Alkali Creek (Main, North Fork; <i>Humms Fork</i> )	Yes	None	No
Alkali Creek ( <i>Woodruff Narrows Reservoir</i> )	Yes	None	No
Antelope Creek ( <i>Byrnes Draw</i> )	Yes	None	No

**Table A1: Kemmerer Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary**

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
Antelope Creek ( <i>Boulder Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Aspen Creek	Yes	None	No
Austin Wash	Yes	None	No
Bartlett Creek	Yes	None	No
<b>Bear River</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Recreational, Wildlife</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Beaver Dam Creek	Yes	None	No
Beaver Creek (Main, West Fork)	Yes	None	No
Beaver Dam Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
Bel Creek	Yes	None	No
Big Dry Creek	Yes	None	No
<b>Blacks Fork River</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Recreational, Other-Ecological</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Blacks Fork River (Little West Fork)	Yes	None	No
Bloom Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
Boney Canyon	Yes	None	No
Bourne Creek	Yes	None	No
Box Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
<b>Bridger Creek unit (includes Bridger and North Bridger Creeks)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Historical</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Bruner Creek	Yes	None	No
Bullpen Creek	Yes	None	No
Byrne Creek	Yes	None	No
Cabin Creek	Yes	None	No
Camp Creek ( <i>Oyster Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Camp Creek ( <i>Kemmerer Reservoir</i> )	Yes	None	No
Carl Creek	Yes	None	No
Carter Creek	Yes	None	No
Cedar Creek	Yes	None	No
Chalk Creek	Yes	None	No
Chappel Creek	Yes	None	No
Chicken Creek	Yes	None	No
Claudia Creek	Yes	None	No
Clear Creek ( <i>East Muddy Creek</i> )	Yes	None	No
Clear Creek ( <i>Little Hogsback</i> )	Yes	None	No
Clear Creek ( <i>Fossil</i> )	Yes	None	No
Clear Creek (North Fork)	Yes	None	No
Cliff Creek	Yes	None	No

**Table A1: Kemmerer Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary**

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
Coal Branch Creek	Yes	None	No
Coal Creek (Thomas Fork)	No	None	No
<b>Coal Creek (US 89/Salt Creek)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Recreational, Fisheries</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Coal Creek (Main, East, Omega, Exclosure, Banoose and Anna Marie Forks <sup>1</sup> ; Smithsfork)	Yes	None	No
Collett Creek	Yes	None	No
Cook Canyon	Yes	None	No
Corral Creek	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek ( <i>Cottonwood Reservoir</i> )	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek ( <i>Cottonwood Bench</i> )	Yes	None	No
Cow Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
Coyote Creek	Yes	None	No
Craven Creek	Yes	None	No
Curmt Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
<b>Dempsey Creek</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Historical</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Dempsey Creek (North, South, & West Forks)	Yes	None	No
Diamond Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Dipper Creek	Yes	None	No
Dry Muddy Creek	Yes	None	No
Dry Wash	Yes	None	No
<b>Emigrant Creek</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Historical</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Erwine Creek	Yes	None	No
Evans Creek	Yes	None	No
Everly Creek	Yes	None	No
Felter Creek	Yes	None	No
Fenn Creek	Yes	None	No
First Creek	Yes	None	No
Fish Creek ( <i>Mumford Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Fish Creek ( <i>Naughton Reservoir</i> )	Yes	None	No
Fisher Creek	Yes	None	No
<b>Fontenelle Creek</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Recreational</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Fourth creek	Yes	None	No
Fowkes Canyon Creek (Main, North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Grade Canyon Creek	Yes	None	No
Groo Canyon	Yes	None	No
Hague Creek	No	None	No
<b>Hams Fork</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Recreational</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Table A1: Kemmerer Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary**

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
Hawkins Creek	Yes	None	No
Heard Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
Hershler Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Hill Creek	Yes	None	No
Hinshaw Creek	Yes	None	No
Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
Honey Creek	Yes	None	No
Hooper Creek	Yes	None	No
Horse Creek ( <i>Stoffer Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Horse Creek ( <i>Meeks Cabin Reservoir</i> )	Yes	None	No
Howland Creek	Yes	None	No
<b>Huff Creek</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Fisheries, Wildlife</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Jackson Creek	Yes	None	No
Jones Creek	Yes	None	No
LaChapelle Creek	Yes	None	No
Lake Creek	Yes	None	No
Leavitt Creek	Yes	None	No
Leeds Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Beaver Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Bryne Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Creek (Main, East Branch)	Yes	None	No
Little Dee Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Dry Creek ( <i>Flaming Gorge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Little Dry Creek ( <i>Crooked Canyon</i> )	Yes	None	No
Little Dry Fork	Yes	None	No
Little Muddy Creek (Main; North Fork; <i>Hogsback</i> )	Yes	None	No
Little Muddy Creek ( <i>Muddy Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Lost Creek	Yes	None	No
Mayfield Creek	Yes	None	No
Meadow Spring Wash	Yes	None	No
Meeks Creek	Yes	None	No
Mess o' Springs Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Mill Creek (Main, South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Moss Creek	Yes	None	No
Muddy Creek ( <i>Muddy Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Muddy Creek ( <i>Pomeroy Basin</i> )	Yes	None	No
Muddy Creek (Main)	Yes	None	No

**Table A1: Kemmerer Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary**

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
Musselman Creek	Yes	None	No
Nadine Creek <sup>1</sup> (Main, North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
North Chapel Creek	Yes	None	No
North Willow Creek	Yes	None	No
Nuggett Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Peggy Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Piedmont Creek	Yes	None	No
<b>Pine Creek unit (includes Pine Creek and one unnamed tributary to Pine Creek)</b>	Yes	Scenic, Recreational, Wildlife	Yes
Pine Hollow Creek (Main, North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Pleasant Valley Creek	Yes	None	No
Poison Creek	Yes	None	No
Pole Creek (East Fork)	Yes	None	No
Potato Creek	Yes	None	No
Preacher Hollow	Yes	None	No
Quakenasp Canyon Creek	Yes	None	No
Quarry Creek	Yes	None	No
Rachel Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
<b>Raymond Creek unit (includes Raymond and South Fork of Raymond Creeks, Trail Creek, Cougar Hollow, Yellow Pine, and Green Canyon)</b>	Yes	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, Wildlife	Yes
Red Canyon Creek	Yes	None	No
Red Eye Creek	Yes	None	No
Red Rock Fork	Yes	None	No
Reed Reservoir Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Road Hollow	Yes	None	No
Robertson Creek	Yes	None	No
Robinson Creek	Yes	None	No
Rock Creek ( <i>Bigelow Bench</i> )	Yes	None	No
Rock Creek ( <i>North Oyster Ridge</i> )	No	None	No
Rock Creek ( <i>Tump Range</i> )	Yes	None	No
Roney Creek	Yes	None	No
Ryan Creek	Yes	None	No
Rychman Creek	Yes	None	No
Sage Chicken Flat Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Sage Creek	Yes	None	No
Salt River	Yes	None	No

**Table A1: Kemmerer Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary**

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
Salt Creek ( <i>The Hogback</i> )	Yes	None	No
Salt Creek ( <i>US 89/Salt Canyon</i> )	Yes	None	No
Sawmill Creek	Yes	None	No
Second Creek	Yes	None	No
Section 27 Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Section 28 Creek <sup>1</sup>	Yes	None	No
Sevenmile Wash	Yes	None	No
Sheep Creek ( <i>South of Sullivan Hollow</i> )	Yes	None	No
Sheep Creek (Main; North, South, & Middle Forks ; <i>North of Bell Butte</i> )	Yes	None	No
Shurtleff Creek	Yes	None	No
Shute Creek (Main; South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Silver Springs Creek (Main, East Branch)	Yes	None	No
Sixmile Creek	Yes	None	No
Slate Creek (Main; North & Middle Forks)	Yes	None	No
<b>Slate Creek (South Fork)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Historical</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Sliderock Creek	Yes	None	No
Smallpox Creek	Yes	None	No
<b>Smiths Fork River (Main, West, &amp; Dry Forks of Smiths Fork River, Porcupine, and Trespass Creeks)</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries</b>	<b>Yes</b>
Snow Creek	Yes	None	No
Soda Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
South Lake Creek	Yes	None	No
Spider Creek	Yes	None	No
Spring Creek ( <i>Bear River Divide</i> )	Yes	None	No
Spring Creek ( <i>Poison Creek</i> )	Yes	None	No
Spring Creek ( <i>Cottonwood Hollow</i> )	Yes	None	No
Steep Creek 1	Yes	None	No
Stewart Creek	Yes	None	No
Stone Creek	Yes	None	No
Stoner Creek (Main, North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Stowe Creek	Yes	None	No
Sublette Creek (Main, South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Sulphur Creek	Yes	None	No
Third Creek	Yes	None	No
Three Mile Creek	Yes	None	No

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Free Flowing</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Eligible</i>
Trail Creek ( <i>Stoffer Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Trail Creek ( <i>Lake Naughton</i> )	Yes	None	No
Tuffield Creek (Main, South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Twin Creek (Main, North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Warfield Creek	Yes	None	No
Watercress Creek	Yes	None	No
West Beaver Creek	Yes	None	No
West Muddy Creek	Yes	None	No
West Willow Creek	Yes	None	No
Wheat Creek	Yes	None	No
Whitney Creek	Yes	None	No
Wilkinson Creek	Yes	None	No
Willow Creek ( <i>Sullivan Hollow</i> )	Yes	None	No
Willow Creek ( <i>Red Canyon</i> )	Yes	None	No
Willow Creek ( <i>Wasatch National Forest</i> )	Yes	None	No
Willow Creek ( <i>Oyster Ridge</i> )	Yes	None	No
Wyman Creek	Yes	None	No
Yellow Creek	Yes	None	No
Yellow Hollow Creek	Yes	None	No
Zieglers Wash	Yes	None	No

<sup>1</sup> Indicates names given to unnamed waterways by the BLM

<i>Name</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Phone Number</i>	<i>Resource Area</i>
Lilian Jonas	Jonas Consulting	928-774-6451	IDT Leader/Consultant
Patty Jonas	Jonas Consulting	928-634-9656	Technician
Wally Mierzejewski	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4508	Recreation/Scenic
Vernon Phinney	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-0518	Wildlife
Andy Pils	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4550	Wildlife
Michele Easley	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4524	NRS
Lynn Harrell	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4515	Archeology
Arlan Hiner	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4503	AFM-Resources
Gary McNaughton	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4509	Geology
John Henderson	BLM/Rock Springs FO	307-352-0220	Fisheries



## **ATTACHMENT B**

### **IDENTIFICATION AND TENTATIVE CLASSIFICATION OF BLM- ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN THE KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA DETERMINED TO MEET THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**

<b>Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria</b>						
<i>Public Land Parcel Number</i>	<i>Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels</i>	<i>Location of Public Land Parcel</i>	<i>Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel</i>	<i>Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands</i>	<i>Notes/Description</i>	<i>Tentative Classification</i>
<b>BEAR RIVER</b>						
1	1.16	Lower Woodruff Narrows; T. 18 N., R. 120 W., Sec. 20	End of waterway segment reviewed	Recreational and Wildlife Values	Popular fishing, camping, and eagle viewing area. Important winter roost habitat for bald eagles.	Scenic
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.16</b>			
<b>BLACKS FORK RIVER</b>						
1	1.52	T. 13 N., R 116 W., Sec. 18		Scenic, Recreational, and Ecological Values	Unique landscape with variety of vegetation. Important regional fishing area. Unique mix of plant species.	Recreational
2	0.25	T. 13 N., R 116 W., Sec. 6	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Ecological Values	Unique landscape with variety of vegetation. Important regional fishing area. Unique mix of plant species.	Scenic
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.77</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>2.95</b>			
<b>BRIDGER CREEK (part of Bridger Creek unit)</b>						
1	1.44	T. 19 N., R. 120 W., Sec. 1, 12		Scenic and Historical Values	Interpretive site overlooking pristine historical landscape. Main route of Oregon Trail with a number of well-preserved ruts.	Scenic
2	2.23	T. 20 N., R 120 W., Sec. 22, 26, 27, 35	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Historical Values	Interpretive site overlooking pristine historical landscape. Main route of Oregon Trail with a number of well-preserved ruts.	Scenic
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>4.76</b>			
<b>NORTH BRIDGER CREEK (part of Bridger Creek unit)</b>						
1	4.69	T. 20 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 17, 18; R. 120 W., Sec. 17, 18, 22, 23	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Historical Values	Interpretive site overlooking pristine historical landscape. Main route of Oregon Trail with a number of well-preserved ruts.	Scenic
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>4.69</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>4.69</b>			

<b>COAL CREEK</b>						
1	0.73	T. 28 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 25, 26	0.32	Recreational and Fisheries Values	Popular fishing area. Important Bonneville Cutthroat trout fisheries.	Recreational
2	1.92	T. 28 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 26, 27	0.64	Recreational and Fisheries Values	Popular fishing area. Important Bonneville Cutthroat trout fisheries.	Recreational
3	0.31	T. 28 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 27	End of waterway segment reviewed	Recreational and Fisheries Values	Popular fishing area. Important Bonneville Cutthroat trout fisheries.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>2.96</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>3.92</b>			
<b>DEMPSEY CREEK</b>						
1	0.53	T. 24 N., R. 117 W., Sec 29, 30	0.85	Scenic and Historical Values	Overlooks pristine historical landscape. Contains the best preserved section of the Dempsey/Hockaday Trail.	Scenic
2	0.71	T. 24 N., R. 117 W., Sec 29, 32, 33	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Historical Values	Overlooks pristine historical landscape. Contains the best preserved section of the Dempsey/Hockaday Trail.	Scenic
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>2.09</b>			
<b>EMIGRANT CREEK</b>						
1	2.97	T. 23 N., R. 115 W., Sec. 9, 10, 14	0.30	Scenic and Historical Values	Overlooks pristine historic landscape. Location of the Slate Creek cutoff of the Emigrant Trail, includes inscriptions and graves.	Scenic
2	3.18	T. 23 N., R. 115 W., Sec. 13, 14, 23, 24, 25; R. 114, Sec. 30.	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Historical Values	Overlooks pristine historic landscape. Location of the Slate Creek cutoff of the Emigrant Trail, includes inscriptions and graves.	
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>6.15</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>6.45</b>			

FONTENELLE CREEK						
1	0.16	T. 25N., R. 115 W., Sec. 21	0.25	Recreational Values	Destination fishing stream.	Scenic
2	1.11	T. 25N., R. 115 W., Sec. 21, 28	1.95	Recreational Values	Destination fishing stream.	Scenic
3	0.42	T. 25N., R. 115 W., Sec. 34; T. 24N., R. 115 W., Sec. 6	0.12	Recreational Values	Destination fishing stream.	Scenic
4	0.94	T. 24N., R. 115 W., Sec. 6	1.91	Recreational Values	Destination fishing stream.	Wild
5	3.45	Fontenelle Gap. T. 24N., R. 115 W., Sec. 2, 3, 4	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Recreational Values	Spectacular Canyon at Fontenelle Gap. Destination fishing stream.	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>6.08</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>10.31</b>			
HAMS FORK						
1	0.13	Below Kemmerer Res. T. 23 N., R. 117 W., Sec. 25, 36	End of waterway segment reviewed	Recreational Values	A important fishery that allows year-round fishing opportunities.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>0.13</b>			
HUFF CREEK						
1	2.34	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 27 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 21, 22	0.31	Scenic, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Narrow river valley with spectacular views. Important Bonneville cutthroat stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Recreational
2	0.53	Raymond Mnt WSA; T. 27 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 15	0.79	Scenic and Fisheries Values	Narrow river valley with spectacular views. Important Bonneville cutthroat stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Recreational
3	3.15	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 27 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 3, 10; T. 28 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 27, 34	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Fisheries Values	Narrow river valley with spectacular views. Important Bonneville cutthroat stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>6.02</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>7.12</b>			

<b>PINE CREEK</b> (part of Pine Creek unit)						
1	3.68	T. 25 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 26, 34, 35	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Wildlife Values	Spectacular canyon with exceptionally clear water and good plant diversity. Provides fishing, hiking, hunting, and camping opportunities. Canada lynx critical habitat	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>3.68</b>			
<b>UNNAMED TRIBUTARY</b> (part of Pine Creek unit)						
1	0.80	T. 24 N., R. 118 W., Sec 3, 4; T. 25 N., R. 118 W., Sec 35			Spectacular canyon with exceptionally clear water, cascades, good plant diversity. Provides hiking, hunting, and camping opportunities. Canada lynx critical habitat	Recreational
2	0.52	T. 25 N., R. 118 W., Sec 35	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Recreational Values	Spectacular canyon with exceptionally clear water, cascades, good plant diversity. Provides hiking, hunting, and camping opportunities. Canada lynx critical habitat	
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.38</b>			
<b>RAYMOND CREEK</b> (part of Raymond Creek unit)						
1	4.10	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 26 N., R. 119; W., Sec. 4, 5, 6; T. 27 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 28, 33	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Canyon with colorful formations, spectacular views and brilliant fall colors. Important recreational area for hiking, backpacking, hunting horsebackriding, fishing, and mountain climbing. Important Bonneville cutthroat trout stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>4.10</b>			
<b>RAYMOND CREEK (SOUTH FORK)</b> ; part of Raymond Creek unit)						
1	2.33	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 26 N., R. 119; W., Sec. 4, 9.	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Canyon with colorful formations, spectacular views and brilliant fall colors. Important recreational area for hiking, backpacking, hunting horsebackriding, fishing, and mountain climbing. Important Bonneville cutthroat trout stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>2.33</b>			

<b>COUGAR HOLLOW</b> (Part of Raymond Creek unit)						
1	0.97	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 27 N., R. 119; W., Sec. 34, 35	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Canyon with colorful formations, spectacular views and brilliant fall colors. Important recreational area for hiking, backpacking, hunting horseback riding, fishing, and mountain climbing. Important Bonneville cutthroat trout stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>0.97</b>			
<b>TRAIL CREEK</b> (Part of Raymond Creek unit)						
1	1.43	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 27 N., R. 119; W., Sec. 33, 34	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Canyon with colorful formations, spectacular views and brilliant fall colors. Important recreational area for hiking, backpacking, hunting horseback riding, fishing, and mountain climbing. Important Bonneville cutthroat trout stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.43</b>			
<b>YELLOW PINE</b> (part of Raymond Creek unit)						
1	1.39	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 26 N., R. 119; W., Sec. 3, 4, T. 27 N., R. 119 W., Sec. 33	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Canyon with colorful formations, spectacular views and brilliant fall colors. Important recreational area for hiking, backpacking, hunting horseback riding, fishing, and mountain climbing. Important Bonneville cutthroat trout stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.39</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.39</b>			
<b>GREEN CANYON</b> (Part of Raymond Creek unit)						
1	1.04	Raymond Mnt. WSA; T. 26 N., R. 119; W., Sec. 9	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Fisheries, and Wildlife Values	Canyon with colorful formations, spectacular views and brilliant fall colors. Important recreational area for hiking, backpacking, hunting horseback riding, fishing, and mountain climbing. Important Bonneville cutthroat trout stream. Canada lynx critical habitat	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.04</b>			

SLATE CREEK (SOUTH FORK)						
1	0.79	T. 22 N., R 114 W., Sec. 7, 8.	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Cultural Values	Deep, narrow canyon with colorful geological features. Benchmark site for prehistoric, stratified campsite.	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>0.79</b>			
SMITHS FORK RIVER (part of the Smiths Fork River unit)						
1	2.12	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 3, 10	1.29	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular peaks and views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Scenic
2	1.66	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 15, 22, 27	0.18	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
3	0.11	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 27	3.29	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
4	0.06	T. 27 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 4,	0.10	Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
5	0.52	T. 27 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 4, 9	1.58	Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
6	0.38	T. 27 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 16, 21	3.38	Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
7	0.12	T. 27 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 33	End of waterway segment reviewed	Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>4.97</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>14.79</b>			

<b>SMITHS FORK RIVER (WEST FORK;</b> part of the Smiths Fork River unit)						
1	1.34	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 4, 9, 10	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.34</b>			
<b>SMITHS FORK RIVER (DRY FORK;</b> part of the Smiths Fork River unit)						
1	3.69	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 4, 9, 16	0.44	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
2	0.16	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 16	1.19	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
3	0.33	T. 27 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 21, 28	1.93	Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
4	0.10	T. 27 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 33	End of waterway segment reviewed	Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities. Important Bonneville Cutthroat stream.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>4.28</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>7.84</b>			
<b>HOBBLE CREEK</b> (part of the Smiths Fork River unit)						
1	0.07	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 34	0.65	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities.	Recreational
2	0.49	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 33	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>1.21</b>			

<b>PORCUPINE CREEK</b> (part of the Smiths Fork River unit)						
1	0.69	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 27	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities.	Recreational
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>0.69</b>			
<b>TRESPASS CREEK</b> (part of the Smiths Fork River unit)						
1	0.97	T. 28 N., R. 118 W., Sec. 3, 10	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Fisheries Values	Forested river valley with large willow bottom and spectacular views of peaks to the north. Trophy brown trout waters with camping and hunting opportunities.	Wild
<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed</b>	<b>0.97</b>			

**ATTACHMENT C**

**WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW:  
KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA**

## **WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW: KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA**

Of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-administered public land surfaces (public lands) along the 13 waterways or waterway units in the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan (RMP) planning area determined to meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) eligibility criteria (see Table C1), public lands along eleven were found not to meet the suitability factors and were dropped from further consideration. Public lands along one waterway (Huff Creek) and one waterway unit (Raymond Creek unit) were found to meet the suitability factors. Summaries of the suitability determinations of all 13 waterways or waterway units are presented below in Section II.

### **I. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT DURING THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW.**

On March 20, 2002, BLM planning team members for the RMP made preliminary WSR suitability determinations for public lands along waterways within the Kemmerer RMP planning area determined eligible for WSR designation. Table C2 provides the names and contact information for those individuals who attended the WSR suitability review in the Kemmerer Field Office on that date. At this time, these determinations have not been submitted to the public for review. The public will have the opportunity to comment on the suitability review results during the normal scoping process and throughout the environmental analysis and planning process for the Kemmerer RMP planning effort. Any comments made by the public concerning the determinations made in this review will be taken into consideration and documented in the RMP planning process. This WSR suitability review may be modified if deemed necessary as a result of public comment.

### **II. RESULTS OF THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW OF PUBLIC LANDS ALONG WATERWAYS IN THE KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA.**

#### **Bear River**

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Bear River review segment does not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.
- C The BLM would be unable to manage the small amount of public lands involved (1.04 miles along the review segment) in the context of a WSR. By itself, designating the short segment of Bear River through public lands would not be a sufficient means to protect the recreational and wildlife values.
- C A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified recreational and wildlife values. A WSR designation would provide no foreseeable additional protection.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Blacks Fork River**

It was determined that the two public land parcels along the Blacks Fork River review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.
- C The BLM would be unable to manage the small amount of public lands involved (0.77 miles along the review segment) in the context of a WSR. By itself, designating the short segment of Blacks Fork River through public lands would not be a sufficient means to protect the scenic, recreational, and ecological values.
- C The BLM would be unable to manage the public lands involved in the context of a WSR because of the interspersed parcels of private land. Only 37 percent of the total length of the waterway segment reviewed flows through public lands.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Bridger Creek unit (includes Bridger Creek and North Bridger Creek)**

It was determined that the two public land parcels along the Bridger Creek unit review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C Potential use conflicts exist on both private and public lands within the review segment which could be incompatible with inclusion in the NWSRS. For instance, there is a reasonably foreseeable potential for development of oil and gas leases which could come into conflict with a WSR designation.
- C A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified scenic and historic values. A WSR designation would provide no foreseeable additional protection.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Coal Creek**

It was determined that the three public land parcels along the Coal Creek review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.

- C A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified recreational and fishery values. A WSR designation would provide no foreseeable additional protection.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Dempsey Creek**

It was determined that the two public land parcels along the Dempsey Creek review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The potential exists for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.
- C Potential use conflicts exist on both private and public lands within the review segment corridor which could be incompatible with inclusion in the NWSRS. For instance, there is a reasonably foreseeable potential for development of oil and gas leases which could come into conflict with a WSR designation.
- C A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified recreational and fishery values. A WSR designation would provide no foreseeable additional protection.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Emigrant Creek**

It was determined that the two public land parcels along the Emigrant Creek review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified recreational and fishery values. A WSR designation would provide no foreseeable additional protection.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Fontenelle Creek**

It was determined that the five public land parcels along the Fontenelle Creek review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.
- C The BLM would be unable to manage the public lands involved in context of a WSR because of the interspersed parcels of private land. Only 59.0 percent of the total length of the waterway segment reviewed flows through public lands.

The BLM is currently negotiating a land trade with the owner of the section of private land located between the two downstream segments of Fontenelle Creek. If the land trade is successful and a change in land ownership occurs, the length of the downstream segment of Fontenelle Creek through public lands would be sufficient to support a suitability determination. The BLM would then amend this WSR review report and, if appropriate, the Kemmerer RMP to include the downstream segment of Fontenelle Creek as suitable. Until then, the land and resource values on public lands along Fontenelle Creek can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Hams Fork**

It was determined that the one public land parcel along Hams Fork does not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The public lands involved do not constitute a worthy addition to the NWSRS. After careful review, it was determined that the existing development (e.g., power lines) along the review segment of Hams Fork and the amount of traffic in the area distracts from the recreational qualities, making the available recreational opportunities not unique enough to warrant the review segment eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS.
- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.
- C The BLM would be unable to manage the small amount of public lands involved (0.33 miles along the review segment) in the context of a WSR. By itself, designating the short segment of Hams Fork through public lands would not be a sufficient means to protect the recreational values.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

### **Huff Creek**

It was determined that the three public land parcels along the Huff Creek review segment meet the WSR suitability factors and should be managed to maintain or enhance their outstandingly remarkable values for any possible future consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. This suitability determination is based on the unique qualities of the public land resources and their regional and national significance, making them worthy of future consideration for addition to the NWSRS.

The outstanding scenic, fishery, and wildlife values associated with the public lands involved make this a uniquely diverse waterway segment in the region. Within the review segment, the scenic qualities are of particular high value as the public lands involved offer spectacular views of the Sublette Mountain Range from a pristine river valley. The fishery and wildlife values are also

of significance as the reviewed segment is an important Bonneville Cutthroat trout stream and the public lands within the waterway corridor include critical habitat for the threatened Canada lynx.

Making up more than 84.6 percent of the lands along the review segment, the public lands are manageable by the BLM under the provisions of the WSR Act. Other factors that compliment and enhance this manageability include (1) the public lands are located either within or adjacent to the Raymond Mountain WSA and thus are currently managed in a fashion compatible with a WSA designation; (2) there are no anticipated conflicts with the management objectives on the small amount of state and private lands separating the review segments; and (3) there are no incompatible upstream uses as the review segment includes the headwaters of Huff Creek. The BLM planning team does recognize the need to acquire public access through a small segment of private land at the mouth of Huff Creek. Apart from this, the BLM planning team did not identify any significant factors that would prevent the management of the reviewed waterway segments as part of the NWSRS.

#### **Pine Creek unit (includes Pine Creek and one unnamed tributary)**

It was determined that the one public land parcel along Pine Creek and the two public land parcels along the unnamed tributary within the Pine Creek unit review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C Potential use conflicts exist on both state and public lands within the review segment corridor which could be incompatible with inclusion in the NWSRS. For instance, reasonable foreseeable future maintenance, improvement and/or expansion activities related to the Pine Creek Ski Area may be impeded if the public lands are included in the NWSRS. A designation would also prevent any land disposal actions also related to the ski area that may be pursued in the future.
- C The potential exists for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream private and/or state lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions.
- C A WSR designation is or inappropriate as other mechanisms (e.g., an ACEC) would more effectively protect identified scenic, recreational, and wildlife values.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained

yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

**Raymond Creek unit (includes Raymond Creek and South Fork of Raymond Creek, Trail Creek, Cougar Hollow, Yellow Pine, and Green Canyon)**

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Raymond Creek unit review segment meets the WSR suitability factors and should be managed to maintain or enhance its outstandingly remarkable values for any possible future consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. This suitable determination is based on the unique qualities of the public land resources and their regional and national significance, making them worthy of any future consideration for addition to the NWSRS.

The outstanding scenic, recreational, fishery, and wildlife values associated with the public lands involved make this a uniquely diverse waterway unit in the region. Within the review segment, the scenic qualities are of particular high value as the public land involved include colorful canyons with unique rock formations and spectacular views of the Sublette Mountain Range. The public lands are part of a nationally recognized recreation area as they offer opportunities for backpacking, hiking, horseback riding and hunting in a pristine and remote area. WGFD considers that the review waterway unit contains the best genetically “pure” strain of Bonneville cutthroat trout in the area. The wildlife values are also of significance as the public lands within the waterway corridor include critical habitat for the threatened Canada lynx.

Making up 100 percent of the lands along the review segment, the public lands are manageable by the BLM under the provisions of the WSR Act. Other factors that compliment and enhance this manageability include (1) the public lands are located within the Raymond Mountain WSA and thus are currently managed in a fashion compatible with a WSA designation; (2) there are no incompatible upstream uses as the review segment includes the headwaters of Raymond Creek and the entire length of the associated tributaries; and (3) the BLM planning team did not identify any obstacles that would prevent the management of the reviewed waterway segments as part of the NWSRS.

**Slate Creek (South Fork)**

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the South Fork of Slate Creek does not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following

- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could

come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.

- C The BLM would be unable to manage the small amount of public lands involved (1.32 miles along the review segment) in the context of a WSR.
- C A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified scenic and cultural values. A WSR designation would provide no foreseeable additional protection.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

**Smiths Fork River unit (includes Smiths Fork River, West Fork and Dry Fork of Smiths Fork River, and Hobble, Porcupine and Trespass Creeks)**

It was determined that the seven public land parcels along the Smiths Fork River unit review segment do not meet the WSR suitability factors and will be given no further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The non-suitable determination is based on the following:

- C The potential for activities to occur on the adjacent, upstream, and/or downstream state and private lands that BLM has no jurisdiction or control over. Such activities could come into conflict with WSR management prescriptions. For instance, there exists the potential for development on upstream private lands that could impact water quality, which would be incompatible with a WSR designation.
- C The BLM would be unable to manage the public lands involved in context of a WSR because of the interspersed parcels of private land. Only 47.7 percent of the total length all segments within the reviewed waterway unit flows through public lands.
- C While there is a relatively long stretch of continuous public lands along the upper section of the review segment, these public lands, by themselves, do not constitute a worthy addition to the NWSRS as they do not support the scenic, recreational, and fishery values.

The land and resource values on public lands involved can and will continue to be appropriately managed under all other applicable BLM mandates and regulations for multiple use, sustained

yield, and environmental integrity and should suffer no adverse effects for lack of a WSR designation.

<i>Waterway Reviewed</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>Justification</i>
<b>Bear River</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability, WSR designation is inappropriate
<b>Blacks Fork River</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability
<b>Bridger Creek</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; potential use conflicts; manageability
<b>Coal Creek</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability; WSR designation is inappropriate
<b>Dempsey Creek</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; potential use conflicts; manageability; WSR designation is inappropriate
<b>Emigrant Creek</b>	Public lands not suitable	WSR designation is inappropriate
<b>Fontenelle Creek</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability
<b>Hams Fork</b>	Public lands not suitable	Not a worthy addition to NWSRS; land ownership conflicts; manageability
<b>Huff Creek</b>	Public lands suitable	Scenic, fisheries, and wildlife values; unique land and resource diversity
<b>Pine Creek</b> (includes one unnamed tributary)	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; potential use conflicts; manageability; WSR designation is inappropriate
<b>Raymond Creek</b> (includes South Fork of Raymond Creek, Trail Creek, Cougar Hollow, Yellow Pine, and Green Canyon)	Public lands suitable	Scenic, recreational, fisheries and wildlife values; unique land and resource diversity
<b>Slate Creek</b>	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability
<b>Smiths Fork River</b> (includes Dry and West Fork of Smiths Fork River and Hobble, Porcupine, and Trespass Creeks)	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability

<i>Name</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Phone Number</i>	<i>Resource Area</i>
Lilian Jonas	Jonas Consulting	928-774-6451	IDT Leader/Consultant
Wally Mierzejewski	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4508	Recreation/Scenic
Jerry Pierce	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4525	Range
Andy Pils	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4550	Wildlife
Mike Mischloney	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4523	Range
Lynn Harrell	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4515	Archeology
Arlan Hiner	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4503	AFM-Resources

Jeff Rawson	BLM/Kemmerer FO	307-828-4502	Field Manager
-------------	-----------------	--------------	---------------

**ATTACHMENT D**

**MANAGEMENT OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS  
WITHIN THE KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
PLANNING AREA THAT MEET THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS  
SUITABILITY FACTORS**

## **MANAGEMENT OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN THE KEMMERER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA THAT MEET THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY FACTORS**

The interim management prescriptions described in this document are meant to provide temporary or interim protection of the Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) values on suitable waterway areas prior to the completion of the Kemmerer Resource Management Plan (RMP). Included are management objectives, management actions, and appropriate allocations of land and resource uses that will maintain the outstandingly remarkable values and tentative classifications identified for Huff Creek and the Raymond Creek unit. Pursuant to the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) of 1968, as amended, until the public reviews are completed and final decisions are made on the WSR eligibility and suitability determinations, no uses of the reviewed Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-administered public land surfaces (public lands) will be authorized which could impair any outstandingly remarkable values they may contain, or would otherwise reduce or destroy their potential eligibility classification or suitability for consideration for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS).

### **I. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS REVIEW PROCESS**

In conducting the WSR review process, application of the WSR eligibility criteria, determining the tentative WSR classifications, and the application of the WSR suitability factors, focused on the public lands within a one-half mile wide corridor along the reviewed river segments (i.e., approximately one quarter mile wide along each bank of the waterway along the length of the review segment). The public lands within and adjacent to these corridors will be considered in future site specific, activity or management implementation planning to fulfill the stated management objective.

The public lands along the reviewed segments of Huff Creek and the Raymond Creek unit were found to meet the WSR suitability factors to be given further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The public lands along the reviewed segments of Blacks Fork, Hams Fork, and Bear Rivers; Coal, Dempsey, Emigrant, Fontenelle, and Slate Creeks; and the Bridger Creek, Pine Creek, and Smiths Fork River units do not meet the WSR suitability factors. This determination is based upon the public lands involved not containing characteristics which made them worthy additions to the NWSRS; the public being land-locked by private lands and inaccessible to the public, and the unlikelihood of obtaining public access to the public lands via private property; the potential use conflicts along the review segments (i.e., oil and natural gas drilling and development, ski area expansion) that could occur if the public lands are included in the NWSRS; and/or the public lands not being manageable as part of the NWSRS because of potential

management conflicts with interspersed (up and downstream) and adjacent private lands.

.

## **II. MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE**

The management objective for the public lands that meet the WSR suitability factors is to maintain or enhance their outstandingly remarkable values and WSR classification, until Congress considers them for possible designation. The interim management prescriptions for suitable waterways in the Kemmerer RMP planning area apply only to the waterway corridor which extends the length of the identified waterway segment and includes the waterway area, its immediate environment, and an average of no more than one quarter mile (1,320 feet) from the ordinary high water mark on both sides of the waterway. This boundary is preliminary and, by Section 3(b) of the WSRA, may vary on either side of the waterway and be narrower or wider as long as the total corridor width averages no more than 320 acres (half of a mile or 2,640 feet wide) per river mile, and can be delineated by legally identifiable lines (e.g., survey or property lines) or some form of on-the-ground physical feature (e.g., canyon rims, roads, etc.) which provide the basis for protecting the waterway's outstandingly remarkable values. Final boundary delineation will be made if and when Congress decides to designate the waterway segments under review

### **Huff Creek**

Three public land parcels along Huff Creek (involving 6.02 miles of the creek) were found to meet the WSR suitability factors to be given further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. The public lands along all 6.02 miles are tentatively classified as scenic.

Interim management practices for the three public land parcels along Huff Creek meeting the scenic classification (involving 6.02 miles along the creek) will focus on maintaining or enhancing the outstandingly remarkable scenic, fishery, and wildlife values and the relatively unmodified character of the area in a near-natural setting. Any activities that would conflict with this objective and any physical or visual intrusions on the public lands involved are prohibited. Some intrusions on the public lands involved may be allowed if they are not readily evident or are short lived, and do not adversely affect maintaining the scenic classification.

Temporary cultural and paleontology activities (e.g., recordation, sampling, testing, stabilization, rehabilitation, and reconstruction) may be allowed on the public lands, if the outstandingly remarkable values are maintained and if no permanent adverse impacts would occur to either the public lands directly involved or any other lands within or adjacent to the corridor.

The public lands are within the Raymond ACEC and thus closed to mineral leasing and related exploration and development activities. There are currently no existing leases within the

waterway corridor. The public lands are withdrawn from land disposal, mineral location, and entry under the land laws. Valid existing rights (existing mining claims) will be recognized and subject to existing (e.g., 43 CFR 3809) regulations. The public lands are closed to recreational dredging for minerals, such as gold, and to mineral material sales.

Geophysical exploration is allowed if a site specific analysis determines no adverse effects will occur. Vehicles will be restricted to existing roads and trails only. Foot access is required off of existing roads. Surface charges may be allowed if site specific analysis determine no permanent adverse impacts would occur.

The public lands will be closed to most surface disturbing activities such as construction of rights-of-way, mineral development, most types of recreation site development, and wildlife habitat and range improvements. Some recreation developments and wildlife and range improvements may be allowed on the public lands so long as there are no substantial adverse effects to the natural-like appearance of the lands within the waterway corridor and their immediate environment. Hiking trails may be built if there is a demand for them and they conform with the objective for the scenic classification.

The public lands will be closed to land disposal actions. Exchanges of public lands “outside the corridor” could be considered for acquiring private or state lands within the corridor or between the public land parcels along the creek; however, public lands within the corridor will not be exchanged.

The public lands are within a right-of-way avoidance area where transmission lines, natural gas lines, water lines, etc., will be allowed only under certain circumstances.

Water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities will be prohibited on public lands.

Motorized and non-motorized vehicles are restricted to using designated roads and trails. Mountain biking is allowed on designated roads to the extent that no adverse effects occur. Hikers will be required to "pack it out"; there will be no garbage facilities.

Management and suppression of fires within the waterway corridor will be carried out in a manner compatible with contiguous Federal lands. On wildfires, suppression methods will be used that minimize long-term impacts on the waterway and waterway area. Presuppression and prevention activities will be conducted in a manner which reflects management objectives for a scenic waterway area. Prescribed fires may be used to maintain or restore ecological condition.

The public lands are closed to commercial timber sales or harvesting. Cutting of trees may be allowed with written permission or in association with safety and environmental protection requirements (such as clearing trails, visitor safety, hazardous fuels reduction and fire suppression activities).

Increases in active grazing preferences on public lands will be prohibited. Range improvements will only be allowed if they are compatible with objectives for the scenic river classification.

The public lands will be closed to vegetation treatment or manipulation by other than hand or aerial seeding methods using species that will restore natural vegetation. Undesirable and exotic species could be removed by hand or through backpack/hand application of appropriate herbicides.

The public lands are managed under a Class II Visual Resource Management (VRM) classification.

**Raymond Creek Unit (Includes Raymond Creek, South Fork of Raymond Creek, Trail Creek, Cougar Hollow, Yellow Pine, and Green Canyon)**

One public land parcel along the Raymond Creek unit (involving 4.10 miles along Raymond Creek, 2.33 miles along South Fork of Raymond Creek, 0.97 miles along Cougar Hollow, 1.43 miles along rail Creek, 1.39 miles along Yellow Pine, and 1.04 miles along Green Canyon) was found to meet the WSR suitability factors to be given further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. All of the public lands within the Raymond Creek unit are tentatively classified as wild.

Interim management practices for the one public land parcel along Raymond Creek unit meeting the wild will focus on maintaining or enhancing the outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, fishery, and wildlife values and maintaining the relatively primitive, pristine, rugged, and unaltered character of the area. Any activities that would conflict with this objective and any physical or visual intrusions on the public lands involved are prohibited.

Temporary cultural and paleontology activities (e.g., recordation, sampling, testing, stabilization, rehabilitation, and reconstruction) may be allowed on the public lands, if the outstandingly remarkable values are maintained and if no permanent adverse impacts would occur to either the public lands directly involved or any other lands within or adjacent to the corridor.

The public lands are within the Raymond ACEC and thus closed to mineral leasing and related exploration and development activities. There are currently no existing leases within the waterway corridor. The public lands are withdrawn from land disposal, mineral location, and entry under the land laws. Valid existing rights (existing mining claims) will be recognized and subject to existing (e.g., 43 CFR 3809) regulations. The public lands are closed to recreational dredging for minerals, such as gold, and to mineral material sales.

Geophysical exploration is limited to foot access and use of surface cables on the public lands (use of motorized or non-motorized vehicles is prohibited). Surface charges may be allowed if site specific analysis determine no permanent adverse impacts would occur.

The public lands are closed to surface disturbing activities such as construction of major recreation developments (e.g., campgrounds, put-in or take-out areas, or other such facilities), wildlife habitat improvements, range improvements, rights-of-way, mineral development, etc. Hiking trails may be built, "by hand labor," if there is a demand for them and they conform with the objective for wild classification. Some minor recreation developments (e.g., signs, kiosks) may be allowed on the public lands so long as there are no substantial adverse effects to the natural-like appearance of the lands within the waterway corridor and their immediate environment.

The public lands are closed to land disposal actions.

The public lands will be in an exclusion area for rights-of-way. No new rights-of-way or expansions of existing rights-of-way will be approved.

Water impoundments, diversions, or hydroelectric power facilities are prohibited on public lands.

The public lands are closed to motorized and non-motorized vehicles. Hikers will be required to "pack it out"; there will be no garbage collection facilities.

Management and suppression of fires within the waterway corridor will be carried out in a manner compatible with contiguous Federal lands. On wildfires, suppression methods will be used that minimize long-term impacts on the waterway and waterway area. Presuppression and prevention activities will be conducted in a manner which reflects management objectives for a wild waterway area. Prescribed fires may be used to maintain or restore ecological condition.

The public lands are closed to commercial timber sales or harvesting. Cutting of trees may be allowed with written permission or in association with safety and environmental protection

requirements (such as clearing trails, visitor safety, hazardous fuels reduction and fire suppression activities).

Increases in active grazing preferences and construction of new range improvements on public lands will be prohibited.

The public lands will be closed to vegetation treatment or manipulation by other than hand or aerial seeding methods using species that will restore natural vegetation. Undesirable and exotic species could be removed by hand or through backpack/hand application of appropriate herbicides.

The public lands are managed under a Class II Visual Resource Management (VRM) classification.