FORM 1

Documentation of BLM Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Findings from Previous Inventory on Record

1. Is there existing BLM wilderness inventory information on all or part of this area?

No ☒ (go to Form 2) **Yes** ☐ (If yes, and if more than one area is within the area, list the unique identifiers of those areas):

a) Inventory Source: N/A

b) Inventory Area Name(s)/Number(s): N/A

c) Map Name(s)/Number(s): N/A

d) BLM District(s)/Field Office(s): N/A

2. BLM Inventory Finds on Record:

Existing inventory information regarding wilderness characteristics (if more than one BLM inventory area is associated with the area, list each area and answer each question individually for each inventory area):
Inventory Source: N/A

Area #/Name	Sufficient Size? Yes/No (acres)	Naturalness? Yes/No	Outstanding Solitude? Yes/No	Outstanding Primitive & Unconfined Recreation? Yes/No	Supplemental Values? Yes/No

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conducting Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

FORM 2

Current Conditions: Presence or Absence of Wilderness Characteristics

Area Number/Name: Little Snake Unit 353	Acreage: 6,323 acres

(1) Is the area of sufficient size? (If the area meets one of the exceptions to the size criterion, check "Yes" and describe the exception in the space provided below)

Yes ☒ No ☐

Note: If "No" is checked the area does not have wilderness characteristics; check "NA" for the remaining questions below.

Description (describe the boundaries of the area—wilderness inventory roads, property lines, etc.):
Boundaries for this unit are defined by maintained Moffat County Roads. The southern boundary is Moffat County Road 66; the northern and eastern boundaries are Moffat County 66N; and the western boundary is Moffat County Road 75S. Adjacent to the southern boundary is a designated Wilderness Study Area. Out of seven routes surveyed, none were found to meet the definition of a Wilderness Inventory Road.

(2) Does the area appear to be natural?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Note: If "No" is checked the area does not have wilderness characteristics; check "NA" for the remaining questions below.

Description (include land ownership, location, topography, vegetation, and summary of major human uses/activities):

This unit is located north of the town of Sunbeam, adjacent and west of the Little Snake River in Township 9 North, Range 96 and 97 West; and Township 10 North, Range 97 West (Ute Meridian).

The unit is dominated by a high relief, north/south trending ridge on the west side of the unit that steps down in a series of large, flat plateaus down to a dominantly east/west ravine, tributary to the Little Snake River. The land is BLM-owned. Vegetation cover on the high elevations is pinyon-juniper forest. Intermediate slopes and plateau steps are dominated by sage. Lowlands and flat areas have sage and mixed medium grasses for cover. The north end of the unit shows possible historic use for farming and/or ranching. Disused range improvements and signs of land

clearing were observed. Many old, reclaimed tow-track routes criss-cross across the north. A capped well immediately outside of the unit was dated 1940, which may be indicative of the year(s) this land was occupied and actively used.

(3) Does the area (or the remainder of the area if a portion has been excluded due to unnaturalness and the remainder is of sufficient size) have outstanding opportunities for solitude?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Description (describe the area's outstanding opportunities for solitude):
On the west boundary, the pinyon-juniper forest is a dense curtain that seems to shield the highlands from the outside influence. Across the unit, the large stepping elevation changes seem to isolate one plateau from another both visibly and audibly. The deep canyons are extremely visually-segregated from the rest of the unit. There are no current manmade land uses on this unit or on immediately adjacent units (other than recreation), adding to the extreme quiet and sense of solitude.

(4) Does the area (or the remainder of the area if a portion has been excluded due to unnaturalness and the remainder is of sufficient size) have outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Note: If "No" is checked for both 3 and 4 the area does not have wilderness characteristics; check "NA" for question 5.

Description (describe the area's outstanding opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation):
Although only one concentrated use site was observed, the area's unique topography and high relief offer a plethora of opportunities for camping, hiking, and hunting.

(5) Does the area have supplemental values (ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational scenic or historical value)?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Description:
Unique topography and high relief combine with resistance, cliff-forming rock units to create spectacular visual appeal. Also, the vastness and beauty of the surrounding areas outside the unit, but visible from the high hills, is significant.

Summary of Analysis

Area Name and/or Number: Little Snake Unit 353

Summary
(Note: explain the inventory findings for the entirety of the inventory unit. When wilderness characteristics have been identified in an area that is smaller than the size of the total inventory unit, explain why certain portions of the inventory unit are not included within the lands with wilderness characteristics (e.g. the inventory found that certain parts lacked naturalness).

Results of analysis:

The unit is dominated by a high relief, north/south trending ridge on the west side of the unit that steps down in a series of large, flat plateaus down to a dominantly east/west ravine, tributary to the Little Snake River. The north end of the unit shows possible historic use for farming and/or ranching. A capped well immediately outside of the unit was dated 1940, which may be indicative of the year(s) this land was occupied and actively used.

Although only one concentrated use site was observed, the area's unique topography and high relief offer a plethora of opportunities for camping, hiking, and hunting. Dense pinyon-juniper forest acts as a curtain that seems to shield the highlands from the outside influence. Across the unit, the large stepping elevation changes seem to isolate one plateau from another both visibly and audibly. The deep canyons are extremely visually-segregated from the rest of the unit. There are no current manmade land uses on this unit or on immediately adjacent units (other than recreation), adding to the extreme quiet and sense of solitude.

1. Does the area meet any of the size requirements? ☒ Yes ☐ No

2. Does the area appear to be natural? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

3. Does the area offer outstanding opportunities of solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

4. Does the area have supplemental values? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Check one:

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conducting Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

☒ The area, or a portion of the area, has wilderness characteristics and is identified as Land with Wilderness Characteristics (LWC).

☐ The area does not have wilderness characteristics.

Prepared by (team members):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

(Name, Title, Date)

Reviewed by (District of Field Manager):

Name: **Title:**

Date:

Field Office: Little Snake
Unit: 353

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 01

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: Route extends northeast from junction of Moffat County Road 75S (boundary road) and Moffat County 75E. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: The original purpose is unknown, but it currently could be used to access the area for recreational purposes including hunting, camping, and wildlife observation. It is not used regularly, as no tire tracks were observed.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown ☐

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?
Yes ☒ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☐ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☒ No ☐

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☒ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☐ Other ☒

Describe: Route appears to have been bladed at some point and vegetation has been removed. Pinyon-juniper was removed to create a path down the slope.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: No evidence of mechanical maintenance; route is highly eroded and on a steep slope.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: Route was in poor condition after the first 100 feet. The bulk of this route has been naturally reclaimed.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

No tire tracks were observed; no observation of foot traffic either. The route was in poor condition after the first 100 feet. There was no evidence that the route is used in a regular or continuous manner.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 02

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: Route branches east/northeast off of Moffat County Road 75S at the south end of the unit. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: The southern 50 feet of this route is currently used to access a concentrated use site. The route appears to continue on past this site, without signs of current use, and with significantly degraded quality. There were no observed current uses of this route past the campsite.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown ☒

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?
Yes ☒ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☐ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☒ No ☐

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☐ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☒ Other ☒

Describe: This route where it descends a steep hill was cut into the hillside, and there are signs of vegetation and rock removal to facilitate access.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: Route is washed out and impassable by vehicle. No evidence of current maintenance observed.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: The bulk of this route is 90% naturally reclaimed and eroded. The route has no practical purpose, and major earth work would be required to repair this route.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

The first (south) 50 feet of this route leads to a concentrated use site with a fire pit. No tire tracks were observed, so this section is likely currently used rarely, possibly one time per year. The bulk of this route is impassable by pickup truck and no tire tracks were observed. The bulk of this route has probably not been used for many (greater than 20) years.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 03

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: Two-track route branches off of Moffat County Road 75S (boundary road) and heads north, then turns west. Route is located in the southwest portion of the unit. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: Current use is most likely recreation. Original use is unknown, but due to the straight nature of the route, it could have been used in petroleum exploration many years ago (greater than 20). No evidence of recent use observed.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown ☒

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?
Yes ☒ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☐ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☒ No ☐

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☒ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☐ Other ☒

Describe: Sparse vegetation in the middle of the two-track route, and pinyon-juniper trees had been removed at some point creating a clear path through a grove of trees.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: No evidence of maintenance observed; route is only passable unit the top of the slope (approximately 200 feet), then becomes impassable due to erosion and vegetation.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: The bulk of the route has been reclaimed by nature. The bladed area has vegetation growing back. There is no practical purpose other than recreation, and much would need to be done to make it drivable.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and

other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

No evidence of regular or continuous use observed. No tire tracks or foot traffic seen.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 04

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: This route runs approximately east/west and extends outside of the unit. The route crosses Moffat County Road 75S and enters the unit on the central, west side. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: There is no observed current practical purpose for this route. The route may be used for recreational purposes and access to wilderness.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown ☒

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?
Yes ☐ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☐ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of mechanical construction; route is a two-track through sage brush, with sage brush growing between the tire ruts. No evidence of blading/sage removal.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: No evidence of mechanical maintenance.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: Route serves no current practical purpose, and there are other nearby routes available for passage.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

Tire ruts and slight indentations were observed, but no clear, recent racks. This route may be used where it extends outside of the unit, but the portion within Unit 353 may be used very infrequently (less than one time annually) and may go unused for many years.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 05

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: This route branches east from Moffat County Road 66N near the northwestern corner of the unit. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: The route is a branch connecting Moffat County Road 66N with a network of old two-track routes in the northwest section of the unit. No evidence as to the current uses was observed, other that as a road connector.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown ☐

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?
Yes ☐ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☐ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☐ Other ☐

Describe: Route is a two-track through sage with sage and grass growing between the tire ruts. No evidence of vegetation removal/blading.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: No evidence of mechanical maintenance.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: This route only serves to connect Moffat County Road 66N with a two-track (Route 06). This connection is available in other spots relatively close.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☒ No ☐

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

Several sets of tire tracks were observed. Vegetation is growing between the tire ruts but not in them. Route may be used 1-5 times per year for recreation and access to the wilderness.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 06

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: Route 06 runs approximately north/south in the northwest corner of the unit. Route 06 branches off of Moffat County Road 66N, east of the junction with Moffat County Road 75S. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: No evidence of current use was observed. The route may be used for jeeps/OHVs or for other recreational use and access to the wilderness. The route connects several other two-track routes in this area, possibly a network of old farm roads. The route may also have been historically used for hydrocarbon exploration/production.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown ☒

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?

Yes ☐ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☐ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☐ Other ☐

Describe: Route is primarily two-track through sagebrush with sage and grass growing between the tire ruts. No evidence of brush/vegetation removal.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: Route is 80% reclaimed with grass growing in the tire ruts on sections of it.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: The route has no current practical use. The route is partially naturally reclaimed with vegetation regenerating in the tire tracks. Other routes for recreational access to the wilderness are available in the immediate area.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and

other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

Tire indentations were observed rarely, but there were no clear tracks. Grass is growing in the tire ruts in places. This route may have not been used recently and for many years.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

U.S Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conduction Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands
Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS INVENTORY

ROUTE ANALYSIS

Wilderness Characteristics Inventory Area Unique Identifier: Little Snake Unit 353 Route or Route Segment Name and/or Identifier: Route 07

I. LOCATION: Refer to attached map GIS data and BLM corporate data (GIS). List photo point references (where applicable) or reference attached photo log:

Describe: Route branches south off of Moffat County Road 66N in the northern portion of the unit. The two-track was very faint and hard to see while on Moffat County Road 66N. See attached photo log.

II. ROUTE CONTEXT

A. Current Purpose (if any) of Route: (Examples Rangeland/Livestock Improvements (stock tank, developed spring, reservoir, fence, corral), Inholdings (ranch, farmhouse), Mine Site, Concentrated Use Site (camp site), Recreation, Utilities (transmission line, telephone, pipeline), Administrative (project maintenance, communication site, vegetation treatment)).

Describe: No current use observed; original use is unknown, but it appears to be part of a historic farm/range road network. A berm pond was observed in the distance, but no visible connection to it was found. Route is potentially connected to Routes 05 and 06, but route connection was unable to be found.

B. Right-of-Way (ROW):

1. Is there a ROW associated with this route?
Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown ☐

2. If yes, what is the stated purpose of the ROW?

3. Is the ROW still being used for this purpose?
Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown or N/A ☒

Explain:

III. WILDERNESS INVENTORY ROAD CRITERIA

A. Evidence of construction or improvement using mechanical means?

Yes ☐ (if either A.1 *or* A.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both A.1 *and* A.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Construction: (Is there evidence that the route or route segment was originally constructed using mechanical means?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Examples: Paved ☐ Bladed ☐ Graveled ☐ Roadside Berms ☐ Cut/Fill ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of mechanical construction. Vegetation in the middle of two-track was substantial; route was reclaimed by nature by approximately 90%.

2. Improvements: (Is there evidence of improvements using mechanical means to facilitate access?) Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Examples: Culverts ☐ Hardened Stream Crossings ☐ Bridges ☐ Drainage ☐ Barriers ☐ Other ☐

Describe: No evidence of improvements. Moffat County Road 66N was bladed at some point, and obstructed the turn off to Route 07, which is an indication of no use or improvements for many years.

B. Maintenance: (Is there evidence of maintenance that would ensure *relatively* regular and continuous use?): Yes ☐ (if either B.1 *or* B.2 is checked "yes" below) No ☒ (if both B.1 *and* B.2 are checked "no" below)

1. Is there Evidence or Documentation of Maintenance using hand tools or machinery? Yes ☐ No ☒ If "yes": by Hand Tools ☐ by Machine ☐

Explain: No evidence of mechanical maintenance. The turn off to Route 07 was obstructed by the blading of Moffat County 66N. Nature has reclaimed the route by 90%.

2. If the route or route segment is in good condition, but there is no evidence of maintenance, would mechanical maintenance with hand tools or machines be approved by BLM to meet the purpose(s) of the route in the event this route became impassable? Yes ☐ No ☒

Explain: Route serves no practical purpose or use; route has not been used in many years. Nature has reclaimed it by at least 90%.

C. Relatively regular and continuous use: (Does the route or route segment ensure relatively regular and continuous use?) Yes ☐ No ☒

Describe evidence (e.g., direct, vehicles or vehicle tracks observed, or indirect, evidence of use associated with purpose of the route such as maintenance of facility that route accesses) and other rationale for whether use has occurred and will continue to occur on a *relatively* regular basis (i.e., regular and continuous use relative to the purpose(s) of the route).

No evidence of regular or continuous use was observed. Route has been reclaimed by nature, and the entrance to the route has been obstructed by improvements made to Moffat County Road 66N.

IV. CONCLUSION:

Does the route or route segment meet the definition of a wilderness inventory road (i.e., are items III.A *and* III.B *and* III.C all checked yes)?

Yes ☐ = Wilderness Inventory Road No ☒ = Not a road for wilderness inventory purposes

Explanation: Criteria not met as described above.

Evaluator(s):

Name	**Title**	**Date**
Jennifer Ashlin	AECOM Geologist	10/3/2012
Drew Parker	AECOM GIS Specialist	10/3/2012

PHOTO LOG

Field Office:	**LITTLE SNAKE**
Unit:	**353**

COLORADO

U.S Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

From BLM Manual 6310 – Conducting Wilderness Characteristics Inventory on BLM Lands

Manual Version 6-129 (03/15/2012)

Date	Photo Name/Frame #:	Photo Direction	UTM	Township	Range	Section
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_001_N	N	12N 4513991.8354N 732726.0002E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.13
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_002_NE	NE	12N 4514946.7836N 732540.7271E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.12
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_003_SE	SE	12N 4514950.7794N 732541.5509E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.12
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_004_E	E	12N 4518802.0389N 730018.2776E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.31
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_005_SE	SE	12N 4520553.5062N 730861.9959E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.28
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_006_S	S	12N 4521044.5211N 732123.7532E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.23
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_007_W	W	12N 4520368.9092N 732793.8227E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.25
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_008_SW	SW	12N 4520364.2347N 732799.4777E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.25
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_009_S	S	12N 4520329.4904N 732805.0876E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.25
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_010_SW	SW	12N 4517030.5279N 735128.3925E	TWN009N	RNG096W	Sec.6
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_011_S	S	12N 4517019.1632N 735130.8284E	TWN009N	RNG096W	Sec.6
10/3/2012	OP3ALS353_012_NW	NW	12N 4515634.3318N 735978.7327E	TWN009N	RNG096W	Sec.12
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_001_N	N	12N 4513992.4008N 732300.168E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.13
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_002_E	E	12N 4514971.2673N 732000.1122E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.9
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_003_SW	SW	12N 4515844.5097N 731355.4678E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.9
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_004_S	S	12N 4516710.4642N 730768.1509E	TWN009N	RNG097W	Sec.6
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_005_E	E	12N 4518503.8833N 729997.323E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.31
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_006_N	N	12N 4518805.018N 730017.2285E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.31
10/3/2012	RP3ALS353_007_N	N	12N 4518539.0013N 730439.5988E	TWN010N	RNG097W	Sec.31