FINAL REPORT

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

Prepared for

Bureau of Land Management
Rawlins Field Office
1300 North Third Street
Rawlins, Wyoming 82301

Prepared by

Jonas Consulting
785 North Canyon Terrace Drive
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

December 2, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter **Page Number**

I. INTRODUCTION 1
A. Public Involvement and Coordination 1

II. PROCESS 2
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 Rawlins 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 Rawlins 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: Rawlins Resource Management Plan Planning Area A-1

ATTACHMENT B - Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands Within the Rawlins 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: Rawlins Resource Management Plan Planning Area C-1

ATTACHMENT D - Management of BLM-Administered Public Lands Within the Rawlins Resource Management Plan Planning Area That Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Suitability Factors D-1

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

December 2, 2002

I. INTRODUCTION

As part of the planning effort for developing the Rawlins 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 Rawlins RMP planning area (previously known as the Great Divide 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, making 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 defined 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 Rawlins Field Office.

The results of this WSR review will be part of the Management Situation Analysis activities for the Rawlins 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 criteria and suitability factors; 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:

- ***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.

- ***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 Rawlins 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 Rawlins 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 to public lands in the Rawlins 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 Rawlins RMP planning area are as follows:

- ***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.

- ***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.

- ***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).

- ***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.

- ***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.

- ***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.

- ***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.

- ***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 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 pubic lands will be managed or prioritized for recreational use or development.

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

On December 5, 2001, BLM planning team members for the Rawlins RMP met to conduct a WSR eligibility review for the Rawlins 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 402 waterways reviewed in the planning area, 393 were found to have no outstandingly remarkable values and were dropped from further consideration, while nine were determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. One of these nine waterway review segments, Skull Creek, actually includes the main waterway segment and two tributaries that together were reviewed as a "waterway unit," specifically, the Skull Creek unit. The other eight waterways involving public lands determined to meet the eligibility criteria are Big Creek, Bunker Draw, Cherry Creek, Duck Creek, Encampment River, Littlefield Creek, Muddy Creek, and the North Platte River.

Attachment A (WSR Eligibility Review) reflects the results of the review and eligibility determination for the public lands considered and includes maps of the 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 Rawlins 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 for 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 Rawlins RMP Planning Area

The WSR suitability determinations for the Rawlins 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 Rawlins RMP on March 28, 2002.

The public lands along the reviewed segment of the Encampment River 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 via private property would not be likely; (3) there exist potential use conflicts along the review segments (i.e., oil and natural gas drilling and development) 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 Rawlins 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 the Encampment River) and are presented in Attachment D (Management Public Lands within the Rawlins RMP Planning Area That Meet the WSR Suitability Factors). These prescriptions will be applied immediately as well as be presented in the Rawlins 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 Rawlins 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 Rawlins RMP planning area would be used in developing any such reports.

ATTACHMENT A

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS ELIGIBILITY REVIEW:

RAWLINS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA

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

Bureau of Land Management (BLM)-administered public land surfaces (public lands) along 402 waterways in the Rawlins Resource Management Plan (RMP) planning area were reviewed for Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR) eligibility (see Table A1). Public lands along 393 of these waterways were found not to meet the eligibility criteria and dropped from further consideration. Public lands along nine waterways 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 5, 2001, BLM planning team members for the Rawlins RMP made preliminary WSR eligibility determinations for public lands along waterways within the Rawlins RMP planning area. Table A2 provides the names and contact information for those individuals who attended the WSR eligibility review in the Rawlins 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 Rawlins 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 RAWLINS RMP PLANNING AREA

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG BIG CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Big Creek reviewed is 7.72 miles long. It begins in the SE$^1/_4$ of section 9, T. 13 N., R. 81 W. and ends at its confluence with the North Platte River in the NW$^1/_4$ of section 20, T. 14 N., R. 81 W. Within this segment of waterway, the river flows through three public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Big Creek through these public land parcels is 3.39 miles long (approximately 44 percent of the segment length reviewed). The public lands reviewed attract visitors from outside the area to fish. Recreationists also enjoy the available hunting and picnicking opportunities. An outfitter located on private lands adjacent to the public land parcels brings in visitors to the public lands from all over the country, while adjacent State lands provide parking and easy access for the rest of the public.

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

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG BUNKER DRAW DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Bunker Draw reviewed is 0.15 miles long. It is located below a spring in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 17, T. 26 N., R. 83 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Bunker Draw through this public land parcel is 0.15 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway segment reviewed. This public land parcel includes a deeply incised canyon unique to the region. The maples and cottonwoods on public lands in the waterway corridor add to the scenic quality, especially during the fall season.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along Bunker Draw that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A2 shows the public lands involved.

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG CHERRY CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Cherry Creek reviewed is 5.40 miles long. It begins in the S½ of section 25 and ends in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 2; T. 27 N., R.88 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Cherry Creek through this public land parcel is 5.40 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway segment reviewed. The upper section is located in the Ferris Mountain Wilderness Study Area (WSA). Through implementation of appropriate range management standards, this public land parcel includes one of the most pristine creeks off the Ferris Mountains and is used as an ideal or "showcase" example for proper range management techniques.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along Cherry Creek that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A3 shows the public lands involved.

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG DUCK CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Duck Creek reviewed is 3.25 miles long. It begins in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 5 and ends in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 3; T. 23 N., R.71 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through two public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Duck

Creek through these public land parcels is 2.97 miles (approximately 91 percent of the segment length reviewed). Located within the review segment is a 35-foot waterfall that is unique to the area and has a scenic quality that has the potential to attract visitors from outside the area.

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

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG THE ENCAMPMENT RIVER DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of the Encampment River reviewed is 2.51 miles long. It begins in the SW$^1/_4$ of section 25 and ends in the NW$^1/_4$ of section 24; T. 14 N., R. 84 W. Within this segment of waterway, the river flows through the Encampment River WSA, which includes one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of the Encampment River through this public land parcel is 2.51 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway reviewed. This public land parcel includes a rugged canyon with colorful rock outcroppings and thick riparian vegetation. The river is considered a "Class 2" stream (very good trout water of statewide importance), as designated by Wyoming Game and Fish, that attracts anglers from outside the region. The public lands also provide hiking and horseback riding opportunities. A public campground is located directly downstream from the review segment and provides easy public access to the waterway segment under review. The public lands are also associated with historic copper mining operations and tie hacking, with an old flume and mining associated sites (e.g., prospector pits, shafts, adits, mining cabins) existing on public lands within the river corridor. The public lands also include important bighorn sheep lambing grounds along the steep canyon walls above the river.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along the Encampment River that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A5 shows the public lands involved.

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG LITTLEFIELD CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Littlefield Creek reviewed is 4.58 miles long. It begins in the S½ of section 11 and ends in the center of section 17; T. 17 N., R. 89 W. Within this segment of waterway, the creek flows through one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Littlefield through this public land parcel is 4.58 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway reviewed. This public land parcel includes exceptionally high-quality habitat for the Colorado River cutthroat trout; there is historical documentation of the species existing in the creek during Jim Bridger's time (i.e., the 1850's). BLM and Wyoming Game and Fish have been using the public lands for reintroduction of the Colorado River cutthroat trout since September 2001. The success of these efforts is assured because of the use of artificial barriers which deter competitive fish

species. This is the only population of Colorado River cutthroat trout in the entire watershed and is unique because other populations are in forested headwater streams. The public lands also include one of the few intact dogwood/birch communities in the area.

Table A1 and Attachment B contain further details on the public land parcel along Littlefield Creek that meets the WSR eligibility criteria. Figure A6 shows the public lands involved.

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG MUDDY CREEK DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The entire length (87.50 miles) of Muddy Creek was reviewed. The creek begins SW of the Continental Divide in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 2, T. 16 N., R. 89 W. and ends at its confluence with the Little Snake River near Baggs, Wyoming, in the W½ of section 27, T. 13 N., R. 91 W. Along its entire length, the creek flows through 47 public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of Muddy Creek through these public land parcels is 34.96 miles (approximately 40 percent of the segment length reviewed). These public land parcels provide a "textbook" example of stream rehabilitation used as a demonstration area for managers and educators.

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

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG THE NORTH PLATTE RIVER DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of the North Platte River reviewed is 5.22 miles long. It begins in the SE$^1/_4$ of section 26 and ends in the NW$^1/_4$ of section 15; T. 15 N., R. 82 W. Within this segment of waterway, the river flows through two public land parcels determined to meet the WSR eligibility criteria. The length of the North Platte River through these public land parcels is 4.59 miles (approximately 88 percent of the segment length reviewed). These public land parcels include a beautiful steep canyon unique to the area. The segment of waterway reviewed has been designated by the Wyoming State Game and Fish as a Blue Ribbon trout fishery and attracts anglers from across the nation. The review segment is also boated extensively. The BLM offers two campsites on public lands which provide important boat access for recreationists. A trail system on public lands also offers hiking opportunities. The public lands provide important winter and nesting habitat for bald eagles.

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

PUBLIC LANDS ALONG SKULL CREEK (INCLUDING SHORT SEGMENT OF TWO UNNAMED TRIBUTARIES) DETERMINED TO MEET THE WSR ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Segment of Waterway Reviewed

The segment of Skull Creek reviewed is 11.75 miles long. It begins in the N½ of section 16, T. 13 N., R. 97 W. and ends in the SW$^1/_4$ of section 10; T. 14 N., R. 96 W. The main branch of the unnamed tributary reviewed (Tributary A) is 6.99 miles long. It begins in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 8, T. 13 N., R. 97 W. and ends at its confluence with Skull Creek in the SW$^1/_4$ of section 29; T. 14 N., R. 96 W. The second unnamed tributary reviewed (Tributary B) is 6.01 miles long. It begins in the NE$^1/_4$ of section 13, T. 14 N., R. 97 W. and ends at its confluence with Tributary A in the NW$^1/_4$ of section 2; T. 13 N., R. 97 W. The Skull Creek unit flows through the Adobe Town WSA, which includes one public land parcel determined to meet the WSR eligibility requirements. Skull Creek flows through this public land parcel for 11.75 miles, which is the entire length of the waterway reviewed. The unnamed tributaries flow though the same public land parcel for a total of 13.00 miles when combined. Within this public land parcel, the Skull Creek unit traverses bad-land topography, with hoodoos and interesting mud ball formations in the waterway corridor. A well-known vertebrate fossil study area is also located on public lands, with large amounts of fossil fish, turtles, and other animals being exposed by streambed erosion.

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

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Abel Creek	Yes	None	No
Alamosa Gulch	Yes	None	No
Antelope Creek (Ver Plancke Reservoir)	Yes	None	No
Antelope Creek (Sellers Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Antelope Draw	Yes	None	No
Antelope Creek (West of Baldy Butte)	Yes	None	No
Antelope Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Anthill Draw (East & West Fork)	Yes	None	No
Arkansas Creek	Yes	None	No
Ashley Creek	Yes	None	No
Austin Creek	Yes	None	No
Bad Water Creek	Yes	None	No
Badger Creek	Yes	None	No
Bar M Creek	Yes	None	No
Barrel Spring Creek	Yes	None	No
Barrel Springs Draw (Main, North & South)	Yes	None	No
Bear Creek	Yes	None	No
Bear Creek	Yes	None	No
Beaver Creek	Yes	None	No
Beaver Jimmy Creek	Yes	None	No
Bell Creek	Yes	None	No
Big Ditch	Yes	None	No
Big Draw (No. 1 & 2)	Yes	None	No
Big Creek	**Yes**	**Recreational**	**Yes**
Birch Creek	Yes	None	No
Bird Gulch	Yes	None	No
Bitter Creek	Yes	None	No
Blue Gap Draw	Yes	None	No
Bluegrass Creek	Yes	None	No
Blydenburg Draw	Yes	None	No
Bone Creek	Yes	None	No
Boswell Creek	Yes	None	No
Bothwell Creek	Yes	None	No
Bottle Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Box Canyon	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Brennan Draw	Yes	None	No
Brush Creek	Yes	None	No
Buck Draw	Yes	None	No
Buck Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Buckland Draw	Yes	None	No
Bull Camp Creek	Yes	None	No
Bull Creek	Yes	None	No
Bulls Creek	Yes	None	No
Bunker Draw	**Yes**	**Scenic**	**Yes**
C Y Draw	Yes	None	No
Cabin Draw	Yes	None	No
Calf Creek	Yes	None	No
Cameron Creek	Yes	None	No
Canary Grave Draw	Yes	None	No
Canyon Creek (North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Cave Creek	Yes	None	No
Cedar Breaks Draw	Yes	None	No
Cedar Creek	Yes	None	No
Centennial Creek	Yes	None	No
Chalk Draw	Yes	None	No
Charlie Brooks Draw	Yes	None	No
Cherokee Creek (Rawlings)	Yes	None	No
Cherokee Creek (South of Bear Creek Ridge)	Yes	None	No
Cherokee Creek (East & West Forks; Rye Gulch)	Yes	None	No
Cherokee Creek (Main, East & West Forks; Cherokee Draw)	Yes	None	No
Cherokee Creek (Main, South Fork; Smiley Draw)	Yes	None	No
Cherokee Draw	Yes	None	No
Cherry Creek	**Yes**	**Other-Ecological**	**Yes**
Chicken Springs Wash	Yes	None	No
Coal Bank Draw	Yes	None	No
Coal Bank Creek (Seaverson Reservoir)	Yes	None	No
Coal Bank Creek (Bolster Reservoir)	Yes	None	No
Coal Bank Wash	Yes	None	No
Coal Creek (Mine Draw)	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Coal Creek (Coal Creek Canyon)	Yes	None	No
Coal Gulch (No. 1 & 2)	Yes	None	No
Coal Mine Draw	Yes	None	No
Cold Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Colloid Draw	Yes	None	No
Cooper Creek	Yes	None	No
Copper Creek	Yes	None	No
Corral Creek (Blind Canyon)	Yes	None	No
Corral Creek (Norbacher Canyon)	Yes	None	No
Corral Creek (Main, South Fork; E. of Bennett Peak)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Ferris Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (N. of Mine Hill)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Sugarloaf Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Freezeout Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Main, North Fork; The Bluff)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Bald Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Cedar Ridge)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (W. of Lambert)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (N. of Dixon)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Creek (Seminoe Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Cottonwood Draw	Yes	None	No
Cow Creek (W. of Deep Gulch)	Yes	None	No
Cow Creek (Cow Creek Reseroir)	Yes	None	No
Cow Creek (Pran Gulch)	Yes	None	No
Coyote Draw	Yes	None	No
Cress Creek	Yes	None	No
Creston Draw	Yes	None	No
Crooked Wash	Yes	None	No
Crow Creek (North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Cumberland Gulch	Yes	None	No
Cyclone Draw	Yes	None	No
Davidson Creek	Yes	None	No
Deadman Creek	Yes	None	No
Deep Creek	Yes	None	No
Deep Gulch	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Deer Creek (S. of Pass Creek Basin)	Yes	None	No
Deer Creek (E. of Bear Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Deer Creek (Pennock Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Devils Canyon	Yes	None	No
Deweese Creek	Yes	None	No
Difficult Creek	Yes	None	No
Dipping Vat Creek	Yes	None	No
Dirtyman Draw	Yes	None	No
Dirtyman Fork	Yes	None	No
Dixie Draw	Yes	None	No
Dry Cow Creek	Yes	None	No
Dry Creek (Main, South & North Forks; W. of Pennock Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Dry Creek (Dry Creek Rim)	Yes	None	No
Dry Creek (Beer Mug Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Dry Creek (Chalk Bluff)	Yes	None	No
Duck Creek	**Yes**	**Scenic**	**Yes**
Dufunny Creek	Yes	None	No
Dutton Creek (East Fork)	Yes	None	No
Eagle Creek	Yes	None	No
Eagles Nest Draw	Yes	None	No
East Arkansas Creek	Yes	None	No
East Cottonwood Creek	Yes	None	No
Echo Spring Draw	Yes	None	No
Elk Creek	Yes	None	No
Elkhorn Draw	Yes	None	No
Emigrant Creek	Yes	None	No
Encampment River	**Yes**	**Scenic, Recreational, Historical, Wildlife**	**Yes**
Fillmore Creek	Yes	None	No
Finn Creek	Yes	None	No
First Cottonwood Draw	Yes	None	No
First Sand Creek	Yes	None	No
Fish Creek	Yes	None	No
Fivemile Ditch	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Fivemile Hole	Yes	None	No
Fly Creek	Yes	None	No
Foote Creek	Yes	None	No
Fourmile Creek	Yes	None	No
Fourtymile Creek	Yes	None	No
French Creek	Yes	None	No
Garden Gulch	Yes	None	No
Garrish Draw	Yes	None	No
Gartman Creek	Yes	None	No
Goetze Creek (Main, North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Gooseberry Creek	Yes	None	No
Greasewood Creek	Yes	None	No
Green Creek	Yes	None	No
Grindstone Wash	Yes	None	No
Grove Creek	Yes	None	No
Halleck Creek	Yes	None	No
Hamilton Creek	Yes	None	No
Handsell Draw	Yes	None	No
Hangout Wash	Yes	None	No
Hanna Draw	Yes	None	No
Hansen Draw	Yes	None	No
Hartt Cabin Draw	Yes	None	No
Hartt Creek	Yes	None	No
Hatch Creek	Yes	None	No
Hay Gulch	Yes	None	No
Haystack Draw	Yes	None	No
Haystack Wash	Yes	None	No
Heather Creek	Yes	None	No
Hell Canyon Creek	Yes	None	No
Hicox Draw	Yes	None	No
Holler Draw	Yes	None	No
House Creek	Yes	None	No
Horse Gulch	Yes	None	No
Horse Pasture Draw	Yes	None	No
Hugus Draw	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Hunt Creek	Yes	None	No
Hurt Creek	Yes	None	No
Hurt Gulch	Yes	None	No
Indian Creek (Ferris Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Indian Creek (North & South Forks; Rye Gulch)	Yes	None	No
Indian Creek (Windy Ridge)	Yes	None	No
Indian Springs Creek (Separation Flats)	Yes	None	No
Indian Springs Creek (Dome Rock)	Yes	None	No
Iron Springs Creek (Leo)	Yes	None	No
Iron Springs Creek (Rocky Draw)	Yes	None	No
Iron Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Jack Creek	Yes	None	No
Jelm Creek	Yes	None	No
Jep Canyon	Yes	None	No
Jim Creek	Yes	None	No
Jock Draw	Yes	None	No
Johnson Creek	Yes	None	No
Junk Creek	Yes	None	No
Kinney Creek (Five Mountain Butte)	Yes	None	No
Kinney Creek (Wilson Ridge)	Yes	None	No
La Marsh Creek	Yes	None	No
Lake Creek (South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Laney Wash	Yes	None	No
Laramie River	Yes	None	No
Latham Draw	Yes	None	No
Laundry Draw	Yes	None	No
Lawn Creek	Yes	None	No
Lee Creek	Yes	None	No
Lindsey Creek	Yes	None	No
Lisenby Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Bear Creek (N. of Bear Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Little Bear Creek (E. of Bristol Ridge)	Yes	None	No
Little Beaver Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Camp Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Cherry Creek	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Little Jack Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Halleck Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Medicine Bow River (Main, North & South Forks; North & South Prongs of South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Little Pinto Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Robbers Gulch	Yes	None	No
Little Sage Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Sandstone Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Shoe Creek	Yes	None	No
Little Snake River	Yes	None	No
Littlefield Creek	**Yes**	**Fisheries, Other-Ecological**	**Yes**
Loca Creek (Main, West Fork)	Yes	None	No
Lone Tree Creek (E. of Miller Hill)	Yes	None	No
Lone Tree Creek (State Hwy 77 & 487)	Yes	None	No
Long Creek	Yes	None	No
Lost Creek (Little Basin)	Yes	None	No
Lost Creek (Eagles Nest)	Yes	None	No
Lost Soldier Creek	Yes	None	No
Lost Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Low Creek	Yes	None	No
Maggie Creek	Yes	None	No
Mahoney Draw	Yes	None	No
Martinez Springs Creek	Yes	None	No
McCager Draw	Yes	None	No
McCarthy Canyon	Yes	None	No
McIntosh Draw	Yes	None	No
McIntyre Draw	Yes	None	No
McKinney Creek	Yes	None	No
McLain Creek	Yes	None	No
Meadow Creek (S. of Marshall)	Yes	None	No
Meadow Creek (Seminoe Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Medicine Bow River (Main & East Fork)	Yes	None	No
Meiser Creek	Yes	None	No
Methodist Creek	Yes	None	No
Middle Chugwater Creek	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Middle Ditch	Yes	None	No
Middlewood Creek	Yes	None	No
Mill Creek (Laramie Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Mill Creek (South Fork; Bunker Hill)	Yes	None	No
Miller Creek	Yes	None	No
Miner Creek	Yes	None	No
Miners Canyon	Yes	None	No
Missouri Draw	Yes	None	No
Moores Creek	Yes	None	No
Morgan Creek	Yes	None	No
Mud Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Muddy Creek (Red Hill)	Yes	None	No
Muddy Creek (McKiney Creek)	Yes	None	No
Muddy Creek (Baggs)	**Yes**	**Other-Hydrological**	**Yes**
Mule Creek	Yes	None	No
Mulligan Draw	Yes	None	No
Norbacher Canyon	Yes	None	No
North Barrel Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
North Cedar Creek	Yes	None	No
North Cottonwood Creek	Yes	None	No
North Ditch	Yes	None	No
North Laramie River	Yes	None	No
North Platte River	**Yes**	**Scenic, Recreational, Wildlife**	**Yes**
North Spring Creek	Yes	None	No
O'Bryen Creek	Yes	None	No
Olson Draw	Yes	None	No
Onemile Creek	Yes	None	No
Osborne Draw	Yes	None	No
Otto Creek	Yes	None	No
Owl Gulch	Yes	None	No
Parsons Creek	Yes	None	No
Pass Creek	Yes	None	No
Percy Creek	Yes	None	No
Pete Creek (Main, West Branch)	Yes	None	No
Pine Grove Creek	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Pines Draw	Yes	None	No
Pinto Creek (Main, South Fork)	Yes	None	No
Poison Draw	Yes	None	No
Pole Creek (W. of Pine Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Pole Creek (Bar M Mountain)	Yes	None	No
Pole Gulch	Yes	None	No
Pollock Draw	Yes	None	No
Potato Creek	Yes	None	No
Powder Wash (North Fork)	Yes	None	No
Quealy Creek (North & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Rainbow Canyon	Yes	None	No
Rankin Creek	Yes	None	No
Rasmussen Creek	Yes	None	No
Rattlesnake Creek	Yes	None	No
Reader Cabin Draw	Yes	None	No
Red Creek (Rocky Crossing)	Yes	None	No
Red Creek (Main, North & Middle Prongs; Red Creek Rim)	Yes	None	No
Red Draw	Yes	None	No
Red Mountain Spring Creek	Yes	None	No
Red Wash	Yes	None	No
Red Wash Draw	Yes	None	No
Reed Creek	Yes	None	No
Rendle Draw	Yes	None	No
Rendle Luke Draw	Yes	None	No
Reno Draw	Yes	None	No
Riddle Creek	Yes	None	No
Road Gulch	Yes	None	No
Robbers Gulch	Yes	None	No
Rocky Draw	Yes	None	No
Roger Canyon	Yes	None	No
Rogers Creek	Yes	None	No
Ruedloff Draw	Yes	None	No
Rush Creek	Yes	None	No
Rye Grass Draw	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Sage Creek (Main, Middle & South Forks; Leo)	Yes	None	No
Sage Creek (Sage Creek Reservoir)	Yes	None	No
Saint Marys Creek	Yes	None	No
Saint Marys Ditch	Yes	None	No
Saltiel Creek	Yes	None	No
Sand Creek (Sand Creek Canyon)	Yes	None	No
Sand Creek (Shirley Basin)	Yes	None	No
Sand Creek (Reader Cabin Draw)	Yes	None	No
Sand Draw	Yes	None	No
Sand Springs Creek	Yes	None	No
Savery Creek (Main, North Fork)	Yes	None	No
Saylor Creek	Yes	None	No
School Creek (Seminoe Mountains)	Yes	None	No
School Creek (Road 660 & 3404)	Yes	None	No
Second Cottonwood Draw	Yes	None	No
Second Sand Creek	Yes	None	No
Separation Creek	Yes	None	No
Sevenmile Creek	Yes	None	No
Sevenmile River	Yes	None	No
Shallow Creek	Yes	None	No
Shamrock Draw	Yes	None	No
Shearing Pen Draw	Yes	None	No
Sheep Creek (Red Draw)	Yes	None	No
Sheep Creek (Seminoe Mountains)	Yes	None	No
Shell Creek	Yes	None	No
Shellrock Creek	Yes	None	No
Shingle Creek	Yes	None	No
Sinkhole Draw	Yes	None	No
Sips Creek	Yes	None	No
Sixteenmile Draw	Yes	None	No
Skull Creek unit (includes Skull Creek and two unnamed tributaries)	**Yes**	**Scenic, Other-Paleontological**	**Yes**
Slate Draw	Yes	None	No
Sledge Creek	Yes	None	No
Slide Draw	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Smiley Draw	Yes	None	No
Smith Draw	Yes	None	No
Snow Creek	Yes	None	No
Snowshoe Canyon	Yes	None	No
Soap Hole Wash	Yes	None	No
Soldier Creek	Yes	None	No
Sourdough Gulch (Main & East Fork)	Yes	None	No
South Cottonwood Creek	Yes	None	No
South Pine Draw	Yes	None	No
South Spring Creek (East Fork)	Yes	None	No
Spottlewood Creek	Yes	None	No
Spring Creek (N. of Moss Agate Ridge)	Yes	None	No
Spring Creek (Hay Canyon)	Yes	None	No
Spring Creek (Colores)	Yes	None	No
Springs Creek	Yes	None	No
Squaw Creek	Yes	None	No
Standard Draw	Yes	None	No
Stewart Creek	Yes	None	No
Stink Creek	Yes	None	No
Stinking Creek	Yes	None	No
Stone Creek	Yes	None	No
Stoney Creek	Yes	None	No
Stratton Draw	Yes	None	No
Strekfus Draw	Yes	None	No
Sugar Creek	Yes	None	No
Sullivan Creek	Yes	None	No
Sunday Morning Creek	Yes	None	No
Sunrise Creek	Yes	None	No
Taylor Draw	Yes	None	No
Tea Creek	Yes	None	No
Teddy Creek	Yes	None	No
Texas Creek	Yes	None	No
Third Sand Creek	Yes	None	No
Threemile Ditch	Yes	None	No
Tincup Creek	Yes	None	No

Table A1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Eligibility Review Summary			
Waterway Reviewed	***Free Flowing***	***Outstandingly Remarkable Values on Public Lands***	***Eligible***
Tree Draw	Yes	None	No
Troublesome Creek	Yes	None	No
Trough Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Truckdrivers Creek	Yes	None	No
Twentymile Draw	Yes	None	No
Twentytwomile Draw	Yes	None	No
Two Creek	Yes	None	No
Wagonhound Creek	Yes	None	No
Walker Draw	Yes	None	No
West Junk Creek	Yes	None	No
Whiskey Creek	Yes	None	No
White Rock Draw	Yes	None	No
Wild Cow Creek (Main, Middle & South Forks)	Yes	None	No
Wild Horse Draw	Yes	None	No
Willow Creek (Main, East & West Branches)	Yes	None	No
Willow Gulch	Yes	None	No
Willow Springs Creek	Yes	None	No
Willow Springs Draw	Yes	None	No
Windmill Draw	Yes	None	No
Wise Dugout Draw	Yes	None	No
Wood Creek	Yes	None	No
Yankee Draw	Yes	None	No
Young Draw	Yes	None	No

Table A2: Rawlins Field Office Eligibility Review Meeting Attendance, December 5, 2001			
Name	***Agency***	***Phone Number***	***Resource Area***
Lilian Jonas	Jonas Consulting	928-774-6451	IDT Leader/Consultant
Patty Jonas	Jonas Consulting	928-634-9656	Technician
Krystal Clair	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4206	Recreation, Scenic
Mark Newman	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4248	Geology
Susan Foley	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4221	Soils
Robert Epp	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4217	Range
Frank Blomquist	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4207	Wildlife/Fisheries/Botanical

ATTACHMENT B

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

Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria						
Public Land Parcel Number	*Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels*	*Location of Public Land Parcel*	*Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel*	*Outstandingly Remarkable Values of Public Land Parcel*	*Notes/Description*	*Tentative Classification*
BIG CREEK						
1	1.23	T. 13 N., R. 81 W., Sec. 9	0.30	Recreational Values	Exceptional fishing opportunities.	Scenic
2	1.42	T. 13 N., R. 81 W., Sec. 4, 5	4.03	Recreational Values	Exceptional fishing opportunities.	Scenic
3	0.74	T 14. N., R. 81 W., Sec. 20	End of waterway segment reviewed	Recreational Values	Exceptional fishing opportunities.	Recreational
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**3.39**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**7.72**			
BUNKER DRAW						
1	0.15	T 26 N, R. 83 W., Sec. 17	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic Values	Deeply incised, brilliant colored canyon.	Recreational
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**0.15**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**0.15**			
CHERRY CREEK						
1	5.40	T. 27 N., R 88 W., Sec. 1, 2, 12, 13, 24, 25	End of waterway segment reviewed	Ecological Values	"Showcase" example for appropriate rangeland management techniques.	Wild/Scenic
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**5.40**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**5.40**			
DUCK CREEK						
1	2.32	T. 23 N., R. 71 W., Sec. 4, 5	0.28	Scenic Values	Unique 35-foot waterfall .	Wild
2	0.65	T. 23 N., R. 71 W., Sec 3, 4,	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic Values	Unique 35-foot waterfall .	Wild
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**2.97**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**3.25**			

Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria						
Public Land Parcel Number	*Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels*	*Location of Public Land Parcel*	*Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel*	*Outstandingly Remarkable Values of Public Land Parcel*	*Notes/Description*	*Tentative Classification*
ENCAMPMENT RIVER						
1	2.51	T. 14 N, R. 84 W, Sec. 23, 24, 25, 26	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, Historical, and Wildlife Values	Beautiful river canyon. Class 2 trout fishery. Hiking, horseback riding, and camping opportunities. Historic copper mining and tie hacking area. Important bighorn sheep lambing grounds.	Wild
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**2.51**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**2.51**			
LITTLEFIELD CREEK						
1	4.58	T. 17 N, R. 89 W., Sec. 8, 9, 10, 11, 17	End of waterway segment reviewed	Fisheries and Ecological Values	Exceptionally high-quality habitat for the Colorado River cutthroat trout. Rare intact dogwood/birch community.	Scenic
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**4.58**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**4.58**			
MUDDY CREEK						
1	1.14	T. 16 N., R 89 W., Sec. 2	5.04	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
2	1.93	T. 17 N., R 89 W., Sec. 18, 20, 29	0.18	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
3	1.68	T. 17 N., R 90 W., Sec. 2	3.54	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
4	0.07	T. 17 N., R 90 W., Sec. 2	0.29	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
5	0.21	T. 17 N., R 90 W., Sec. 2	2.07	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
6	1.01	T. 17 N., R 90 W., Sec. 4	1.17	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
7	0.64	T. 18 N., R 90 W., Sec. 32	0.46	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
8	0.43	T. 18 N., R 90 W., Sec. 32	0.18	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational

Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria						
Public Land Parcel Number	*Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels*	*Location of Public Land Parcel*	*Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel*	*Outstandingly Remarkable Values of Public Land Parcel*	*Notes/Description*	*Tentative Classification*
9	0.30	T. 18 N., R 90 W., Sec. 32	0.71	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
10	1.48	T. 17 N., R 90 W., Sec. 6	0.24	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
11	0.20	T. 17 N., R 90 W., Sec. 6	1.67	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
12	1.79	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 2	0.56	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
13	0.10	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 10	0.94	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
14	0.16	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 10	0.16	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
15	0.17	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 4	1.13	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
16	1.86	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 4	0.84	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
17	1.87	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 4	0.10	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
18	0.07	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 8	0.50	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
19	1.01	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 6	3.77	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
20	0.62	T. 17 N., R 91 W., Sec. 6	1.19	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
21	1.74	T. 17 N., R 92 W., Sec. 12	1.12	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
22	1.13	T. 17 N., R 92 W., Sec. 22	0.72	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
23	0.56	T. 17 N., R 92 W., Sec. 28	0.14	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational

Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria						
Public Land Parcel Number	*Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels*	*Location of Public Land Parcel*	*Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel*	*Outstandingly Remarkable Values of Public Land Parcel*	*Notes/Description*	*Tentative Classification*
24	0.11	T. 17 N., R 92 W., Sec. 32; T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 5	2.87	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
25	0.30	T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 8	1.52	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
26	3.01	T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 17	0.08	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
27	0.11	T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 20	0.42	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
28	0.12	T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 20	0.67	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
29	2.48	T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 20	2.88	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
30	6.47	T. 16 N., R 92 W., Sec. 29, 32, 33; T. 15 N., R 92 W., Sec. 3, 4	0.15	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
31	0.29	T. 15 N., R 92 W., Sec. 1, 2, 3	0.17	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
32	0.46	T. 15 N., R 92 W., Sec. 12	0.08	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
33	0.05	T. 15 N., R 92 W., Sec. 13; T. 15 N., R 91 W., Sec. 18, 19, 30, 31	2.43	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
34	0.14	T. 15 N., R 91 W., Sec. 31	0.11	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
35	0.29	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 6	0.10	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
36	0.07	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 7	0.20	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
37	0.11	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 18	4.67	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
38	0.20	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 18	2.17	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational

Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria						
Public Land Parcel Number	*Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels*	*Location of Public Land Parcel*	*Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel*	*Outstandingly Remarkable Values of Public Land Parcel*	*Notes/Description*	*Tentative Classification*
39	0.06	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 18	4.47	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
40	0.05	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 19	0.25	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
41	0.04	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 19	0.61	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
42	0.06	T. 14 N., R 91 W., Sec. 32	0.77	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
43	0.05	T. 13 N., R 91 W., Sec. 4	0.49	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
44	0.05	T. 13 N., R 91 W., Sec. 15	0.24	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
45	0.05	T. 13 N., R 91 W., Sec. 15	0.37	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
46	0.13	T. 13 N., R 91 W., Sec. 22	0.10	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
47	0.09	T. 13 N., R 91 W., Sec. 27	End of waterway segment reviewed	Hydrological Values	"Textbook" example of stream rehabilitation.	Recreational
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**34.96**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**87.50**			
NORTH PLATTE RIVER						
1	3.11	T. 15 N., R. 82 W., Sec. 23, 26.	0.63	Scenic, Recreational, and Wildlife Values	Unique steep canyon. Blue Ribbon Fishery. Boating and hiking opportunities. Important bald eagle wintering and nesting area.	Wild/Scenic
2	1.48	T. 15 N., R. 82 W., Sec. 14, 15, 23,	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic, Recreational, and Wildlife Values	Unique steep canyon. Blue Ribbon Fishery. Boating and hiking opportunities. Important bald eagle wintering and nesting area.	
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**4.59**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**5.22**			

Table B1: Identification and Tentative Classification of BLM-Administered Public Lands that Meet the Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Criteria						
Public Land Parcel Number	*Length (miles) of Waterway Segment Across Public Land Parcels*	*Location of Public Land Parcel*	*Distance (miles) to Next Public Land Parcel*	*Outstandingly Remarkable Values of Public Land Parcel*	*Notes/Description*	*Tentative Classification*
SKULL CREEK (part of Skull Creek Unit)						
1	11.75	T. 13 N., R. 96 W., Sec. 6; T. 13 N., R. 97 W., Sec. 1, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15; T. 14 N., R. 96 W., Sec. 10, 15, 16, 20, 29, 31, 32	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Paleontological Values	Bad land topography. Vertebrate fossil study area.	Wild
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**11.75**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**11.75**			
TRIBUTARY A (part of Skull Creek Unit)						
1	6.99	T. 13 N., R. 97 W., Sec. 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9; T. 14 N., R. 97 W., Sec. 36; T. 14 N., R. 96 W., Sec. 29, 30, 31	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Paleontological Values	Bad land topography. Vertebrate fossil study area.	Wild
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**6.99**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**6.99**			
TRIBUTARY B (part of Skull Creek Unit)						
1	6.01	T. 13 N., R. 97 W., Sec. 2, 3; T. 14 N., R. 97 W., Sec. 13, 23, 24, 27, 28, 34	End of waterway segment reviewed	Scenic and Paleontological Values	Bad land topography. Vertebrate fossil study area.	Wild
Total Length of Waterway Segment Across Public Lands	**6.01**	**Total Length of Waterway Segment Reviewed**	**6.01**			

ATTACHMENT C

WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SUITABILITY REVIEW:

RAWLINS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA

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

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

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

On March 28, 2002, BLM planning team members for the Rawlins RMP made preliminary WSR suitability determinations for public lands along waterways within the Rawlins 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 Rawlins 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 Rawlins 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 RAWLINS RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN PLANNING AREA.

Big Creek

It was determined that the three public land parcels along the Big 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:

- 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.

- 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 44 percent of the total length of the waterway segment reviewed flows through public lands.

- Potential use conflicts exist on both private and public lands within the review segment corridor which could occur if it is included in the NWSRS. For instance, there is a reasonably foreseeable potential for development of existing mining claims along the review segment which could come into conflict with a WSR designation.

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.

Bunker Draw

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Bunker Draw 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:

- 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.

- The BLM would be unable to manage the small amount of public lands involved (0.15 miles along the review segment) in the context of a WSR. By itself, designating the short segment of Bunker Draw through public lands would not be a sufficient means to protect the scenic 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.

Cherry Creek

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Cherry Creek 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:

- The public lands involved do not constitute a worthy addition to the NWSRS. After careful review, it was determined that the ecological qualities along the review segment of Cherry Creek do not warrant it eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS.

- A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate. The ecological qualities were obtained without a WSR designation and can be protected under existing mechanisms.

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.

Duck Creek

It was determined that the two public land parcels along the Duck 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:

- 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.

- The BLM would be unable to manage the public lands involved in context of a WSR because of the interspersed parcels of private land. While more than 91 percent of the total length of the waterway segment reviewed flows through public lands, the BLM has no jurisdiction or control over the small private land parcel near the middle of the review segment.

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.

Encampment River

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Encampment River 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 future consideration for addition to the NWSRS.

The outstanding scenic, recreational, historical, and wildlife values associated with the public lands involved makes this a uniquely diverse waterway segment in the region. Within the review segment, the scenic and recreational values are of particular high value as the area attracts visitors from outside the area for fishing, hiking, and horseback riding opportunities within a beautiful river canyon environment. The historic values are also notable as the area contains numerous artifacts from early mining activities. The canyon walls along the review segment also provide bighorn lambing grounds important for the species.

Making up 100% 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 review segment is located within the Encampment River WSA and thus are currently managed in a fashion compatible with a WSA designation (2) while private, state, and national forest lands occur upstream of the review segment, all upstream uses have been determined compatible and would not adversely affect a WSR designation; and (3) the BLM planning team did not identify any obstacles that would prevent them from managing the reviewed waterway segments as part of the NWSRS.

Littlefield Creek

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Littlefield Creek 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:

- A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate. The fisheries and ecological qualities currently receive sufficient management through a cooperative effort by Wyoming Game and Fish and the BLM. 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.

Muddy Creek

It was determined that the 47 public land parcels along the Muddy 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:

- The public lands involved do not constitute a worthy addition to the NWSRS. After careful review, it was determined that the hydrological qualities along the review segment of Muddy Creek do not warrant it eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS.

- 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 40 percent of the total length of the waterway segment reviewed flows through public lands.

- A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate. The hydrological qualities were obtained without a WSR designation and can be protected under existing mechanisms.

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.

North Platte River

It was determined that the two public land parcels along the North Platte 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:

- 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.

- The BLM would be unable to manage the public lands involved in context of a WSR because of the interspersed parcels of private land. While nearly 88 percent of the total length of the waterway segment reviewed flows through public lands, the BLM has no jurisdiction or control over the small private land parcel near the middle of the review segment.

- A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified scenic, recreational, and wildlife values. 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.

Skull Creek Unit (includes two unnamed tributaries)

It was determined that the one public land parcel along the Skull Creek Unit 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:

- A WSR designation is deemed unnecessary or inappropriate as other existing mechanisms sufficiently protect identified historical values. 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.

Table C1: Rawlins Resource Planning area Wild and Scenic Suitability Review Summary		
Waterway Reviewed	***Determination***	***Justification***
Big Creek	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; potential use conflicts; manageability
Bunker Draw	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability
Cherry Creek	Public lands not suitable	Not a worthy addition to NWSRS; WSR designation is inappropriate
Duck Creek	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability
Encampment River	Public lands suitable	Scenic, historical, and wildlife values; unique land and resource diversity
Littlefield Creek	Public lands not suitable	WSR designation is inappropriate
Muddy Creek	Public lands not suitable	Not a worthy addition to NWSRS; Land ownership conflicts; manageability; WSR designation is inappropriate
North Platte River	Public lands not suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability; WSR designation is inappropriate
Skull Creek (includes two unnamed tributaries)	Public lands not suitable	WSR designation is inappropriate

Table C2: Rawlins Field office Suitability Review Meeting Attendance, March 28, 2002			
Name	***Agency***	***Phone Number***	***Resource Area***
Lilian Jonas	Jonas Consulting	928-774-6451	IDT Leader/Consultant
Krystal Clair	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4206	Recreation, Scenic
Mike Bower	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4272	Fisheries/Riparian
Mark Newman	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4248	Geology
Susan Foley	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4221	Soils
Robert Epp	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4217	Range
Frank Blomquist	BLM/Rawlins FO	307-328-4207	Wildlife/Fisheries/Botanical

ATTACHMENT D

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

MANAGEMENT OF BLM-ADMINISTERED PUBLIC LANDS WITHIN THE RAWLINS 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 Rawlins 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 the Encampment River. 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 segment (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 this corridor will be considered in future site specific, activity or management implementation planning to fulfill the stated management objective.

The public lands along the reviewed segment of the Encampment River 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 Big, Cherry, Duck, Littlefield, and Muddy Creeks; North Platte River; Bunker Draw; and the Skull Creek unit do not meet the WSR suitability factors. This determination is based upon the public lands not containing characteristics which make them worthy additions to the NWSRS; the public lands being land-locked by private lands and inaccessible to the public, and unlikelihood of obtaining public access to the public lands via private property; the existing potential use conflicts along the review segments (i.e., oil and natural gas drilling and development) which 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 Rawlins RMP planning area apply only to the waterway corridor which extends the length of the identified waterway segment and includes the waterway area, it's 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 segment under review.

Encampment River

The one public land parcel along the Encampment River (involving 2.51 miles along the river) was found to meet the WSR suitability factors to be given further consideration for inclusion in the NWSRS. All of the public lands involved are tentatively classified as wild.

Interim management practices for the one public land parcel along the Encampment River will focus on maintaining or enhancing the outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, historical, 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 lands will be closed to mineral leasing and related exploration and development activities. Existing mineral leases on these lands will be allowed to expire. The public lands will be closed to mineral location (e.g., filing of mining claims and related exploration and development). A withdrawal from land disposal, mineral location, and entry under the land laws will be pursued. Valid existing rights (existing mining claims) will be recognized and subject to existing (e.g., 43 CFR 3802) regulations. All mineral activity will be conducted in a manner that minimizes surface disturbance, water sedimentation, pollution, and visual impairment. The public lands will be closed to recreational dredging for minerals, such as gold, and to mineral material sales

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

The public lands will be 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 tails may be built, “by hand labor,” if there is a demand for them and they conform with the management objective for these lands. 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 will be closed to land disposal actions.

The public lands will be in an exclusion area for rights-of-way.

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

The public lands are closed to motorized vehicles. Non-motorized vehicles (e.g., bicycles, wheelchairs, and game carts) are restricted to existing trails. Recreationists will be required to "pack it out"; there will be no garbage facilities. Campfires can be permitted in keeping with current fire management regulations.

Any fire suppression activities on public lands will use “light-on-the-land” techniques. No motorized ground equipment will be used to suppress fires.

The public lands will be closed to commercial timber sales or harvesting. Cutting of trees will only 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). Chainsaw use will not be allowed and any evidence of cutting activities must be minimized.

Increases in active grazing preference 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 chemical spraying.

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