
***Proposed Resource Management Plan and
Final Environmental Impact Statement***

Bighorn Basin Resource Management Plan Revision Project

Appendix F

Special Designations: Wild and Scenic Rivers and
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Introduction.....	F-1
2.0	Wild and Scenic River Designation Process.....	F-1
3.0	ACEC Nomination Process.....	F-12
3.1	Relevance.....	F-12
3.2	Importance.....	F-13
4.0	References.....	F-19

LIST OF TABLES

Table F-1.	Characteristics for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area.....	F-2
Table F-2.	Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area.....	F-4
Table F-3.	Summary Results of the ACEC Evaluation Process.....	F-14

This page intentionally left blank.

APPENDIX F

SPECIAL DESIGNATIONS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This appendix includes a brief description of the Wild and Scenic River (WSR) and Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) designation and evaluation processes. This appendix also contains information on where to obtain the full reports that provided additional information on these processes.

2.0 WILD AND SCENIC RIVER DESIGNATION PROCESS

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) initiated a WSR review of all BLM-administered public lands along waterways within the Worland and Cody planning areas. This review was to determine eligibility, assign a tentative classification, and screen for suitability factors, as identified in the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) of 1968, as amended (see Table F-1). No waterway segments were determined eligible during this review in the Grass Creek Resource Area. The review process and decisions can be reviewed in the Grass Creek Resource Management Plan (RMP) (1999). Those segments in the remainder of the Planning Area determined eligible and assessed for suitability are all recommended as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System under alternatives B and E.

The BLM WSR review includes a three-step process:

1. Determining whether public lands along waterways meet the WSR eligibility criteria to be tentatively classified as wild, scenic, or recreational.
2. Determining whether any of those public lands that meet the eligibility criteria are also assessed for suitability.
3. Determining what rivers and adjacent public lands are determined suitable and recommended for designation and how they will be managed.

The WSR review was conducted separately from the RMP planning process to expedite the review process, resulting in a stand-alone WSR review report. The BLM will use this land use planning process to gather additional data, in the form of public comments and the impact analysis contained in Chapter 4 of this Proposed RMP and Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), to support eligibility and suitability findings. This WSR suitability assessment may be modified as a result of public comments. Following the review and response to any public comments on the Draft RMP and Draft EIS that address WSR recommendations presented in this document, the BLM will release the map and Record of Decision that contain the agency's WSR findings.

The Worland and Cody *Wild and Scenic River* reports may be viewed online at:
<http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/bighorn/docs/wsr.html>

Table F-1. Characteristics for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area

Name	Length of Segment on BLM-administered Lands (miles) ²	Outstandingly Remarkable Values	Tentative Classification	Suitability Screening from BLM WSR Review	Justification for Determination of Not Suitable ^{3, 4}
Cody Field Office					
Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone (2 segments) ¹	8.51	Cultural; Fish; Geologic; Historic; Other Values (whitewater); Recreational; Scenic; Wildlife	Scenic	Suitable (4.79 miles) Not Suitable (3.72 miles)	Segment 2: Majority private surface land and mineral estate Segment 3: Waterway segments met suitability factors
Cottonwood Creek ¹	4.05	Geologic; Historic; Other Values (endemic/rare vegetation, aspen stands, riparian); Scenic; Wildlife	Scenic	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Cow Creek (2 segments) ¹	1.92	Cultural; Geologic; Historic; Other Values (aspen stands, riparian, endemic/rare vegetation); Scenic; Wildlife	Wild	Suitable	Waterway segments met suitability factors
Deer Creek	1.46	Cultural; Fish; Recreational; Scenic	Scenic	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Meeteetse Creek ¹	2.78	Geologic; Historic; Other Values (riparian, alpine vegetation, volcanic-specialized vegetation); Wildlife	Wild	Not Suitable	Private mineral estate
North Fork Shoshone River ¹	0.85	Cultural; Fish; Geologic; Historic; Recreational; Scenic; Wildlife	Recreational	Not Suitable	Majority private surface land and mineral estate
Oasis Spring Creek	2.07	Cultural; Fish; Recreational; Scenic	Wild	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors ⁵
Pat O’Hara Creek ¹	2.17	Cultural; Historic	Scenic	Not Suitable	Effective current management
Porcupine Creek	10.8	Cultural; Fish; Other Values (riparian); Recreational; Scenic	Wild/Scenic	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
South Fork Shoshone River ¹	1.99	Cultural; Fish; Geologic; Historic; Recreational; Scenic; Wildlife	Recreational	Not Suitable	Majority private surface land and mineral estate
Trout Creek	0.96	Cultural; Fish; Other Values (riparian); Recreational; Scenic	Wild	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Worland Field Office					
Canyon Creek	1.30	Cultural	Scenic	Not Suitable	Land ownership conflicts; manageability
Deep Creek	5.20	Fish; Recreational; Scenic	Wild	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors

Table F-1. Characteristics for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Length of Segment on BLM-administered Lands (miles) ²	Outstandingly Remarkable Values	Tentative Classification	Suitability Determination	Justification for Determination of Not Suitable ^{3, 4}
Dry Medicine Lodge Creek	10.59	Cultural; Geologic; Other Values (caving, aquifer recharge); Recreational; Scenic	Scenic	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Kirby Creek (3 segments)	0.10	Historic	Recreational	Not Suitable	Majority private surface land and mineral estate
Medicine Lodge Creek	5.70	Cultural; Geologic; Other Values (sinking streams, aquifer recharge); Recreational; Scenic	Wild	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Laddie Creek (2 segments, part of Paint Rock Creek unit)	1.37	Cultural	Recreational	Suitable (0.63 miles) Not Suitable (0.74 miles)	Segment 1: Land ownership conflicts and manageability Segment 2: Waterway segments met suitability factors
Paint Rock Creek (2 segments, part of Paint Rock Creek unit)	7.02	Cultural; Recreational; Scenic	Recreational	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Paint Rock Creek, South Fork (2 segments, part of Paint Rock Creek unit)	3.46	Cultural; Fish	Recreational	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Powder River (Middle Fork)	2.53	Recreational	Recreational	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
Trapper Creek	10.91	Cultural; Geologic; Other Values (caving area); Recreational; Scenic	Wild	Suitable	Waterway segment met suitability factors
White Creek (4 segments)	6.98	Cultural; Scenic	Wild	Suitable (5.70 miles) Not suitable (1.28 miles)	Segments 1-3: Land ownership conflicts; manageability Segment 4: Waterway segment met suitability factors

Sources: BLM 2002; BLM 2003; BLM 2009a; BLM 2009b

¹Waterway Segment Revaluated as part the 2009 Cody Field Office Wild and Scenic River Addendum Report.

²Approximate length based on available geographic information system data; segment lengths have been rounded to the nearest hundredth of a mile.

³To provide for a range of alternatives, all Wild and Scenic River eligible segments are recommended as suitable under alternatives B and E, and none of the Wild and Scenic River eligible segments are recommended as suitable under Alternative C.

⁴Detailed explanations of how suitable waterways met each of the suitability factors appears in the Worland and Cody Field Office Wild and Scenic River Reports, available on the project website.

⁵The 2003 Wild and Scenic Rivers Review Report found Oasis Spring Creek eligible, tentatively classified as Wild, and suitable for inclusion. However, the 2009 Wild and Scenic Rivers Review Addendum Report found Oasis Spring Creek not eligible because the waterway is identified as ephemeral, which also means that Oasis Spring Creek does not have a tentative classification, and is not suitable. The BLM decided to keep Oasis Spring Creek in the RMP for analysis and alternatives.

BLM Bureau of Land Management
WSR Wild and Scenic River

In following the WSR process, the BLM used the Bighorn Basin Resource RMP Revision as the vehicle to identify the suitability of each of the eligible waterway corridors. Each element of the revision process, including but not limited to scoping, RMP tours, workshops, cooperators meetings, and public comments, was used to for determining suitability. As identified earlier as the third process, the BLM determined that none of the eligible waterway corridors are suitable for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Refer to Table F-2 for suitability determination for each of the waterway corridors.

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
<i>Cody Field Office</i>		
Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone (Segment 1)	No	<p>Factor 1: Scenic and recreation quality are outstanding. However, the amount of private land interspersed with BLM may make it difficult to maintain ORV's.</p> <p>Factor 2: BLM-administered mineral/surface estate interspersed with private land. Not suitable due to the preponderance of private land, dominating this portion of the waterway.</p> <p>Factors 2, 4, 5, 7, 9: Difficult to administer, due to the preponderance of private land interspersed with smaller segments of river on public land.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 8, 9, 11: Local interest would include those Valid Existing Rights to allow for irrigation water out of the Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River. Those rights would be honored.</p> <p>Factors 3, 9: Irrigation uses off the Clarks Fork.</p> <p>Factors 3, 13: In 1993, during the first inventory, there was interest by the state to develop these waters into a dam/reservoir. Recent conversations with the governor's office reflected a change in that interest.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River, Segment 1 as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS.</p>
Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone (Segment 2)	No	<p>Factor 1: Includes outstanding scenic and recreation values.</p> <p>Factor 2: The majority of land along this waterway is privately owned. The BLM does not control actions on private property, so this preponderance of private ownership would make the maintenance of the identified ORVs difficult.</p> <p>Factor 3: State of Wyoming expressed interest in developing this waterway through the construction of a dam and reservoir. However, recent communication with the Governor's Office indicates that the state may no longer be considering this option; Valid existing water rights would be allowed to continue for the remainder of the permit term, and could potentially be renewed after the term ends. However, new irrigation rights-of-way would only be granted if they were designed to limit effects on the identified ORVs that make this waterway eligible.</p> <p>Factors 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13: Local interest in the potential designation of the Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River includes concerns related to the withdrawal of irrigation water from the river.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River, Segment 2 as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone (Segment 2)	No	<p>Factor 1: Outstanding area. Scenery, water sports, fisheries, geology, history, and recreation.</p> <p>Factor 2: BLM administers both surface and mineral estate.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 8, 11: Some water rights may include using this area for irrigation (pumping water out of the river). These are Valid Existing Rights and should not be affected.</p> <p>Factors 3, 8, 11, 13: Powersite Reservation 26 and Powersite Classification 201 currently apply to this portion of the Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River. The suitable determination for Segment 3 is based on a revocation of this power site withdrawal. The decision to revoke this withdrawal would be made by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission;</p> <p>Several ditches take water out with head-gates, one head-gate pumps water out of the river. Public Water reserve in segments.</p> <p>Factors 3, 13: In 1993, during the first inventory, there was interest by the state to develop these waters into a dam/reservoir. Recent conversations with the governor’s office reflected a change in that interest.</p> <p>Factor 6: With the abutment of this segment of the river with the designated WSR on USFS, the BLM will be consistent with surrounding management and retention of those values that make this area suitable.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: The RMP revision’s preferred alternative manage this area under a CSU (historic trails) and NSO (Recreation), which will aid in protecting the identified ORVs within the waterway corridor. These underlying prescriptions negate the need to recommend this waterway corridor for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone, Segment 3 as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Cottonwood Creek	No	<p>Factor 1: Class A scenic area. Dramatic rise of canyon walls, good trail management for horseback rides and non-motorized vehicles.</p> <p>Factors 2, 4: BLM administers both surface and mineral estate and the water rights.</p> <p>Factor 3: Historically, this canyon water was diverted for irrigation 50-80 years ago, ending at Pete’s Cabin.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: The river corridor is within the Little Mountain ACEC and the Craig Thomas Special Management Area, which management prescriptions (such as administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing, ROW avoidance, renewable exclusion area) in the BLM’s preferred alternatives will benefit the identified ORVs within Cottonwood Creek.</p> <p>Factor 10: Public interest in this canyon has been supportive of this area receiving some special management. Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Cow Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS.</p>
Cow Creek (Segment 1)	No	<p>Factors 1, 12: This area is similar to other canyons in Little Mountain area - but it ties to Porcupine Creek which was already recommended as eligible and suitable in the 1993 inventory. This area will continue to be remote and inaccessible - very difficult to get to unless hiking.</p> <p>Factors 2, 4: BLM administers both estates (surface/mineral).</p> <p>Factors 2, 4, 11: BLM is currently managing the area and it is staying in character.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: The river corridor is within the Little Mountain ACEC and the Craig Thomas Special Management Area, which management prescriptions (such as administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing, ROW avoidance, renewable exclusion area) in the</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
		<p>BLM’s preferred alternatives will benefit the identified ORVs within Cow Creek.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Cow Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Cow Creek – Segment 2	No	<p>Factor 1: Historic Area, Geological features.</p> <p>Factor 2: BLM-administered surface and minerals.</p> <p>Factor 3: Continued grazing and recreation opportunities.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: The river corridor is within the Little Mountain ACEC and the Craig Thomas Special Management Area, which management prescriptions (such as administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing, ROW avoidance, renewable exclusion area) in the BLM’s preferred alternatives will benefit the identified ORVs within Cow Creek (Segment 2).</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Cow Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Deer Creek, Porcupine Creek, and Trout Creek River Corridors	No	<p>Factors 1, 12: As determined during the ORV analysis for Porcupine Creek and its eligible tributaries, the scenic and recreational value of this river is very unique, particularly when compared to other rivers of this type in the region. The addition of the Porcupine Creek and its tributaries into the WSR system would provide a creditable addition. The scenic qualities are extremely unique when viewed from a regional perspective, since few canyons in the region have walls as high or as vertical, and remain in such an undisturbed pristine condition.</p> <p>Factor 2: With the exception of two small tracts of private land on Porcupine Creek encompassing a total of 0.5 miles, the remainder of Porcupine Creek and its eligible tributaries are public land administered by the BLM. This includes 9.7 miles on Porcupine Creek, 1.3 miles on Deer Creek, 2.4 miles on Oasis Spring Creek and 0.9 miles on Trout Creek, for a total of 14.3 miles. This abundance of public lands presents minimal land ownership conflict and would ensure effective manageability if the river is designated as a WSR.</p> <p>Factors 2, 6: As previously indicated, the majority of the analyzed portion of Porcupine Creek and its tributaries is public land. Acquisition of the existing 0.5 miles of private property is not deemed necessary to effectively manage the area as a WSR. Because of this large degree of public land, and no need to acquire the property to administer the river, estimates have not been prepared indicating the cost of federal acquisition of the involved private property.</p> <p>Factors 3, 5, 7: The United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Mines, indicates the areas adjacent to Porcupine Creek and its associated tributaries have occurrences of numerous mineral resources, and further indicate depending on the configuration of any associated withdrawal, may impact mineral development.</p> <p>The United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs, indicates they want to ensure continued involvement of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Crow Tribe during any analysis of this section of river for Wild and Scenic values.</p> <p>Correspondence has also been received from the Wyoming Water Development Commission opposing the designation of this river as a WSR, since it would mean more federal control of water resources.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 11: No known conflicts have been identified on the section of river under analysis in this document. Potential conflicts may exist upstream on lands administered by the USFS, or downstream on Crow Tribal Lands. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, representing the Crow Tribe, has indicated concern with potential conflict with Crow Tribal Lands in Montana as a result of this analysis. There are no known potential</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
		<p>conflicts which would result from inclusion of Porcupine Creek and its associated tributaries in the WSR system. There are also no known projects or proposals which would be foreclosed or diminished if the area were not protected under the WSR system. Of course, the designation would provide congressional protection to the area.</p> <p>Factors 3, 8, 11: The river corridors are within the Little Mountain ACEC and the Craig Thomas Special Management Area, which management prescriptions (such as administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing, ROW avoidance, renewable exclusion area) in the BLM’s preferred alternatives will benefit the identified ORVs within these river corridors.</p> <p>Factors 3, 8, 12, 13: There are no known historical or existing rights which would be adversely affected by designation of Porcupine Creek or its associated tributaries. There is existing livestock trailing and a primitive access road occurring in the scenic section of the river, and it is not anticipated that the designation would adversely impact either of these ongoing uses. Infringement of other potential future land uses in the corridor; i.e., grazing privileges, mining claims, and rights-of-way, may occur to some degree. Wild and scenic characteristics now present in the river corridor would be protected from alteration resulting from future land uses and development.</p> <p>Factors 3, 9, 13: The WGFD has voiced concerns about maintaining the ability to do riparian habitat management adjacent to the river, but has not indicated opposition or support for designation.</p> <p>Factors 4, 7, 9: Porcupine Creek and its associated tributaries, if designated a WSR could be effectively managed by the BLM. If ongoing studies would determine portions of the creek administered by the USFS, are also suitable, the entire river could be effectively managed by either agency or jointly by both.</p> <p>Factor 5: There is no known interest, by any entity, in sharing the cost of administering the river as a WSR.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Porcupine Creek, Deer Creek, Trout Creek, or any waterway corridor as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS, or to manage any river corridors to maintain or enhance the identified ORVs. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Meeteetse Creek	No	<p>Factor 1: Scenic, geologic, wildlife, historic values in waterway corridor. Currently, there is no legal vehicular access. However, Carter Mountain and the Meeteetse Creek drainage are accessible via hiking from USFS.</p> <p>Factor 2: BLM-administered surface; private mineral estate.</p> <p>Factors 2, 4, 7, 11: The mineral estate along Meeteetse Creek is privately owned, and this ownership pattern is the primary reason a suitability determination was not supported for this waterway. While the BLM could impose certain conditions of approval for minerals development in this area, the preservation of the identified ORVs would be difficult if such development occurred.</p> <p>Factors 2, 7, 8: Segments 1 & 2 are divided by a parcel of Wyoming State Land.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 8, 11: Continued use for grazing, recreation, and wildlife. In the Carter Mountain ACEC. Hunt Oil could develop their mineral interest, but the BLM would have administrative control on surface conditions of approval.</p> <p>Factor 8: Agency can manage these resources with other than WSR designation.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Meeteetse Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
North Fork Shoshone River		<p>Factor 1: Scenic, recreation and geology. Yellowstone National Park corridor leading to the East Gate of the park.</p> <p>Factors 1, 2, 7, 8, 9, 10: In the areas where the river crosses BLM-administered surface, the agency manages both the surface and the mineral estate. Public lands along this waterway provide important river access points and habitat for animals such as grizzly bears. However, the majority of land along this waterway is privately owned. The BLM does not control actions on private property, so this preponderance of private ownership would make the maintenance of the identified ORVs difficult.</p> <p>Factor 2: The BLM administers both surface and mineral estate. However, with the preponderance of private land interspersed along the river corridor, ORV's may be hard to maintain in the present state.</p> <p>Factor 3: No reasonably foreseeable potential uses known beyond current multiple uses.</p> <p>Factors 5, 6, 8, 9: Management of WSR in this area would be onerous due to the amount of private land and traffic.</p> <p>Factor 10: Heavy recreation area along the highway to Yellowstone National Park.</p> <p>Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate North Fork Shoshone River as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Oasis Spring Creek	No	<p>Factor 1: The 2003 WSR eligibility analysis originally found Oasis Spring Creek as eligible. The 2009 Cody Field Office Addendum found that Oasis Spring Creek is not eligible because it is ephemeral, not intermittent.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: The river corridor is within the Little Mountain ACEC, which management prescriptions (such as administratively unavailable for oil and gas leasing, ROW avoidance, renewable exclusion area). These underlying management prescriptions will benefit the identified ORVs within the river corridor.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate the upstream portions of White Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Pat O'Hara Creek		<p>Factor 2: BLM-administered (surface/mineral) with private interspersed.</p> <p>Factor 3: Active grazing leases.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: The BLM is successfully managing the identified ORVs using existing cultural resource laws. The protection these laws afford the cultural and historic sites associated with this waterway is sufficient, making inclusion in the NWSRS unnecessary.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Pat O'Hara Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
South Fork Shoshone River		<p>Factor 1: Very beautiful scenery and heavily used by recreationists and homeowners in the area.</p> <p>Factor 2: In the areas where the river crosses BLM-administered surface, the agency manages both the surface and the mineral estate. However, the majority of land along this waterway is privately owned. The BLM does not control actions on private property, so this preponderance of private ownership would make the maintenance of the identified ORVs difficult.</p> <p>Factor 3: Continued urban interface with BLM land interspersed with private. A large number of private residences and vacation homes have been built on private land along this waterway in recent years. Designation as part of the NWSRS would not stop the</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
		<p>expansion of the wildland urban interface in this area, which would further complicate maintenance of the identified ORVs.</p> <p>Factors 5, 6, 8, 9: The agency would have a difficult time preserving the ORV's for this area, due to the preponderance of private land and continued growth of the area.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate South Fork Shoshone River as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Worland Field Office		
Canyon Creek	No	<p>Factor 2: Potential management conflicts with interspersed and adjacent private lands that may compromise suitability of waterway.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Canyon Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Deep Creek	No	<p>Factor 2: Majority of surface ownership up stream is private; Irrigation diversions and interests upstream of segment; Designated as WSR may prevent upstream water rights.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 8, 9, 13: Irrigation diversions and interests upstream of segment.</p> <p>Designated as WSR may prevent upstream water rights; WGFD interested in maintaining cutthroat species. Have done treatments in the past. In addition, WGFD has in-stream flow protection area within corridor. This allows WGFD to protect stream for minimum base flow requirements.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: Entire waterway corridor within existing CSUs to manage for Big Game Migration Corridors, Raptors, and Rock Art Sites.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Deep Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Dry Medicine Lodge Creek	No	<p>Factor 1: Downstream portion of Dry Medicine Lodge is intermittent, and perennial the upper half.</p> <p>Factors 3, 13: WGFD interested in maintaining cutthroat species, which at this location is one of few exceptional areas along the West Slope of the Bighorn of which support cutthroat trout.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: Entire waterway corridor under CSU stipulations, majority from Canyons RMZ, Rock Art Sites, cutthroat trout, the remainder from big game migration corridors, Blue and Red Ribbon streams, raptor buffers, and sage-grouse. Approximately 9 miles (majority) within Spanish Point ACEC with an unavailable stipulation; 8.1 miles within the lands with wilderness characteristics.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Dry Medicine Lodge Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Kirby Creek	No	<p>Factor 2: Land-locked by private lands and inaccessible to the public; unlikelihood of obtaining public access to the public lands via private property.</p> <p>Factors 2, 3, 11: Potential management conflicts with interspersed and adjacent private lands that may compromise suitability of waterway.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Kirby Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
Medicine Lodge Creek	No	<p>Factors 3, 8, 11: Entire waterway corridor is within the Medicine Lodge WSA, and most of the waterway corridor is within the Spanish Point ACEC. Cave and Karst resources will benefit from WSR designation. ACEC and WSA are currently adequately managing resources.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Medicine Lodge Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Powder River (Middle Fork)	No	<p>Factor 1: The identified area is too small to adequately manage as a WSR.</p> <p>Factors 1, 8, 11: The waterway corridor is too small to adequately manage as a WSR. The Buffalo Field Office manages the waterway downstream and proposes in the RMP revision to continue to retain the free-flowing characteristics and ORVs if Congress denies the Middle Fork Powder River WSR nomination. Entire waterway corridor within CSU stipulation for Class 1 and 2 streams; NSO stipulations within a segment of the corridor for recreation sites.</p> <p>Factor 2: Huge amount of private lands upstream of identified waterway corridor; Drainages in private lands upstream of corridor are scoured.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 9, 11, 13: BLM-administered lands immediately to the west of waterway is managed as a stock driveway; WGFD have implemented fish treatments, and wish to maintain fish management to sustain cutthroat species.</p> <p>Factor 3: Vegetation treatments such as mastication treatments will be precluded.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate the Middle Fork of the Powder River as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Paint Rock Creek Unit	No	<p>Factors 2, 7, 11: The Bighorn USFS allows for motorized use within the valley bottom upstream of the identified waterway segment.</p> <p>Private lands within waterway segment.</p> <p>Factors 3, 7, 9, 11, 13: Historic livestock uses, and current livestock operations are observed in the Paint Rock Unit. Middle Fork Paint Rock is used to trail cattle, as well as motorized vehicles are used to support ranching activities. WGFD currently managing for cutthroat trout.</p> <p>Factors 3, 11, 13: South Fork Paint Rock contains pure strain of cutthroat trout which WGFD manages for. WSR designation may preclude appropriate management to maintain or enhance this resource.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11, 13: Management of identified ORVs will conflict with WSR criteria (cutthroat trout); CSU stipulations in place within the Middle Fork Paint Rock, Laddie Creek, and South Paint Rock from Class I and 2 streams and Canyons RMZ; Upper watershed in South Paint Rock under CSU from cutthroat trout stipulations; Major portion of Paint Rock under CSU stipulation from rocks art sites.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate the Paint Rock Creek Unit as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
Paint Rock Creek Unit (upstream portion of Laddie Creek)	No	<p>Factor 2: Land-locked by private lands and inaccessible to the public; unlikelihood of obtaining public access to the public lands via private property.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: the potential management conflicts with interspersed and adjacent private lands that may compromise suitability of waterway.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see</p>

Table F-2. Suitability Determinations for Waterways Determined Eligible for Wild and Scenic River Designation in the Planning Area (Continued)

Name	Suitable	Suitability Factors (refer to BLM Manual 6400)
		the need to designate this unit as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.
Trapper Creek	No	<p>Factor 1: Great X (significant cave resource) is located upstream of Trapper Creek segment, and exits within the WSA.</p> <p>Factors 1, 3, 12, 13: In-stream flow in Trapper Creek.</p> <p>Factor 2: Large amount of private surface ownership up stream.</p> <p>Factors 8, 11: Entire waterway segment is within the Trapper Creek WSA. This waterway segment will be suitable if Congress decides to release the WSA to multiple use.</p> <p>Upper reaches of corridor under an unavailable stipulation from Spanish Point ACEC.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate Trapper Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p> <p>Factor 11: Currently managed under WSA objectives. WSR designation will create redundant management designations.</p>
White Creek	No	<p>Factors 2, 3, 7, 11, 13: Majority of surface ownership up stream is private.</p> <p>Diversion located at mouth of the Canyon; Two-track located within proximity to the upstream boundary used for livestock use and other operations. Designation of WSR will preclude use on the two-track; Proposed vegetation treatment project within proximity to the corridor located on top of the rims.</p> <p>Factor 3: Livestock use surrounding waterway, but managing livestock use within the waterway corridor will not be an issue.</p> <p>Factor 8, 11: NSO found in tiny portion in lower reaches from riparian areas, CSU on entire corridor from Canyon RMZ, as well as raptors, big game corridors, and wetland/riparian buffers.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate White Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>
White Creek (upstream portions)	No	<p>Factor 2: Land-locked by private lands and inaccessible to the public; unlikelihood of obtaining public access to the public lands via private property.</p> <p>Factors 3, 8, 11: Potential management conflicts with interspersed and adjacent private lands that may compromise suitability of waterway.</p> <p>Factor 10: Cooperators, and local, state, and other affected federal agencies did not see the need to designate the upstream portions of White Creek as suitable for inclusion into the NWSRS. In addition, there were no comments during the Land Use Plan that supported the WSR designation.</p>

Sources: BLM 2002; BLM 2003; BLM 2009a; BLM 2009b

ACEC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	RMZ	Recreation Management Zone
BLM	Bureau of Land Management	ROW	Rights-of-Way
CSU	Controlled Surface Use	USFS	United States Forest Service
NSO	No Surface Occupancy	WGFD	Wyoming Game and Fish Department
NWSRS	National Wild and Scenic River System	WSA	Wilderness Study Area
ORV	Outstandingly Remarkable Value	WSR	Wild and Scenic River

3.0 ACEC NOMINATION PROCESS

Part of the planning process for the Bighorn Basin RMP Revision Project included a review of BLM-administered lands to determine whether they met the criteria for designation as ACECs. The ACEC designation is an administrative designation used by the BLM that is accomplished through the land use planning process. It is unique to the BLM in that no other agency uses this form of designation. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), states that the BLM will give priority to the designation and protection of ACECs in the development and revision of land use plans.

ACECs are composed of only BLM-administered lands, and private lands and lands administered by other agencies are not included in the boundaries of ACECs. Unlike other special designations, such as wilderness study areas (WSAs), the designation of an area as an ACEC does not by itself automatically prohibit or restrict other uses in the area (with the exception that a mining plan of operation is required for any proposed mining activity within a designated ACEC). However, to be considered for designation, special management beyond the standard provisions established by the RMP must be required to protect the BLM-administered public lands that meet the important and relevant criteria (described below).

Several steps are required to identify and evaluate ACECs. These steps include (1) the nomination of areas by the public during scoping or by BLM resource specialists, (2) evaluation of the nominated areas to determine if they meet the importance and relevance criteria described below, and (3) consideration of the potential ACECs as management scenarios analyzed in the RMP and EIS. As part of this evaluation, the BLM also considers whether the existing ACEC designations should be modified or terminated. The Draft RMP and Draft EIS contained recommendations proposing potential ACECs for designation. Following the closure of the comment period on the Draft RMP and Draft EIS, the BLM published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to begin preparation of EISs and Supplemental EISs to Incorporate Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Measures into Land Use Plans and Land Management Plans (76 FR 77008, December 9, 2011) in accordance with the BLM National Greater Sage-grouse Planning Strategy Charter released in August 2011 (BLM 2011). Nominations for greater sage-grouse-related ACECs were submitted by members of the public in response to the NOI. The Supplement to the Draft RMP and Draft EIS contains recommendations proposing Greater Sage-Grouse Key Habitat Area and Priority Habitat Management Area ACECs for designation and public comment.

Public comments on the Draft RMP and Draft EIS as well as the Supplement to that document were reviewed and adjustments were made as necessary before the release of this Proposed RMP and Final EIS. Designation of ACECs will be incorporated into the Record of Decision (ROD) approving the RMP.

Regulations at 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) part § 1610.7-2 state that during the resource management planning process, inventory data should be analyzed to determine whether there are areas within the Planning Area containing resources, values, systems or processes or hazards eligible for further consideration for designation as ACECs. In order to be eligible for designation as an ACEC, an area must meet at least one of both the relevance and importance criteria described below.

3.1 Relevance

An area meets the relevance criteria if it contains one or more of the following:

1. A significant historic, cultural, or scenic value (including but not limited to rare or sensitive archeological resources and religious or cultural resources important to Native Americans).

2. A fish and wildlife resource (including but not limited to habitat for threatened, endangered, or sensitive species, or habitat essential for maintaining species diversity).
3. A natural process or system (including but not limited to threatened, endangered, or sensitive plant species; rare, endemic, or relic plants or plant communities which are terrestrial, aquatic, or riparian; or rare geological features).
4. Natural hazards (including but not limited to areas of avalanche, dangerous flooding, landslides, unstable soils, seismic activity, or dangerous cliffs). A hazard caused by human action may meet the relevance criteria if it is determined through the RMP process that it has become part of a natural process.

3.2 Importance

The values, resources, system, processes, and/or hazards that allowed the area to meet the relevance criteria must have qualities that are in need of protection or special attention in order for the area to meet the importance criteria. The area meets the importance criteria if its relevance qualities can be characterized by one or more of the following:

- A. Has more than locally significant qualities which give it special worth, consequence, meaning, distinctiveness, or cause for concern, especially compared to any similar resource.
- B. Has qualities or circumstances that make it fragile, sensitive, rare, irreplaceable, exemplary, unique, endangered, threatened, or vulnerable to adverse change.
- C. Has been recognized as warranting protection in order to satisfy national priority concerns or to carry out the mandates of FLPMA.
- D. Has qualities that warrant highlighting in order to satisfy public or management concerns about safety and public welfare.
- E. Poses a substantial threat to human life and safety or to property.

Based on comments received during scoping and internal recommendations from BLM specialists, nine existing ACECs were nominated for continued designation and five expansion areas associated with these existing ACECs were proposed, as were 14 new ACEC nominations. These 28 nominated areas were evaluated using the relevance and importance criteria described above. Twenty-two of the nominations met both the relevance and importance criteria and were analyzed in the Draft RMP and Draft EIS. Additionally, two ACECs were analyzed in the Supplement to the Draft RMP and Draft EIS.

Table F-3 lists the 28 nominations that were considered. This table lists the acreage of the proposed areas, the values of concern that warranted the nominations, the relevance and importance criteria that each area meets (numbers and letters correspond to the lists above), and whether the area was recommended for analysis in the Draft RMP and Draft EIS or the Supplement to the Draft RMP and Draft EIS.

Additional information relevant to ACECs in the Planning Area, including the original completed ACEC Evaluation Forms and detailed maps of the existing or proposed ACECs, can be viewed in the *Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Evaluation Report*, which is available online at: <http://www.blm.gov/wy/st/en/programs/Planning/rmps/bighorn/docs.html>.

Table F-3. Summary Results of the ACEC Evaluation Process

Area	Acres	Value(s) of Concern	Relevance Criteria ¹	Importance Criteria ¹	Recommended	Comments
Existing ACECs (no expansion proposed)						
Big Cedar Ridge	264	Paleontological	1	A, B	Yes	The area contains abundant paleontological resources, in particular, fossilized plants. Sites with such in situ preservation of entire plant communities are extremely rare, both regionally and nationally.
Red Gulch Dinosaur Tracksite	1,798	Paleontological	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The area contains the largest tracksite in Wyoming, and one of only a few worldwide from the Middle Jurassic Period.
Sheep Mountain Anticline	11,520	Geologic; Caves; Cultural; Scenic	1, 3	A, B	Yes	This area is composed of a classic Laramide anticline featured in textbooks nationwide and studied by geology classes from all over the world. The area also contains several caves, some of international significance, which provide recreational, educational, and research opportunities.
Spanish Point Karst	6,298	Caves; Recreational; Sinking Stream Segments; Water Quality	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The cave/karst system in the area is an important recharge area for the Madison aquifer. The area also contains recreational qualities due to good public access, scenic values, and varied potential recreation activities (primarily hiking, rock climbing, and caving).
Existing ACECs with Proposed Expansions						
Brown/Howe (existing)	5,501	Paleontological	1, 3	A, B	Yes	This area contains paleontological values in the form of dinosaur fossils (primarily of Jurassic age), most notably from the suborder Theropoda and Sauropoda.
Brown/Howe (proposed expansion)	15,233	Paleontological	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The values of the expansion area are similar to the existing, but also includes vertebrate fossils and scientifically important paleobotanical, palynological (pollen), mammalian fossil, and dinosaur eggshell site resources.
Carter Mountain (existing)	10,867	Vegetation; Wildlife	1, 2, 3	B	Yes	This area contains alpine tundra and rare plants, and also includes for big game habitat (crucial winter range).
Carter Mountain (proposed expansion)	5,707	Cultural; Recreational; Special Status Species; Vegetation; Watershed; Wildlife; Soils	1, 2, 3, 4	A, B, C	Yes	The values of the expansion area are similar to the existing, but also include habitat for wildlife transition, and summer ranges. The area also includes special status species, and fragile and unstable soils and intense weather conditions that can cause hazards to visitors.

Table F-3. Summary Results of the ACEC Evaluation Process (Continued)

Area	Acres	Value(s) of Concern	Relevance Criteria ¹	Importance Criteria ¹	Recommended	Comments
Five Springs Falls (existing)	163	Recreational; Scenic; Special Status Species	1, 3	A, B	Yes	Five Springs Falls area provides unique habitat for four plant species that are known to occur only in Wyoming and one other state. This unique habitat is composed of vertical cliff walls that are kept moist by spray from the waterfall. The Five Springs Falls Campground and waterfalls in the area are of recreational and scenic value.
Five Springs Falls (proposed expansion)	1,646	Geologic; Scenic; Public Safety	1, 3, 4	A, B	Yes	Geologic strata situated in the proposed ACEC expansion have been severely uplifted, folded, and faulted, resulting in an area of exceptional scenic and geologic interest and value; the steep topography is unstable, and downslope movements of soil and rock presents a public safety risk.
Little Mountain (existing)	21,476	Caves; Cultural; Paleontological; Scenic	1, 3	A, B, E	Yes	The karst topography has resulted in the capture and preservation of animal fossils, and the area contains sites from Prehistoric occupation. The mine shafts and tailings from uranium mining are a safety hazard.
Little Mountain expansion area (proposed expansion)	50,575	Wildlife; Special Status Species; Recreational; Vegetation; Scenic	1, 2, 3	A, B, C	Yes	This area contains big game seasonal and migration corridors, and known or potentially occurring BLM Sensitive Species and rare plant species habitat; these habitats are under threat from invasive species, human development, and livestock-wildlife disease transfer. The area includes numerous cultural sites (e.g., rock shelters, vision quest sites) and is an important area for hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing, and scenic geologic features.
Upper Owl Creek Area (existing)	13,758	Cultural; Fish; Recreational; Scenic; Soils; Special Status Species; Vegetation; Wildlife	1, 2, 3	A, B	Yes	The ACEC contains wildlife resources and special status species (including migratory birds, wolves, grizzly bears, moose, and wolverines), cultural resources, and primitive recreational opportunities (e.g., hiking, camping, fishing, and horseback riding). Vegetation communities include endemic plant species growing in “moonscapes” where rocky, sparsely-vegetated soils support low-growing, cushion plant communities, as well as forested areas that include old-growth tree stands.
Upper Owl Creek Area (proposed expansion)	18,975	Cultural; Fish; Recreational; Scenic; Soils; Special Status Species; Vegetation; Wildlife	1, 2, 3	A, B	Yes	The values of the expansion area are similar to the existing.

Table F-3. Summary Results of the ACEC Evaluation Process (Continued)

Area	Acres	Value(s) of Concern	Relevance Criteria ¹	Importance Criteria ¹	Recommended	Comments
Proposed ACECs						
Black-tailed Prairie Dog Complex	182	Wildlife; Special Status Species	2, 3	-	No	The area met the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife resources (black-tailed prairie dog, a species that has been petitioned for listing under the ESA) and natural process (potential habitat for black-footed ferret, an Endangered species). It did not meet the importance criteria because special management attention is not required to protect the black-tailed prairie dog complex; standard and routine management prescriptions afforded to special status wildlife species are sufficient.
Chapman Bench	23,326	Special Status Species; Vegetation; Wildlife	2, 3	A, B, C	Yes	The area contains sagebrush habitat used by sensitive bird species and other wildlife.
Clarks Fork Basin/Polecat Bench West Paleontological Area	23,895	Paleontological; Scenic	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The area contains a stratigraphic contact zone and the paleontological and geochemical values associated with these rock layers that are exposed in only a few areas worldwide.
Clarks Fork Canyon	12,249	Geologic; Open Space; Recreational; Special Status Species; Wildlife	2, 3	A, B	Yes	The area contains geologic, crucial winter range for big game, one of only two ranges for mountain goats in the state and one of the largest bighorn sheep ranges in the country, special status species habitat (including plant, sagebrush obligate wildlife, and Yellowstone cutthroat trout), open space, and recreational resources and uses including along the Clarks Fork of the Yellowstone River.
Fifteen Mile and Manderson White-tailed Prairie Dog Complex	7,917	Wildlife; Special Status Species	2	-	No	The area met the relevance criteria for fish and wildlife resources (BLM Sensitive white-tailed prairie dog). It did not meet the importance criteria special management attention is not required to protect the white-tailed prairie dog complex; standard and routine management prescriptions afforded to special status wildlife species are sufficient.
Foster Gulch Paleontological Area	27,302	Paleontological; Scenic	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The area contains a stratigraphic contact zone and the paleontological and geochemical values associated with these rock layers that are exposed in only a few areas worldwide.

Table F-3. Summary Results of the ACEC Evaluation Process (Continued)

Area	Acres	Value(s) of Concern	Relevance Criteria ¹	Importance Criteria ¹	Recommended	Comments
Greater Sage-Grouse Priority Habitat Management Areas	1,116,698	Special Status Species; Vegetation	2, 3	A, B, C	Yes	The area contains sagebrush habitat used by sensitive bird species and other wildlife, including the greater sage-grouse, a candidate species for listing under provisions of the ESA. These habitats are under threat from surface disturbance associated with mineral (including gravel pits) and ROW development, renewable energy developments, heavy recreational and motorized vehicle use, and invasive and nonnative species infestations. These activities threaten important greater sage-grouse habitats, including breeding, later brood-rearing, and winter concentration areas.
Greater Sage-Grouse Key Habitat Area	1,232,583	Special Status Species; Vegetation	2, 3	A, B, C	Yes	Same as above.
McCullough Peaks South Paleontological Area	6,994	Paleontological; Scenic	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The area contains a stratigraphic contact zone and the paleontological and geochemical values associated with these rock layers that are exposed in only a few areas worldwide.
McCullough Peaks/ YU Bench	298,402	Scenic; Historic; Cultural; Wildlife; Recreational; Geologic	1, 2, 3, 4	-	No	The area met the relevance criteria for significant historic, cultural, or scenic value; fish and wildlife resources; natural process or system (for sage-grouse and wild horse habitat and geology); and natural hazards. It did not meet the importance criteria as management concerns are similar to other locations and can be addressed through other means (e.g., Herd Management Areas).
Rainbow Canyon	1,433	Paleontological; Geologic; Scenic	1, 3	A, B	Yes	The area contains scenic and geologic resources, as well as paleontological resources that include dinosaurian and paleobotanical fossils.
Rattlesnake Mountain	19,137	Special Status Species; Vegetation; Wildlife	2, 3	A, B, C	Yes	The area contains wildlife habitat (big game seasonal habitat and migration corridors), vegetation communities associated with the volcanic and limestone soils, and special status wildlife and plant species habitat.
Sheep Mountain	25,153	Vegetation; Wildlife; Special Status Species	1, 2, 3	A, B, C	Yes	The area contains wildlife habitat (big game seasonal habitat and migration corridors) and vegetation communities associated with the volcanic and limestone soils.

Table F-3. Summary Results of the ACEC Evaluation Process (Continued)

Area	Acres	Value(s) of Concern	Relevance Criteria ¹	Importance Criteria ¹	Recommended	Comments
Shoshone River Parcels	424	Wildlife	1, 2, 3, 4	-	No	The area contains riparian and river related values. Met the relevance criteria for significant historic, cultural, or scenic value; fish and wildlife resources; natural process or system; and natural hazards. It did not meet the importance criteria as management and other concerns are similar to other riparian areas in the Planning Area.

¹Values in these columns correspond to the numbers or letters in the lists provided previously in this appendix.

- Not applicable
- ACEC Area of Critical Environmental Concern
- BLM Bureau of Land Management
- ESA Endangered Species Act
- ROW right-of-way

4.0 REFERENCES

- BLM. 2002. Worland Field Office Review of Potential Wild and Scenic Rivers in the Washakie Resource Management Plan Planning Area. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Worland, Wyoming.
- BLM. 2003. Cody Field Office Review of Potential Wild and Scenic Rivers in the Cody RMP Planning. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Cody, Wyoming.
- BLM. 2013a. Geographic Information System (GIS) Data. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Cody Field Office and Worland Field Office, Wyoming.
- BLM. 2009b. Draft Addendum to the Cody Field Office Review of Potential Wild and Scenic Rivers in the Cody RMP Planning Area. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Cody Field Office, Wyoming.
- BLM. 2011. Bureau of Land Management National Greater Sage-Grouse Planning Strategy Charter. U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management. Available on Internet: http://www.blm.gov/pgdata/etc/medialib/blm/wo/Communications_Directorate/public_affairs/sage-grouse_planning/documents.Par.2415.File.dat/Final%20Signed%20GSG%20Planning%20Strategy%20Charter.pdf. August 22.

This page intentionally left blank.