

US Department of Agriculture US Forest Service Region 4, Intermountain Region Ashley National Forest

Wild and Scenic Rivers Eligibility Study and Report

FINAL ELIGIBILITY REPORT

October 2022



Photo Credit: US Forest Service



Prepared by Environmental Management and Planning Solutions, Inc.

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

CHAPTER I.	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	Why Conduct an Eligibility Study and Why Now?	
1.2	What is a Wild and Scenic River?	
1.3	Steps in the Wild and Scenic River Study Process	I-2
	1.3.1 Eligibility Inventory	I-2
	I.3.2 Preliminary Classification	I-3
	1.3.3 Suitability Phase	I-3
1.4	Eligibility Study Area	I-4
1.5	Existing Inventories and Designations	I-5
CHAPTER 2.	IDENTIFICATION METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS	2-1
2.1	Methods and Criteria Used to Identify Stream Segments	2-1
2.2	Eligibility Criteria	2-1
	2.2.1 Free-flowing Criteria	2-2
	2.2.2 Outstandingly Remarkable Values Criteria and Regions of Comparison	ı2-2
	2.2.3 Preliminary Classification Criteria	2-9
2.3	Summary of Eligibility Findings	2-10
CHAPTER 3.	ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA AND DETERMINATIONS	3-1
3.1	Dowd Creek	3-1
3.2	Honslinger Creek	3-3
3.3	North Skull Creek	3-3
3.4	Spring Creek 2	3-6
CHAPTER 4.	NEXT STEPS	4-1
4.1	Interim Management	4-1
4.2	Suitability Study	4-5
CHAPTER 5.	LIST OF PREPARERS	5-1
REFERENCES .	Refi	ERENCES-I
GLOSSARY	G	LOSSARY-I

Page

TABLES		
2-1	Summary of Preliminary Classification Criteria for Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers	2-9
2-2	Summary of Eligible Rivers from the 2017 Inventory	2-10

4-I	Interim Protection for Eligible or Suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers	.4-	2
-----	--	-----	---

FIGURES

Page

I	Previously Inventoried Segments	
2	Segments Inventoried in this Report	2-3
3	Eligible Rivers	2-11
4	Dowd Creek	
5	Honslinger Creek	
6	North Skull Creek	
7	Spring Creek 2	

APPENDICES

A	Rivers	Evaluated	for	Eligibility
---	--------	-----------	-----	-------------

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Forest Service	United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service
FSH	Forest Service Handbook
NHD	National Hydrography Dataset
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWSRS	National Wild and Scenic Rivers System
ORV	outstandingly remarkable value
USGS	United States Geological Survey
WSR	Wild and Scenic River
WSR Act	Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter I. Introduction

I.I WHY CONDUCT AN ELIGIBILITY STUDY AND WHY NOW?

Section 5(d)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 (WSR Act; Public Law 90-542; 16 US Code 1271-1287) directs federal agencies to consider potential Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSRs) in their land and water planning processes ("In all planning for the use and development of water and related land resources, consideration shall be given by all federal agencies involved to potential national wild, scenic, and recreational river areas"). To fulfill this requirement, the US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service's (Forest Service) 2012 planning rule requires the agency to identify rivers eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS). This is required whenever the Forest Service undertakes the development or revision of a land and resource management plan, commonly called a "forest plan."

The Ashley National Forest (the Forest) is in the early stages of revising its forest plan, which was written in 1986 and is now outdated in many ways. The Forest is currently in the Assessment phase, with the entire forest plan revision process expected to take a total of 4 years, concluding with the signing of the Record of Decision in late 2019. More information on the forest plan revision is available via the Forest's website (https://www.fs.usda.gov/ashley) and clicking the "Forest Plan Revision Web Application" link.

I.2 WHAT IS A WILD AND SCENIC RIVER?

Congress enacted the WSR Act on October 2, 1968, to address the need for a national system for river protection. As an outgrowth of a national conservation agenda in the 1950s and 1960s, the WSR Act was enacted in response to the dams, diversions, and water resource development projects that were constructed on America's rivers between the 1930s and 1960s. The WSR Act stipulated that selected rivers should be preserved in a free-flowing condition and be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. Since 1968, the WSR Act has been amended many times, primarily to designate additional rivers and to authorize the study of other rivers for possible inclusion.

The WSR Act seeks to protect and enhance a river's natural and cultural values and to provide for public use consistent with its free-flowing character, its water quality, and its outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs). Designation affords certain legal protections from development. For instance, new dams cannot be constructed, and federally assisted water resource development projects that might negatively affect the designated river values are not permitted. Each river in the NWSRS is administered to protect and enhance the values that caused the river to be designated. Where private lands are involved, the federal managing agency works with local governments and owners to develop protective measures. Designation neither prohibits development on private lands nor gives the federal government control over those private lands.

As of June 2022 (the last designation), the NWSRS protects 13,395.7 miles of 226 rivers in 40 states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; this is a little more than one-quarter of one percent of the nation's rivers (Interagency Wild and Scenic Rivers Coordinating Council 2022). These nationally recognized rivers make up a valuable network of natural and cultural resources, scenic beauty, and recreational opportunities. There are no designated rivers on the Ashley National Forest.

1.3 STEPS IN THE WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY PROCESS

A WSR study process is composed of three main phases: eligibility, classification, and suitability. For this study, the eligibility and preliminary classification phases were conducted in accordance with Forest Service Handbook (FSH) 1909.12 – Land Management Planning Handbook, Chapter 80 – Wild and Scenic Rivers (Forest Service 2015) and with The Wild and Scenic River Study Process technical report (Interagency Wild and Scenic Rivers Coordinating Council 1999). Excerpts from FSH 1909.12 Chapter 80 are presented below to explain the process. This study does not address suitability.

The eligibility study team outlined a preliminary or proposed boundary, usually 0.25 miles on either side of the river. Once a determination of eligibility is made, the boundary may be reconfigured, for example, to fully encompass a river-related feature contributing to the ORV. The boundary must not exceed 320 acres per river mile.

I.3.1 Eligibility Inventory

The inventory of rivers to be studied must include all named rivers on a standard US Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute quadrangle map. Each identified segment is evaluated for eligibility for inclusion in the NWSRS. Determinations of eligibility will be documented by a responsible official (usually a Forest Supervisor) prior to the formulation of alternatives but no later than the release of the draft land management plan.

The WSR Act states that, in order to be found eligible, a river must be "free flowing" and contain at least one river-related value considered to be "outstandingly remarkable."

I.3.2 Preliminary Classification

If the eligibility phase determines segments to be eligible, the Forest Service shall assign a preliminary classification and identify management measures needed to ensure appropriate protection of the values supporting the eligibility and classification. Interim protection measures are described in **Section 4.1**, Interim Management.

The preliminary classification of an eligible river is based on its condition and that of the adjacent lands at the time of the study. The WSR Act specifies and defines three classification categories for eligible rivers: wild, scenic, and recreational. Classes are based on the type and degree of human development and access associated with the river and adjacent lands at the time of the eligibility determination.

Classification does not reflect the types of values present along a river segment. Determining a preliminary classification establishes a guideline for management until either a suitability determination or a designation decision is reached. The classification assigned during the eligibility phase is tentative. Final classification is a congressional legislative determination that occurs with designation of a river segment as part of the NWSRS.

I.3.3 Suitability Phase

While not evaluated in this study, the purpose of the suitability phase is to determine whether eligible rivers are suitable or not for inclusion in the NWSRS, in accordance with the WSR Act. Suitability considerations include the environmental and economic consequences of designation and the manageability of a river if Congress were to designate it. FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 83.2 identifies the various criteria that the Forest Service is to use for determining suitability. The suitability evaluation does not result in actual designation but only a determination of a river's suitability for inclusion in the NWSRS.

The Forest Service cannot administratively designate a river via a planning decision or other agency decision into the NWSRS, and no segment studied is or will be automatically designated as part of the NWSRS. Only Congress can designate a WSR.

In some instances, the Secretary of Agriculture may designate a WSR when the governor of a state, under certain conditions, petitions for a river to be designated. Members of Congress will ultimately choose the legislative language if any suitable segments are presented to them.

River protection standards and guidelines that meet the purposes of the WSR Act will be the responsibility of the Forest administering the river. For any rivers designated by Congress, the Forest will take the following actions:

• Develop a comprehensive river management plan that must define the goals and desired conditions for protecting river values

- Address the capacity of use that the river area can sustain
- Address water quality and instream flow requirements

Rivers found not suitable would be dropped from further consideration and managed according to the objectives outlined in the land management plan. Suitability determinations are draft until the record of decision for the land management plan is signed.

I.4 ELIGIBILITY STUDY AREA

The Ashley National Forest's administrative boundary constitutes the study area for this WSR eligibility report. The Forest is located in northeastern Utah and southwestern Wyoming and encompasses 1,400,400 National Forest acres (1,295,700 acres in Utah and 104,700 acres in Wyoming) in seven counties: Daggett, Duchesne, Summit, Uintah, Utah, and Wasatch Counties in Utah and Sweetwater County in Wyoming. Within the administrative boundary of the Ashley National Forest, there are approximately 22,800 acres of non-National Forest System lands.

The Ashley National Forest is located in three major areas: the northern and southern slopes of the Uinta Mountains, the Wyoming Basin, and the Tavaputs Plateau with about 70 percent of the Forest falling within the Uinta Mountains. The Uinta Mountains are the largest east-west trending mountain range in the lower 48 states. Together with the Tavaputs Plateau, the Uinta Mountains provide a unique ecological transition zone connecting the northern and southern Rocky Mountains. Within these diverse areas, the Forest landscape ranges from high desert country to high mountain areas with elevations ranging from a low of 5,500 feet on the Green River below Little Hole to a high of 13,528 feet above sea level at the summit of Kings Peak (the highest point in Utah). Geology and geomorphology are also diverse, including broad glacial plains above treeline, river canyons at lower elevations, and highly dissected plateau lands.

Across these elevations and regions, there is a range of vegetation in the Forest, including high desert vegetation, shrub-steppe, aspen zones, extensive coniferous forests, and high alpine ecosystems. There is also a large lodgepole pine belt that is unique in Utah. The diversity of fish and wildlife species mirrors this range of life zones.

Typical uses and activities include land- and water-based recreation, livestock grazing, commercial timber harvest, oil and gas production, traditional hardrock mining operations, firewood gathering, hunting, fishing, and viewing scenery and historic sites. Visitors will find a variety of recreation settings, ranging from primitive to highly developed. Historic and prehistoric cultures have used this area extensively, resulting in cultural resources that span all elevations.

1.5 EXISTING INVENTORIES AND DESIGNATIONS

Since the enactment of the WSR Act, there have been three efforts to conduct WSR eligibility or suitability studies and reports on the Ashley National Forest: the 1988 eligibility report, the 2005 eligibility report, and a 2008 suitability report. As with this eligibility study effort, each generation of eligibility studies has sought to update the existing WSR inventory on the Forest to meet the current forest planning directives and guidance under the WSR Act. This section describes those past studies.

As a part of the mid-1980s planning effort for the Ashley National Forest, individual WSR eligibility reports were completed for the six major rivers on the south slope of the Uinta Mountains (Forest Service 1988). These rivers and their eligibility determinations were as follows:

- North Fork of the Duchesne River
 - Ineligible from headwaters to the Forest boundary
- Rock Creek
 - Portion within High Uintas Wilderness eligible
 - Portion outside of the wilderness ineligible
- Lake Fork River
 - Portion within High Uintas Wilderness eligible
 - Portion outside of the wilderness ineligible
- Yellowstone River
 - Portion within High Uintas Wilderness eligible
 - Portion outside of the wilderness ineligible
- Uinta River
 - Portion within High Uintas Wilderness eligible
 - Portion outside of the wilderness ineligible
- Whiterocks River
 - Eligible from headwaters to the Forest boundary

These reports became part of the Ashley National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan by Forest Plan Amendment #07, dated October 23, 1989, and the conclusions and recommendations were included in the plan's Standards and Guidelines.

In 1994, the Bureau of Land Management (Utah State Office), the Forest Service (Intermountain Region), and the National Park Service (Rocky Mountain Region) signed an interagency agreement calling for the three agencies to work cooperatively to define common criteria and processes for use in determining the

eligibility and suitability of Utah rivers for potential inclusion by Congress in the NWSRS. In furtherance of the interagency agreement, the agencies released a paper entitled "Wild and Scenic River Review in the State of Utah, Process and Criteria for Interagency Use" in 1996 to provide a common methodology for identification of ORVs (Forest Service et al. 1996).

Beginning in 2004, the Ashley National Forest undertook another eligibility determination effort to meet revised direction in the relevant 1996, 1997, and 1998 guidelines, agreements, and plans for segmentation and identification of tributaries for evaluation. For this study, the inventory of rivers to be studied was identified using the 5th Level Hydrologic Unit Code to a scale of 1:100,000. The study, as documented in the Forest's 2005 report, considered 141 river segments (either individual rivers or grouped by watershed feature) and determined that 24 segments were eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS (i.e., were free flowing and contained one or more ORVs; Forest Service 2005). The 2005 report also reevaluated the rivers in the 1980s studied, but did not change any of the decisions referenced in Forest Plan Amendment #07. The following rivers were found eligible in the 2005 eligibility study:

- Middle Main Sheep Creek
- Lower Main Sheep Creek
- Carter Creek
- Cart Creek Proper
- Green River
- Pipe Creek
- Upper Whiterocks River
- West Fork Whiterocks River
- Reader Creek
- East Fork Whiterocks River
- Middle Whiterocks River
- Lower Dry Fork Creek
- South Fork Ashley Creek
- Black Canyon
- Ashley Gorge Creek
- Upper Rock Creek
- West Fork Rock Creek, including Fish Creek
- Fall Creek
- Oweep Creek

- Upper Lake Fork River, including Ottoson and East Basin Creeks
- Upper Yellowstone Creek, including Mill Creek
- Garfield Creek
- Upper Uinta River, including Gilbert Creek, Center Fork, and Painter Draw
- Shale Creek and tributaries

In 2008, the Forest Service completed its Final Environmental Impact Statement (Forest Service 2008a) and signed the Record of Decision (Forest Service 2008b) for its *Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study for National Forest System Lands in Utah*. The study evaluated the suitability of 86 eligible rivers (840 miles) on the National Forests in Utah for recommendation for inclusion in the NWSRS. The Forest Service determined 10 rivers (108 miles) on National Forest System lands in Utah were suitable to be designated in the NWSRS by Congress and amended the associated forest plans accordingly. The remaining 76 nonsuitable rivers were released from agency interim protection under the WSR Act and continue to be managed under direction from each respective forest plan. On the Ashley National Forest, two rivers were recommended as suitable. These are as follows:

- Green River (13 miles, scenic classification)
- Upper Uinta River, including Gilbert Creek, Center Fork, and Painter Draw (40 miles, wild classification)

Since the 2008 suitability study, Congress has taken no action on the two rivers determined to be suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS. Congress could either designate these rivers as components of the NWSRS or release them from their status as suitable. To date, Congress has not designated any rivers on the Ashley National Forest as components of the NWSRS. **Figure 1**, Previously Inventoried Segments, displays rivers previously inventoried and rivers that were found suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.



Chapter 2. Identification Methodology and Results

2.1 METHODS AND CRITERIA USED TO IDENTIFY STREAM SEGMENTS

The Forest Service's planning directives (FSH 1909.12 82.2) require all named rivers on a standard USGS 7.5-minute quadrangle map to be studied for eligibility (Forest Service 2015). To meet this requirement, the Forest Service's Region 4 GIS specialists cross-checked the existing National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) against USGS 7.5-minute maps. This was done to ensure that all named rivers from the map were present in the NHD within the Forest Service administrative boundaries. Where names were missing or inconsistent, the Forest Service worked with the USGS to revise the NHD. The resulting revised NHD provides the baseline data for determining the inventory of rivers to be studied.

Using the revised NHD as the baseline, GIS specialists reviewed the previous WSR studies on the Ashley National Forest to exclude previously studied rivers from the 2017 inventory (FSH 1909.12 82.4). The remaining rivers constitute the 2017 inventory of rivers to be studied. Attributed information within NHD was then used to identify watercourses that are not free-flowing, such as canals. These watercourses were not included in the ORV analysis, because they fail to meet the free-flowing eligibility criteria. The remaining inventory consists of 40 rivers with a cumulative length of 82.0 miles on the Forest. These are displayed in **Figure 2**.

2.2 ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Each identified segment in the planning area must be evaluated for its eligibility for inclusion in the NWSRS. To be eligible, a river segment must be "free flowing" and must possess at least one "outstandingly remarkable" value. These criteria are described below.

2.2.1 Free-flowing Criteria

Section 16(b) of the WSR Act defines free-flowing as follows:

...existing or flowing in natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modification of the waterway. The existence, however, of low dams, diversion works, and other minor structures at the time any river is proposed for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers systems shall not automatically bar its consideration for inclusion: provided, that this shall not be construed to authorize, intend, or encourage future construction of such structures within components of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

Congress has allowed for some human modification of a watercourse. Because of this, impoundments or major dams above or below a segment under review, and any minor dams, diversion structures, and riprap in the segment, do not by themselves render a segment ineligible. This includes those impoundments or dams that may regulate flow through the segment. Rivers impacted by such water resource developments may still be eligible, as long as they remain riverine in appearance.

There are no specific requirements concerning minimum flow for an eligible segment. Flows are considered sufficient for eligibility if they sustain or complement the ORVs for which the segment would be designated. Rivers with intermittent flows have been designated into the NWSRS, and rivers representative of desert ecosystems should also be considered for inclusion. The reasons for the determination must be documented. Rivers that are found not to be free flowing are ineligible and need not be considered further.

The Forest Service interdisciplinary team made the determination of free-flowing character based on such considerations as the following:

- Number of impediments
- Type of impediments (e.g., impoundment, diversion, straightening, and riprapping)
- Size of impediments

These factors were considered together to evaluate whether the river remains riverine in appearance and thus is free flowing.

2.2.2 Outstandingly Remarkable Values Criteria and Regions of Comparison

The determination of whether a river's study area contains ORVs is a professional judgment and is documented in this report. To help ensure that the presence of ORVs is consistently evaluated across Region 4, a regional eligibility evaluation process was developed. It established common ORV definitions and outlines the criteria used to evaluate each river, including ORV components, regions of comparison, and datasets to be used during the evaluation. In order to meet





Figure 2A: Segments Inventoried in this Report Flaming Gorge Ranger District



- **Flaming Gorge Reservoir**
- Ranger District boundary
- Ashley National Forest





Source: Forest Service GIS 2017 September 20, 2017 R4WSR_Ashley_2017inv_V01.pdf This product is reproduced from geospatial information prepared by the USDA, Forest Service. The Forest Service makes no expressed or implied warranty, including warranty of merchantability and fitness, with respect to the character, function, or capabilities of the data or their appropriateness for any user's purposes, and reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace this geospatial information without notification.





2. Identification Methodology and Results



October 2022



October 2022

2. Identification Methodology and Results

Figure 2C: Segments Inventoried in this Report Roosevelt Ranger District



----- Inventoried segment

Ranger District boundary

Ashley National Forest





Source: Forest Service GIS 2017 September 20, 2017 R4WSR_Ashley_2017inv_V01.pdf This product is reproduced from geospatial information prepared by the USDA, Forest Service. The Forest Service makes no expressed or implied warranty, including warranty of merchantability and fitness, with respect to the character, function, or capabilities of the data or their appropriateness for any user's purposes, and reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace this geospatial information without notification.

1 2 Miles







2. Identification Methodology and Results

Figure 2D: Segments Inventoried in this Report Duchesne Ranger District (North)



----- Inventoried segment

Ranger District boundary

Ashley National Forest



Source: Forest Service GIS 2017 September 20, 2017 R4WSR_Ashley_2017inv_V01.pdf This product is reproduced from geospatial information prepared by the USDA, Forest Service. The Forest Service makes no expressed or implied warranty, including warranty of merchantability and fitness, with respect to the character, function, or capabilities of the data or their appropriateness for any user's purposes, and reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace this geospatial information without notification.

0

0.7 1.4

Miles







October 2022

2. Identification Methodology and Results

Figure 2E: Segments Inventoried in this Report Duchesne Ranger District (South)

Inventoried segment

- Ranger District boundary
- Ashley National Forest



Source: Forest Service GIS 2017 September 20, 2017 R4WSR_Ashley_2017inv_V01.pdf This product is reproduced from geospatial information prepared by the USDA, Forest Service. The Forest Service makes no expressed or implied warranty, including warranty of merchantability and fitness, with respect to the character, function, or capabilities of the data or their appropriateness for any user's purposes, and reserves the right to correct, update, modify, or replace this geospatial information without notification.

1 2 Miles



This page intentionally left blank.

the individual needs of specific National Forests, the regional process was modified to the minimum extent necessary to meet those needs.

To be considered as outstandingly remarkable, a river-related value must be a unique, rare, or exemplary feature that is significant at a comparative regional or national scale (region of comparison). Values are scenic, recreational, geological, fish related, wildlife related, historic, cultural, botanical, hydrological, paleontological, scientific, or other values. While the spectrum of resources that may be considered is broad, all values should be directly river related. That is, they should have one or more of the following characteristics:

- Be located in the river or on its corridor (within 0.25 miles on either side of the river)
- Contribute substantially to the functioning of the river ecosystem
- Owe their location or existence to the presence of the river

The region of comparison is the geographic area of consideration for each ORV that serves as the basis for meaningful comparative analysis. In this report, a region of comparison is identified for each ORV and may differ across ORVs.

2.2.3 Preliminary Classification Criteria

Each river found to be eligible must be assigned a preliminary classification. Section 2(b) of the WSR Act specifies and defines three classification categories for eligible rivers: wild, scenic, and recreational.

The preliminary classification of a river found to be eligible is based on the condition of the river and the development level of adjacent lands as they exist at the time of the study. **Table 2-1**, Summary of Preliminary Classification Criteria for Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers, summarizes the preliminary classification criteria used in this report. Additional details are provided in FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80.

Attribute	Preliminary Classification Criteria
Water Resource	Wild: Free of impoundment
Development	Scenic: Free of impoundment
	Recreational: Some existing impoundment or diversion
Shoreline Development	Wild: Essentially primitive. Little or no evidence of human activity.
	Scenic: Largely primitive and undeveloped. No substantial evidence of human activity.
	Recreational: Some development. Substantial evidence of human activity.

Table Chapter 2-1 Summary of Preliminary Classification Criteria for Eligible Wild and Scenic Rivers

Attribute	Preliminary Classification Criteria
Accessibility	Wild: Generally inaccessible except by trail
	Scenic: Accessible in places by road
	Recreational: Readily accessible by road or railroad
Water Quality	Wild: Meets, or exceeds criteria, or federally approved State standards for aesthetics, for propagation of fish, and wildlife normally adapted to the habitat of the river, and for primary contact recreation (swimming) except where exceeded by natural conditions Scenic: No criteria are prescribed by the WSR Act Recreational: Same as for Scenic, above

Source: Forest Service 2015

2.3 SUMMARY OF ELIGIBILITY FINDINGS

Of the 40 rivers studied for eligibility in 2017, 4 rivers were determined to be eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS, for a total of 14.0 miles on the Forest. These rivers, their ORVs, and preliminary classifications are included in **Table 2-2**, Summary of Eligible Rivers from the 2017 Inventory. These rivers are also displayed in **Figure 3**. See **Chapter 3**, Description of Eligible Rivers, for additional information on the eligible rivers. **Appendix A**, Rivers Evaluated for Eligibility, includes a table of all rivers evaluated for eligibility in 2017 and the findings.

River Name	Length on Forest (miles)	ORVs	Preliminary Classification
Dowd Creek	3.1	Cultural	Recreational
Honslinger Creek	2.3	Cultural	Recreational
North Skull Creek	1.8	Cultural	Wild
Spring Creek 2	6.8	Cultural	Recreational

Table Chapter 2-2Summary of Eligible Rivers from the 2017 Inventory



This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 3. Eligibility Criteria and Determinations

The rivers listed in this section have been determined to meet the eligibility criteria described in **Section 2.2**, Eligibility Criteria.

3.1 DOWD CREEK Location: From the headwaters south of Windy Ridge and south of Spring Creek in Section 25, T.2N., R.19E. to the confluence with Carter Creek northeast quarter of Section 32, T.2N., R.20E. Total Segment Length: 3.1 miles Length on the Forest: 3.1 miles ORV: Cultural

Description of Outstandingly Remarkable Value

This segment includes 23 previously identified cultural resources. Nineteen are prehistoric sites (10 are eligible to the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP] and 9 are not eligible), several of which are lithic scatters. Two other sites include both prehistoric and historic components and are eligible to the NRHP, and two sites are historic and considered not eligible to the NRHP. Twelve of the NRHP-eligible prehistoric sites are in close proximity to Dowd Creek, and two large prehistoric campsites surround Dowd Spring (the source of the creek), indicating long-term, repeat usage of the creek corridor during prehistory. The sites' clear relationship to Dowd Creek and the prehistoric occupation demonstrate cultural or historic values that are unique, rare, or exemplary within the region of comparison. Therefore, a cultural or historical ORV was identified for this segment.

Preliminary Classification

The preliminary classification for this river is **recreational**. Multiple access points from roads exist.



Length on the Forest: 2.3 miles

3.2 HONSLINGER CREEK

Location: From the headwaters east of Ute Mountain in the southwest quarter of Section 27, T.2N., R.19E. to the confluence with Carter Creek west of the Carter Creek Bridge in the southeast quarter of Section 35, T.2N., R.19E.

Total Segment Length: 2.3 miles ORV: Cultural

Description of Outstandingly Remarkable Value

This segment includes 18 previously identified cultural resources. Seventeen are prehistoric sites, including rock shelters and artifact scatters (12 are considered eligible to the NRHP and 5 are not eligible). One additional site was a historic road constructed by the Civilian Conservation Corps and considered not eligible to the NRHP. Because many of these resources are eligible to the NRHP and because their clear relationship to Leona Creek demonstrates use of the river corridor from prehistory to the early twentieth century, there are cultural or historic values that are unique, rare, or exemplary in the region of comparison. Therefore, a cultural or historical ORV was identified for this segment.

Preliminary Classification

The preliminary classification for this river is **recreational**. Multiple access points from roads exist.

3.3 NORTH SKULL CREEK

Location:	From the headwaters south of Antelope Flat and east of Bear Top		
	Mountain in the east half of Section 2, T.2N., R.21E. to the junction with		
	the Flaming Gorge Reservoir in Section 11, T.2N., R.21E.		
Total Segment Length:	I.8 miles	Length on the Forest:	1.8 miles
	- · ·		

ORV: Cultural

Description of Outstandingly Remarkable Value

This segment includes four previously identified cultural resources, all of which are NRHP-eligible prehistoric sites, including rare prehistoric storage features and a possible burial. The river-related cultural or historic values along this segment are unique, rare, or exemplary in the region of comparison based on these rare, NRHP-eligible resources related to North Skull Creek. Therefore, a cultural or historical ORV was identified for this segment.

Preliminary Classification

The preliminary classification for this river is **wild**. There is no access from roads or trails, and it is within a roadless area.

3. Eligibility Criteria and Determinations





3.4 SPRING CREEK 2 Location: From the headwaters south of Windy Ridge in the southeast quarter of Section 22, T.2N., R.19E. to the junction with the Flaming Gorge reservoir near the Sheep Creek Boat Ramp in the south half of Section 9, T.2N., R.20E. Total Segment Length: 6.8 miles Cultural

Description of Outstandingly Remarkable Value

This segment includes 11 previously identified cultural resources. Ten are prehistoric sites (eight are considered eligible to the NRHP and two are not eligible), most of which are artifact scatters or rock shelters. There is also one site with both prehistoric and historic occupations that is considered eligible to the NRHP. Nine of the NRHP-eligible sites are in close proximity to the creek and include prehistoric storage structures and rock shelters that demonstrate long-term usage of the drainage during prehistory. The prehistoric use of the Spring Creek 2 corridor as a significant resource indicates there are cultural or historic values that are unique, rare, or exemplary within the region of comparison. Therefore, a cultural or historical ORV was identified for this segment.

Preliminary Classification

The preliminary classification for this river is **recreational**. Spring Creek 2 is accessible from the Flaming Gorge Uinta Scenic Byway, Sheep Creek Bay Road, and Death Valley Road.



October 2022

National **Forest**

This page intentionally left blank.

Chapter 4. Next Steps

4.1 INTERIM MANAGEMENT

Forest Service-identified rivers determined to be eligible or suitable are afforded interim protective management until a decision is made on the future use of the river and adjacent lands through an Act of Congress or a determination that the river is not suitable. It is the Forest Service's policy to manage and protect the free-flowing character, preliminary classification, water quality, and identified ORVs of eligible or suitable rivers. The planning rule at 36 CFR 219.10 provides for interim management of Forest Service-identified eligible or suitable rivers or segments, to protect their values. Interim protective measures for eligible or suitable segments are identified in FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 84 (Forest Service 2015).

The Responsible Official may authorize site-specific projects and activities on National Forest System lands in the corridors of eligible or suitable rivers only where the project and activities are consistent with all of the following:

- The free-flowing character of the identified river is not adversely modified by the construction or development of stream impoundments, diversions, or other water resources projects.
- ORVs of the identified river area are protected.
- For all Forest Service-identified rivers, classification of an eligible river must be maintained as inventoried unless a suitability study is completed that recommends management at a less restrictive classification (such as from wild to scenic or scenic to recreational; Forest Service 2015).

Additional statutory, regulatory, or policy requirements may apply if the study river is located within a wilderness area or other designated area (see FSM 2354.42e).

Table 4-1, below, describes the interim protection standards for Forest Serviceidentified eligible and suitable study rivers. Forest Plan components must meet the intent of these interim river protection measures. (Forest Service 2015).

Table Chapter 4-1	
Interim Protection for Eligible or Suitable Wild and Scenic Rivers	

Issue	Management Prescription/Action
Water Resources Projects	These projects will be analyzed as to their effect on a river's free flow, water quality, and ORVs, with adverse effects to be prevented to the extent of existing agency authorities (such as special-use authority)
Hydroelectric Power Facilities	Forest Service-identified eligible rivers are to be protected pending a suitability determination. Forest Service-identified suitable rivers are to be protected for their free-flowing condition, water quality, and ORVs pending a designation by Congress.
Minerals	Locatable Minerals: Existing or new mining activity on a Forest Service- identified eligible or suitable river are subject to regulations in 36 CFR, Part 228, and must be conducted in a manner that minimizes surface disturbance, sedimentation, pollution, and visual impairment.
	Leasable Minerals: For all eligible or suitable rivers, leases, licenses, and permits under mineral leasing laws must include conditions necessary to protect the values of the river corridor that make it eligible or suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS.
	Saleable Minerals: Disposal of saleable mineral materials is prohibited for eligible or suitable rivers tentatively classified as Wild. For segments tentatively classified as scenic or recreational, disposal of saleable mineral materials is allowed if the values for which the river may be included in the NWSRS are protected.
Transportation System	Wild: Roads and railroads are generally not compatible with a wild classification. Prevent actions related to the road system that would preclude protection of the river as wild. Do not plan roads outside of the corridor that would adversely affect the wild classification. New trail construction should generally be designed for non-motorized uses. However, limited motorized uses that are compatible with identified values and unobtrusive trail bridges may be allowed. New airfields may not be developed.
	Scenic: New roads and railroads are permitted to parallel the river for short segments or bridge the river if such construction fully protects its values, including its free-flowing character. Bridge crossings and river water access are allowed. New trail construction or airfields must be compatible with and fully protect identified values.
	Recreational: New roads and railroads are permitted to parallel the river if such construction fully protects the river's values, including its free-flowing character. Bridge crossings and river access are allowed. New trail construction or airfields must be compatible with and fully protect identified values.
Issue	Management Prescription/Action
------------------------	--
Utility Proposals	New transmission lines such as gas lines, water lines, and similar linear facilities are not compatible and are discouraged. Where no reasonable alternative exists, additional or new facilities should be restricted to existing rights-of-way. Where new rights-of-way would be necessary for a utility line, the proposed project must be evaluated as to its effect on the river's ORVs and classification. Any portion of a utility proposal that has the potential to affect the river's free-flowing character must be evaluated as a water resources project.
Recreation Development	Wild: As stated in the US Department of Agriculture/US Department of the Interior Guidelines, major public-use areas such as large campgrounds, interpretive centers, or administrative headquarters must be located outside the river corridor.
	Minimum facilities, such as toilets and refuse containers, may be provided if necessary to protect and enhance water quality and other identified river values, while also providing for public recreation uses that do not adversely impact or degrade those values. All facilities must be located and designed to harmonize with the primitive character, natural, and cultural settings of the river corridor. The facilities must protect identified river values including water quality and be screened from view from the river to the extent possible.
	Scenic: Public-use facilities such as moderate-size campgrounds, simple sanitation and convenience facilities, public information centers, administrative sites, or river access developments, and so forth are allowed within the river corridor. All facilities must be located and designed to harmonize with their natural and cultural settings, protect identified river values including water quality, and be screened from view from the river to the extent possible.
	Recreational: Recreation, administrative, and river access facilities may be located in close proximity to the river. However, recreational classification does not require extensive recreation development. All facilities must be located and designed to harmonize with their natural and cultural settings, protect identified river values including water quality, and be screened from view from the river to the extent possible.
Motorized Travel	Wild: Motorized travel on land or water may be permitted, but is generally not compatible with this classification. Where motorized travel options are deemed to be necessary, such uses should be carefully defined and impacts mitigated.
	Scenic and Recreational: Motorized travel on land or water may be permitted, prohibited, or restricted to protect the river values

Issue	Management Prescription/Action					
Wildlife and Fish Projects	Wild: Construction of minor structures and vegetation management to protect and enhance wildlife and fish habitat should harmonize with the area's essentially primitive character and fully protect identified river values. Any portion of a proposed wildlife or fisheries restoration or enhancement project that has the potential to affect the river's free- flowing character must be evaluated as a water resources project.					
	Scenic: Construction of structures and vegetation management designed to protect and enhance wildlife and fish habitat should harmonize with the area's largely undeveloped character and fully protect identified river values. Any portion of a wildlife or fisheries restoration or enhancement project that has the potential to affect the free-flowing character must be evaluated as a water resources project.					
	Recreational: Construction of structures and vegetation management to protect and enhance wildlife and fish habitat should fully protect identified river values. Any portion of a wildlife or fisheries restoration or enhancement project that has the potential to affect the river's free- flowing character must be evaluated as a water resources project.					
Vegetation Management	Wild: Cutting of trees and other vegetation is not permitted except when needed in association with a primitive recreation experience, to protect users, or to protect identified ORVs. Examples of such exceptions include activities to maintain trails or suppress wildfires. Prescribed fire and wildfires managed to meet resource objectives may be used to restore or maintain habitat for threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or restore the natural range of variability.					
	Scenic and recreational: A range of vegetation management and timber harvest practices are allowed, if these practices are designed to protect users, or protect, restore, or enhance the river environment, including the long-term scenic character.					
Domestic Livestock Grazing	Wild: Domestic livestock grazing should be managed to protect identified river values. Existing structures may be maintained. New facilities may be developed to facilitate livestock management so long as they maintain the values for which a river was found eligible or suitable, including the area's essentially primitive character.					
	Scenic: Domestic livestock grazing should be managed to protect identified river values. Existing structures may be maintained. New facilities may be developed to facilitate livestock management so long as they maintain the values for which a river was found eligible or suitable, including the area's largely undeveloped character.					
	Recreational: Domestic livestock grazing should be managed to protect identified river values. Existing structures may be maintained. New facilities may be developed to facilitate livestock management so long as they maintain the values for which a river was found eligible or suitable.					

Source: Forest Service 2015

4.2 SUITABILITY STUDY

Any eligible river may be studied for its suitability for inclusion in the NWSRS at any time. Rivers may be studied for suitability as part of a plan development or revision, as part of a plan amendment, in conjunction with a project decision, or in a separate study. A suitability study provides the basis for determining which eligible rivers should be recommended to Congress as potential additions to the NWSRS. The content of a suitability study is described in section 83.3 of FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80 (Forest Service 2015). The Ashley National Forest intends to conduct a suitability evaluation as part of a plan amendment, subsequent to the Record of Decision for its land use plan revision.

Chapter 5. List of Preparers

	ASHLEY NATIONAL FOREST
Name	Title/Role
Ryan Buerkle	Recreation Program Manager, Technical Point of Contact
Jeff Rust	Archaeologist
Allen Huber	Botanist/Ecologist
Dan Abeyta	Wildlife Biologist
Bob Christensen	Wildlife Biologist
Dave Olsen	Wildlife Biologist
Chris Plunkett	Hydrologist

CONTRACTOR					
Name	Role/Responsibility				
ENVIRONM	ENTAL MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING SOLUTIONS, INC.				
	WWW.EMPSI.COM				
Kate Krebs	Project Manager				
Blake Busse	Deputy Project Manager				
Jenna Jonker	GIS				
Derek Holmgren	Scenic ORV Specialist				
Peter Gower	Recreational ORV Specialist				
Morgan Trieger	Fish, Wildlife, Botanic, and Ecological ORVs Specialist				
Nicholas Parker	Cultural/Historic ORV Specialist				
Francis Craig	Geologic ORV Specialist				

References

- Forest Service (United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service). 1988. Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Reports for North Fork of the Duchesne River, Rock Creek, Lake Fork River, Yellowstone River, Uintah River and Whiterocks River. Ashley National Forest. Vernal, Utah. March 1988.
- _____. 2005. Final Eligibility Determination of Wild and Scenic Rivers, Ashley National Forest. Vernal, Utah. July 2005.
- _____. 2008a. Final Environmental Impact Statement for Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study for National Forest System Lands in Utah. Region 4 Office, Ogden, Utah. November 2008.
- _____. 2008b. Record of Decision and Forest Plan Amendments for Wild and Scenic River Suitability Study for National Forest System Lands in Utah. Region 4 Office, Ogden, Utah. November 2008.
- _____. 2015. Forest Service Handbook 1909.12 Land Management Planning Handbook Chapter 80 Wild and Scenic Rivers. WO Amendment 1909.12-2015-1. Washington, DC. January 20, 2015.
- Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and National Park Service (United States Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service; United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management; and United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service). 1996. Wild and Scenic River Review in the State of Utah: Process and Criteria for Interagency Use. Region 4 Office, Ogden, Utah. July 1996.
- Interagency Wild and Scenic Rivers Coordinating Council. 1999. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Study Process, Technical Report. Washington, DC.
 - ____. 2022. River Mileage Classifications for Components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Updated July 2022.

Glossary

Classification. Identification of the class (wild, scenic, or recreational) that appropriately describes an eligible river, based on the criteria established in section 2(b) of the WSR Act (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Determination. A finding in a study report that a river segment does, or does not, meet the criteria found in this chapter to be eligible; or a finding that an eligible river is or is not suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Eligible river. A river segment that has been evaluated, and found to be freeflowing and, in combination with its adjacent land area, possesses one or more ORVs (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Forest Service-identified study rivers. Rivers that the Forest Service has identified for study to determine potential inclusion in the NWSRS, as directed under section 5(d)(1) of the WSR Act. These include the inventory of rivers being studied for eligibility, the eligible rivers being studied for suitability, and the rivers determined to be suitable and recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS but that are not yet designated (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Outstandingly remarkable value (ORV). A scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar river-related value that is a unique, rare, or exemplary feature and is significant when compared with similar values from other rivers at a regional or national scale (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Region of comparison. The geographic area of consideration for each outstandingly remarkable value that will serve as the basis for meaningful comparative analysis (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

River. A flowing body of water or estuary, or a section, portion, or tributary thereof, including rivers, streams, creeks, runs, kills, rills, and small lakes (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

River corridor. The geographic area generally encompassed within one-quarter mile on either side of the river's ordinary high water mark that is studied for eligibility or suitability and that contains the river and its ORVs (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

River segment. A distinct section of a river; in the context of wild and scenic river planning, refers to a distinct portion of a river that has a beginning, an endpoint, and specific classification. A river may be one segment with a classification or have multiple segments, each with a different classification (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Study process. The generic term applied to both the process of inventorying rivers to determine if they are eligible for inclusion in the NWSRS or evaluating eligible rivers to determine if they are suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Study report. The documentation for the inventory and evaluation of wild and scenic river eligibility or suitability (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Study river. See Forest Service-identified study rivers.

Suitable river. A river that a federal agency has studied and determined to be suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS but that has not been statutorily designated. A river found suitable for inclusion in the NWSRS is one that the Forest Service will recommend or has recommended for inclusion in the NWSRS (FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 80.5).

Appendix A Rivers Evaluated for Eligibility

Appendix A. Rivers Evaluated for Eligibility

The following pages include all rivers inventoried for eligibility in this study and the rationale for all ORVs evaluated. The eligibility process is described in the Final Eligibility Study Process for the Ashley National Forest.¹ The table in this appendix lists the 40 rivers in the 2017 inventory and provides summary results of their eligibility determinations.

In general, the absence of discussion regarding a certain characteristic either indicates that the characteristic is not present along that segment or there are no relevant data, depending on the specific characteristic.

Since the previous eligibility study in 2005, the yellow-billed cuckoo has been federally listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened. This listing is considered a changed circumstance under FSH 1909.12, Chapter 80, Section 82.4. While yellow-billed cuckoo habitat is found throughout the Forest, it is considered marginal and does not meet the specified habitat requirements for yellow-billed cuckoo very well. Therefore, rivers inventoried in 2005 were not reevaluated for yellow-billed cuckoo as a potential wildlife ORV.

Non-Free-Flowing Segments

In addition to the free-flowing rivers that were studied for ORVs, the following rivers were identified as not free flowing and thus not evaluated for ORVs:

- Greendale Canal
- Mosby Canal
- Peoples Canal
- Powerplant Canal
- Sheep Creek Canal

¹ Final Eligibility Study Process for the Ashley National Forest. March 2017. Internet website: <u>https://www.fs.usda.gov/ashley</u>.

DATA SOURCES

Scenic	
Scenery Management System	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April 3,
inventory - scenic attractiveness	2017
classes	
Recreational	
Recreation Opportunity Spectrum	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April 3,
(ROS) classifications	2017
Forest service recreation amenities/	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
developed recreation database	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php
Aerial imagery	Google Earth
Inventory roadless data	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php
Trails	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php
Geologic	
USGS physiographic provinces	USGS -
(region of comparison)	https://water.usgs.gov/GIS/metadata/usgswrd/XML/physio.xml#
	stdorder
Sheep Creek Canyon Geologic area	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
(special management area)	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php
Geologic and geomorphic units	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April
mapped in glaciated valleys on the	3, 2017
south slope of the Uinta Mountains	
USGS topographic maps - landform -	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
lava	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php
Quaternary faults	Utah AGRC - https://gis.utah.gov/data/geoscience/
Modern epicenters	Utah AGRC - https://gis.utah.gov/data/geoscience/
Current mineral and selected energy	Utah AGRC - https://gis.utah.gov/data/geoscience/
resources point data	
Mineral locations from in the	Utah AGRC - https://gis.utah.gov/data/geoscience/
Commodity Resource Information	
Board (CRIB) tabular database as	
point data Minerel des esits in Lleek	
Mineral deposits in Otan	Utan AGRC - https://gis.utan.gov/data/geoscience/
INO OCCURRENCE IN ASNIEY INATIONAL	Otan AGRC - https://gis.utan.gov/data/geoscience/
districts, guaternam valuania flow	
districts, quaternary volcanic now,	
Surficial coolegy of Litch	Litch Coological Summer
Surficial geology of Otan	bttps://goological Survey -
Litah mining districts	Litah Goological Survey
	https://goology.utab.gov/rosourcos/data.databasos/utab.mining
	districts/
Active faults	Utah Geological Survey -
	https://geology.utah.gov/resources/data-databases/#tab-id-l
Glacial ice extents	Utah Geological Survey - https://geology.utah.gov/map-
	pub/maps/gis/#tab-id-4

Geologic	
Geological points of interest –	Forest Service Intermountain Region, 2017
Ashley	
Fish	
HUC 6 (region of comparison)	NHD/USGS - https://nhd.usgs.gov/data.html
The status of fishes and amphibians	Peterson, D., Osbourne, T., and Abeyta, D. 2009.
on the Flaming Gorge Ranger	
District	
Inland Cutthroat Trout Protocol	University of Wyoming Geographic Information Science
(ICP) web-mapping application	
INAS - nonindigenous aquatic species	US Geological Survey (USGS). 2017.
Level III Ecoregion (region of	EPA - https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-III-and-IV-
The status of fishes and such this as	Peterson D. Ochourse T. and Aboute D. 2000
on the Eleming Corgo Panger	reterson, D., Osbourne, T., and Abeyta, D. 2007.
District	
No occurrence in Ashley National	FWS - https://catalog.data.gov/dataset/fws-critical-habitat-for-
forest: designated critical habitat	threatened-and-endangered-species-datasetf6b00
RNAs (special management area)	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
(1)	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.php
Invasive plant inventory current	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April
measurements	3, 2017
Bald eagle habitat and locations	Email from Dave Olsen, Forest Service, to Morgan Trieger,
	EMPSi, on May 4, 2017
Data used to measure departure	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April
from historical fire regimes	3, 2017
Data used to measure departure	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April
from historical disturbance regimes	3, 2017
other than fire that are important	
for habitat variation or quality	
Data used to determine degree of	Forest Service data clearinghouse -
fragmentation - rights-of-way	https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/edw/datasets.pnp
Bird habitat and locations	Ashley National Forest via Cloud Vault from Dan Abeyta on April 10, 2017
Bear Top Mountain Bighorn Sheep	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April
Management Area is a management	3, 2017
area from the Forest Plan that has a	
special bighorn sheep emphasis	
No mammals considered were	
determined to be river dependent	
within the Ashley National Forest	
Cultural/Historical	
Forest Service records of cultural	Asniey National Forest via email from Jeffrey Rust on April 19,
sites within a U.S-mile Duffer of	2017
Sureariis to be inventoried	NPS web mapping convice
national mistoric Lanumarks	https://mapservices.ps.gov/arcgis/services/cultural_resources/
polygons	nd public
polygons	

Cultural/Historical	
National Register of Historic Places	NPS website - https://npgallery.nps.gov/NRHP/Download/
Archaeology sites - hexagonal	AGRC - https://gis.utah.gov/data/history/
polygons representing the	·····/···//
presence/absence of recorded	
archaeological sites	
No occurrence in Ashley National	AGRC - https://gis.utah.gov/data/history/
Forest: historic districts and	
cemeteries	
Ecological	
Level III Ecoregion (region of	EPA - https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-iii-and-iv-
comparison)	ecoregions-continental-united-states
Ashley National Forest Ecosystem	USFS. 2009.
Diversity Evaluation Report. Report	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April 3,
3-30-2009, Draft #5	2017
Bear Top Mountain Bighorn Sheep	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April 3,
Management Area is a management	2017
area from the Forest Plan that has a	
special Bighorn Sheep emphasis	
Botanical	
Level III Ecoregion (region of	EPA - https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/level-iii-and-iv-
comparison)	ecoregions-continental-united-states
Ashley National Forest Ecosystem	USFS. 2009.
Diversity Evaluation Report. Report	Ashley National Forest via email from Ryan Buerkle on April 3,
3-30-2009, Draft #5	2017

There are no known occurrences of river lependent, federally-listed
occurrences of river
lependent, federally-listed.
state-listed, or candidate
hreatened or endangered
plant species, plant Species
of Conservation Concern,
or Forest Service-tracked
plant species in the study
corridor. There are no
dministratively designated
pecial botanical areas in
he study corridor.
Accordingly, after an
analysis of the relevant
lata, no botanical ORVs
are present in this segment.
There are no known
occurrences of river
lependent, federally-listed.
state-listed, or candidate
hreatened or endangered
plant species. plant Species
of Conservation Concern.
or Forest Service-tracked
plant species in the study
corridor. There are no
dministratively designated
special botanical areas in
he study corridor
Accordingly, after an
inalysis of the relevant
lata, no botanical ORVs
Those states of the second sec

no visible harming the support. Service Correlation of the lastice of the support highway at lower and of the sympact. Service Correlation of the lastice of the lastice of the support support. Service Correlation of the support mapping the support. Service Correlation of the support mapping the	River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
disturbances, corception the segment. Diverse under low results and operation. The relation of the segment. Diverse tanging of the segment		no visible human	eligible.		stream. The study	habitat quality by disrupting	within the region of	ecosystems identified in	are present in this segment.
hydrog a clover end of signers. Divese indicapp due to length of segment. Divese indicapp due to length of segment. Divese indicapp due to length of segment. Divese indicapp due to length of the region of comparison. Diverse tourner scalar(b) due to length of the region of comparison. Diverse the region of comparison. Diverse the region of comparison. Diverse the		disturbances, except for	The headwaters of Clover		corridor is tributary to the	the dispersal corridor, and	comparison, no cultural or	USFS (2009). The AM LTA	
ever segment. Diverse in under segment. Converte segment. Converte in under segment. Converte in u		highway at lower end of	Creek is Bills Lake, a		Uinta River, which is good	increasing the degree of	historical ORVs were	contains wet meadows	
Indicates to colergit of struct collective, inclusion indicate a test some inter- forture collective, inclusion indicate a test some inter- indicate a tes		the segment. Diverse	scenic, but not unique		habitat for Colorado River	habitat fragmentation and	identified for this segment.	including poor fens.	
segment comparison. Observed introduces collectively, blue with valiable photor import, brivial segment in or- singer, dr. valia segment. CRCT are not known from those been stocked in the have been stocked in the have been stocked in the introduces are leavered by or pairs increased. Mature inter- those been stocked in the introduces are leavered by thore been stocked in the introduces are leavered by the stock and the been introduces are introduces and in recreation and by a stock from the introduces and in recreation and by a stock from the introduces are leavered introduces and in recreation and the been introduces are introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered and are leavered the introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered interval introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered introduces are leavered interval introduces are leavered introduces are le		landscape due to length of	setting in the region of		cutthroat trout: however.	frequency of human		quaking bogs or floating	
fatures collectively, slow inggers, the values fast some level of pow throughout the gras, which wolds support race, unique, or exemption the region of comparison. Therefore, or speers full on or exercation. in the tudy corridor. (CRU Uing, River since 1997) The Uing, River since 1997 The Uing, Riv		segment. Considering these	comparison. Observed		CRCT are not known from	disturbance. The study		mats, and sphagnum bogs	
with value photo indicate at least case level of flow throughout the gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of flow throughout the gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level of gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which would support. indicate at least case level or gar, which wo		features collectively, along	streambed conditions		the study corridor. CRCT	corridor contains tall		are generally widespread in	
 and the vector of a segment is that a small the transfer of the vector of a single segment is the segment is that a small the transfer of the vector of the segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well well segment. Corral Creak A very the vector well well segment is that a for the segment is that a for the vector well well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well well segment. Corral Creak A very the vector well well segment is that a for the vector well well well segment is that a small the transfer of the vector well well segment. Corral Creak A very the vector well well segment is that that the transfer of the vector well well segment. Corral Creak A very the vector well well segment is that that the transfer of the vector well well segment is that that the transfer of the vector well well segment. Corral Creak A very the vector well well segment is that that that the transfer of the vector well well segment is that that the transfer of the vector well well segment is that that that the transfer of the vector well well segment is that that that that that that the transfer of the vector well well segment is that that that that that that that tha		with available photo	indicate at least some level		have been stocked in the	willow (Salix spp.) habitat		the LTA. Except for a	
 alorg this segment is not recursion. There's is null water-based version such as warming or such as warming or suc		imagery, the visual setting	of flow throughout the		Uinta River since 1999.	for riparian dependent		calcareous or rich fen in	
rare_unique_or exemptory is writter-related recrution to regort of the support scence ORV.writter-related recrution to appars utilicient to support support support to the relation of accordingy, after an analysis of the relevant dist, no known recreational ORVs were is to known on the support the support of the support to comparison. Therefore, no scence ORV.there is little to no access and no recreation support to support support to support support biointy to comparison. Therefore, no support support support to support support to support support to support support to recreation. There is little to no access and no recreation. There is a small lite and meadow white to comparison and would not combine to the recreational setting: however, these faitures a recreational documents opportunities or recreational setting: however, these faitures a recreational documents opportunities or recreational setting: however, these faitures a recreational documents opportunities or recreational documents, or relation to support which recreational setting: however, these faitures a report in this segment.There is no USPVS designated special conduction to the support of the relevant data, no volidio comparison and would not combine to support to the relevant data, no volidio comparison and would not combine to support to the relevant data, no volidio comparison and would not combine to support to the relevant data, no volidio comparison and would not combine to the support to the relevant data, no volidio comparison and would not combine to th		along this segment is not	year. which would support		The Uinta River also	avian species. However.		South Fork Rock Creek.	
In the region of comparison. Therefore, Departson. Therefore, Scenic ORV.However, flows do not support support, and the support water-based recreation such as summing of fashing. There is little to no access and no recreation support, support support, the support support and no recreation using of support the support of comparison. There is a small take and no serve of using of support of comparison. There is a small take and no serve of using of support of comparison. There is a small take and no serve of using of support of comparison. There is a small take and no serve of using of support of comparison. There is a small take and no serve of using of support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and neadow within the support of comparison. There is a small take and support of comp		rare, unique, or exemplary	water-related recreation.		contains several	when compared to the		there are no rare habitats	
comparison. Therefore, no Servic ORV.opport sufficient to support such as swimming of fishing. There is lite to no access and no erreation amentics, which limits wistory ability to reach the segment for water-based recreation amentics, which limits the sigment for water-based within the sugment for water-based dy the sugment signal of the relevant data, no ville ORVs. Accordingly, Afer an analysis of the relevant data, no ville ORVs are present in this segment.for this species in the the USGS (Includy grant an analysis of the relevant data, no ville ORVs. Accordingly, Afer an analysis of the relevant data, no ville ORVs are present in this segment.for this species in the the USGS (Includy corridor. Accordingly, Afer an analysis of the relevant data, no ville ORVs are present in this segment.for this segment.for this segment.for this segment. the USF 2009) pastands. These are relatively security of the relevant data, no ville ORVs are present in this segment.for the segment for the USF 2009) pastands. the limit and for the origin of the UIm and for the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.for this segment.for this segment.for the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.for the segment for the the sudy corridor. There are no consisting specialized and rare habitas, funding fers and floating mast, sudy corridor.for the segment for the sudy corridor. There are no consisting specialized analysis of the relevant data, no known necreasional ORVs were identified for this segment.for the section of the segment for the for and the segment for the segment for the segment for the segment for the sudy corridor. There are no known occurridor free d		in the region of	However, flows do not		occurrences of	amount of available habitat		in this LTA. The GB LTA	
Senic ORV.weter-based recreation such as swimming or fabing. There is liftle to no access and no recreation amenices, which limits witor-fability to reach the segment for water-based or water-based present in this segment.BOC, this dues not its to the left eRVS are the relevant data, no tho RVS are present in this segment.Special area the relevant data, no tho RVS are the relevant data, no known recreational ORV were identified for this segment.Special area the relevant data, no known or result in the relevant data, no known or recreational ORV were identified for this segment.Special area the relevant data, no known or rec		comparison. Therefore, no	appear sufficient to support		nonindigenous aquatic	for this species in the		contains one rare or	
Corral Creakusch as swimming of fibiung. There is little to no access and no recreation access and no recreation usch as board.USSS (100; yeathouts, access and no recreation uSSS 200; yeathouts, Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.(USS 200; peathouts, the level of ORV, Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.(USS 200; peathouts, the level of ORV, Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.(USS 200; peathouts, the level of ORV, Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.(USS 200; peathouts, the level of ORV, Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.(USS 200; peathouts, the level of ORV, Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.(USS 200; peathouts, the level of ORV, Accordingly, after an and statistic acces, reserve the species are no to traited to rever- designed special areas, reserve the special areas, reserve the administratively administratively designed special areas, reserve the special areas, reserve the special areas, reserve the region of comparison are recreational CORVs are preserve the region of comparison for recreational cordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known on 		Scenic ORV.	water-based recreation		species tracked by the	ROC. this does not rise to		specialized ecosystem	
folding: There is liftle to no access and no recreasion amenites, which limits visitor's ability to reach the segment for water-based or water-based			such as swimming or		USGS (including rainbow.	the level of ORV.		(USFS 2009): peatlands.	
sccess and no recreation suitors' ability to reach the segment for water-based or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related the sigment for water-based or water-related or water-related the sigment for water-based or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-based or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-based or water-related or water-based or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-based or water-based or water-based or water-related or water-based or water-based <			fishing. There is little to no		brook, and brown trout:	Accordingly, after an		These areas are relatively	
CorralApproximately one-fourth or propertiones the resolution the segment for this segment.No relevant data available or warse-related or warse-			access and no recreation		USGS 2017), and it is	analysis of the relevant		small and scattered in the	
corralwistors' ability to reach the segment for water-based or water-related in recreasional lake and meadow within the study corridor, which the study corridor. There is a small lake and meadow within the study corridor. There is no USPWS from outside the region of comparison and would not contribute to unique recreasional opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek frawing visitors from outside the region of comparison for recreasion. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreasional ORV's were idea. No relevant data available; recreasional ORV's were designated or proposed critical habitat, for frain to popposed recreasional ORV's were experiences, or result in the creek frain manysis of the relevant data, no known recreasional ORV's were idea. No recordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreasional ORV's were idea. No relevant data available; mown or recreasional CRV's were induction of the segment.Inter is no USPWS designated or proposed critical habitat for right species in the study corridor. There are no known critical habitat for right species in the study corridor. There are no for designated or proposed critical habitat for right species in the study corridor. There are no condicided designated or proposed critical habitat for right species in the study corridor. There are no for designated or proposed critical ha			amenities, which limits		assumed these species	data, no wildlife ORVs are		LTA, and include some of	
Segment for varier-based or water-related or water-related or water-related or water-related recreation. There is a small lake and meadow within the study corridor, which contribute to the recreation alseting; however, these fatures are not unique in the region of comparison and would not contribute to unique recreational opportunites or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunites or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunites or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunites or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunites or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing wistors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences or result in the segment. There is no USPWS designated opportunities or the segment is in SMS CreekNo relevant data available.There is no USPWS designated op roposed cricial habitat for rish segment wild for risk approximation or recreation and poportanities or roposed <br< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>visitors' ability to reach the</th><th></th><th>could be present in the</th><th>present in this segment.</th><th></th><th>the less common plants of</th><th></th></br<>			visitors' ability to reach the		could be present in the	present in this segment.		the less common plants of	
Corral Approximately one-fourth The reveation No relevant data available; There is no USFWS There is no USFWS There is no USFWS There are no known Corral Approximately one-fourth This segment is in SMS No relevant data available; There is no USFWS There is no USFWS There are no known There are no known Corral Approximately one-fourth This segment is in SMS No relevant data available; There are no MONV identified, precision of the study corridor. There are no There are no known Corral Approximately one-fourth This segment is in SMS No relevant data available; There are no There are no daming are			segment for water-based		study corridor.	P		the Uinta Mountains:	
Procession. There is a small lake and meadow within the study corridor, which contribute to the recreasional setting; however, these features are not unique in the region of comparison and would not contribute to unique recreasional opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing visiors from outside the region of comparison for recreasional aday, no known recreasional Soft the relevant data, no known ORV identified, of the segment to Norwer recreasional Soft the relevant data, no known ORV identified, recreasional Soft the relevant data, no known ORV identified, there are no USPWSIntere is no USPWS designated or proposed there are no USPWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species, heights, to pography. Diverse westation species, heights, the region of foce correst in a fine creek is a the relevant data, no known ORV identified, the relevant data available; the segment of foce the relevant data available; the segment of comparison for recreasional comparison for recreasional data available; the relevant data available; the relevant data available; the relevant data available; the relevant data available; the segment is no MS Cass A. Varying to pography. Diverse westation species, heights; the segment of foce westation species, heights; the segment of comparison for recreasional data available; the segment is no MS Cass A. Varying to pography. Diverse westation species, heights; the segment of foce westation species, heights;No relevant data available; there is no USFWS the relevant data available; there is no USFWS the segment of concertence of river designated or proposed tricki habitat for fish sudy corridor. There are no known the segment of foce westation the ANF the segment of foce <th></th> <th></th> <th>or water-related</th> <th></th> <th>Accordingly, after an</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>however, these species are</th> <th></th>			or water-related		Accordingly, after an			however, these species are	
Approximately one-fourth Coreallake and meadow within the study corridor, which contribute to the 			recreation. There is a small		analysis of the relevant			not considered to be river-	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment to is in SMS Casa A. Varying recreational ORS were the segment of Rock Creek in the region of comparison and would not contribute to unique recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing visitors from outside the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of Comparison and would not contribute to unique recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of comparison and would not contribute to unique recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the region of comparison for recreational opportunities or experiences, or result in the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs wereNo relevant data available; there is no USPVS designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated			lake and meadow within		data, no fish ORVs are			dependent. The TS LTA	
Corral CrealApproximately one-fourth of the segmentTo relevant data available no known CRV identified, are, The resk is a tributery to poor propertion is no SPS corridor. There are no known operation species, heights, the segment of RockNo relevant data available corridor. There are no difference the segment of RockThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical areas, research natural areas, research natural areas, rese			the study corridor, which		present in this segment.			does contain specialized	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Casa A varying topography. Diverse wegettion species, heights.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, are not unique more and the super of fock mone would not corridor. There are no diminified for this segment.Interest is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for ripor designated or proposed critical habitat for ripor topography. Diverse wegettion species, heights.No relevant data available; no known on recreational data, no comparison for control to the creek for this segment.Intere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for ripor designated or proposed critical habitat for ripor species in the study corridor. There are no known one condendedThere are no known data, no conditional relevant data, no conditional relevant data, no conditional relevant data, no conditional relevant data conditional relevant data conditional relevant data conditional relevant data conditional relevant data conditional relevant data			contribute to the		P			and rare habitats, including	
Approximately one-fourth CreekApproximately one-fourth is segment.Nor elevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for right species, heights.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for river desig			recreational setting:					fens and floating mats.	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights.No relevant data available; the segment of Rock Creek.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for rish species in the study corridor. There are no known occurrences or result in the creek drawing visitors from outside the region of comparison for recreasional opportunities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing visitors from outside the region of comparison for recreasion. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no ecological allowNo relevant data available; designated or proposed critical habitat for rish species in the study corridor. There are no here are no nor recreasions (LTA) designated or proposed critical habitat for rish species in the study corridor. There are no here are no nor recreasion (LTA) designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for river de			however these features					however these habitats are	
Corral Approximately one-fourth The segment is in SMS No relevant data available; roper and ORVs were identified for this segment. There is no USFWS There is no USFWS There is no USFWS This segment in this segment. There are no known or correst or in this segment. Corral Approximately one-fourth The segment of Rock Creek. The segment Rock Creek. The segment Rock Creek. The segment Rock Creek. The			are not unique in the					in the TS9 which is not in	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Yarying to postimately one-fourthNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWSThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish spacies heights.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no the segment is no tonown or endangered critical habitat for fish study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no the study corridor. There are no the study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no the study co			region of comparison and					the study corridor There	
Corral CreakApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse wegetation species, heights, resement of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for rish species in the study corridor. There are no species, heights,No relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for rish species in the study corridor. There are no species, heights,There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for rish species in the study corridor. There are no species in the study corridor. There are no the segment wildlife in the study corridor. There are no designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for river described in the ANFThere are no known occurrences of river designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for river described in the ANFThere are no known occurrences of river designated or proposed critical habitat for river described in the ANFThere are no known occurrences of river described in the ANF texe wegetation species, heights, reserved in the ANFThere are no known occurrences of river described in the ANF texe wegetation species, heights, reserved in the ANFThere are no known occurrences of river described in the ANF texe described in the ANF texe described in the ANFThere are no known occurrences of river described in the ANF texe described in the ANF texe			would not contribute to					are no administratively	
Image: construct of the segmentApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Case A Varying to porcupities or experiences, or result in the creek drawing visitors from outside the region of comparison for recreation. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs were identified for this segment.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, reserve in the segment is in a ROS segment is in SMS Class A Varying to pography. Diverse wegetation species, heights, reserved to Rock reserved to Rock reserved to RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified, reserved reserved reserv								designated special areas	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified or induction the creek is a tributary to Rock Creek.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified or induction the species in the study corridor. There are no species in the study corridor. There are no species in the study corridor. There are no tributary to Rock Creek.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified or induction corridor. There are no of row corridor. There are no species in the study corridor. There are no species in the study corridor. There are no<			opportunities or					such as botanical areas	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, or known ORV identified, or known ORV identified, or known ORV identified, critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, or known ORV identified, or known ORV identified, or known ORV identified, critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, topography. Diverse tributary to Rock Creek.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,No relevant data available; no known ORV identified, topography. Diverse tributary to Rock Creek.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,The segment of Rock The segment of RockThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no threa are no known described or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no threa are no thabitat for riv			experiences or result in					research natural areas	
Corral Approximately one-fourth There is no USFWS There			the creek drawing visitors					significant caves or other	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified. or known ORV identified. or ritor. There are no corridor. There are no corridor. There are no study corridor. Ther			from outside the region of					areas with inherent	
Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs were identified for this segment. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs were identified for this segment. Study corridor. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no ecological ORVs are present in this segment. Corral Approximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS This segment is in SMS No relevant data available; no known ORV identified. There is no USFWS There is no USFWS This segment includes one previously identified or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no known or event time motorized area. The creek is a tributary to Rock Creek. No relevant data available; corridor. There are no known or critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no known or event time motorized area. The creek is a tributary to Rock Creek. No relevant data available; corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no known or event time are not the NBUL No. Study corridor. There are no the NBUL No. Study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no the NBUL No. Study			comparison for recreation					ecological value in the	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no			Accordingly after an					study corridor	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, The segment of RockThere is no USFWS topography. Diverse the segment of RockThere is no USFWS topography. Diverse the segment of RockThere are no known occurrences of river designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no tudy corridor.			analysis of the relevant					Accordingly after an	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, resteament of RockNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no to pown river disible to the NPL PThere is no USFWS data, no ecological ORVs are present in this segment.There are no known occurrences of river designated or proposed critical habitat for river described in the study corridor. There are to bar which is not considered to bar which is not considered the segment of RockThe segment of Rock the segment of RockThe segment o			data no known					analysis of the relevant	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying vegetation species, heights,This segment is in an ROS tributary to Rock Creek.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for river described in the ANFData examined included spatial data for Land Type described in the ANF Ecosystem DiversityThere are no known occurrences of river dependent, federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered the segment of Rock			recreational ORVs were					data no ecological ORVs	
Corral CreekApproximately one-fourth of the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,This segment is in an ROS no known ORV identified.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are noThis segment includes one previously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are noThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are threatened or endangeredThere are no threatened or endangered threatened or endangered			identified for this segment					are present in this segment	
Creekof the segment is in SMS Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights,semi-primitive motorized area. The creek is a tributary to Rock Creek.no known ORV identified.no known ORV identified.no known ORV identified.previously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified corridor. There are the study corridor. There are the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified corridor. There are the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified corridor. There are the study corridor. There are the study corridor. There are the study corridor. There are the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified corridor. There are the study corridor. There are the study corridor. There are no the study corridor. There are no the study corridor. There are nopreviously identified the study corridor. There are the study corridor. There are no the study corridor. Th	Corral	Approximately one-fourth	This segment is in an BOS	No relevant data available:	There is no LISEWS	There is no LISEWS	This segment includes one	Data examined included	There are no known
Class A. Varying topography. Diverse vegetation species, heights, tributary to Rock Creak vegetation species, heights, topography. Diverse vegetation species and topography. Diverse topography. Diverse vegetation species and topography. Diverse topography. Dive	Creek	of the segment is in SMS	semi-primitive motorized	no known OBV identified	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
class A: Varying area: The creck is a topography. Diverse tributary to Rock Creek. vegetation species, heights, the segment of Rock corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of Rock study corridor. There are no the segment of	CICCK	Class & Varving	area. The creek is a	no known Orty identified.	critical babitat for fish	critical babitat for river	cultural resourcethe	Associations (ITA)	dependent federally-listed
vegetation species, heights, The segment of Rock Creek. The segment of Rock Creek Sawmin, Creek Sawm		topography Diverse	tributary to Bock Creek		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	Corral Creek Sawmill	described in the ANE	state-listed or candidate
The segment of the se		vegetation species heights	The segment of Rock		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	which is not considered	Frosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		patterns colors and	Creek where Corrol Creek		known populations of	no known river dependent	not eligible to the NRHP	Evaluation Report (LISES	plant species plant Species
textures Most of segment enters was inventoried in federally-listed state-listed rantor nests in the study Recause this resource is 2009) There are six LTAs of Conservation Concern		textures Most of segment	enters was inventoried in		federally-listed state-listed	raptor nests in the study	Because this resource is	2009 There are six I TA:	of Conservation Concern
is forested. Multiple soil 2005 and found not to be or candidate threatened or corridor. A number of not clearly related to present in the study or Forest Service-tracked		is forested. Multiple soil	2005 and found not to be		or candidate threatened or	corridor. A number of	not clearly related to	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
	and rock colors (tan,	eligible for inclusion in the		endangered fish species,	Forest routes, including the	Corral Creek, and	corridor; Uinta Bollie (UB),	plant species in the study
	brown, dark yellow, gray,	WSR system due to lack of		fish Species of	McAfee Bypass, are present	therefore do not indicate	Alpine Moraine (AM),	corridor. There are no
	dark white). Rock	ORVs. Observed		Conservation Concern, or	in the study corridor.	the existence of cultural or	Parks Plateau (PP), Glacial	administratively designated
	outcrops/slides, hillsides,	streambed conditions		Forest Service-tracked fish	Routes closely parallel and	historical values that are	Canyon (GC), Glacial	special botanical areas in
	lake, ridgeline, and alpine	indicate low levels of flow,		species in the study	cross stream segment,	outstandingly remarkable	Bottom (GB), and Dry	the study corridor.
	terrain are visible. Little	particularly compared with		corridor. The study	primarily in the	within the region of	Moraine (DM). The UB, PP,	Accordingly, after an
	visible human disturbance.	Rock Creek. Flows do not		corridor is not an	downstream portion.	comparison, no cultural or	GC, and DM LTAs do not	analysis of the relevant
	The perennial flow of this	appear sufficient to support		anadromous fish-bearing	Presence of these routes in	historical ORVs were	contain any rare or	data, no botanical ORVs
	small stream begins in a	water-based recreation		stream. The study	the study corridor reduces	identified for this segment.	specialized ecosystems	are present in this segment.
	series of springs, flows for	such as swimming or		corridor is tributary to	wildlife habitat quality by		identified in USFS (2009).	
	approximately one half	fishing, or attract visitors		Rock Creek, which	disrupting the dispersal		The AM LTA contains wet	
	mile, and then continues	for water-related		contains several	corridor, and increasing		meadows including poor	
	subsurface below a stock	recreation. There is a trail		occurrences of	the degree of habitat		fens, quaking bogs or	
	pond. Considered	parallel to the creek, which		nonindigenous aquatic	fragmentation and		floating mats, and	
	collectively, along with	provides hiking and other		species tracked by the	frequency of human		sphagnum bogs are	
	available photo imagery,	trail-based recreation		USGS (including rainbow,	disturbance. The study		generally widespread in the	
	the visual setting along this	opportunities adjacent to		brook, and brown trout;	corridor contains habitat		LTA. Except for a	
	segment is not rare,	the creek. However, the		USGS 2017), and it is	for White-tailed ptarmigan		calcareous or rich fen in	
	unique, or exemplary in the	opportunity or experiences		assumed these species	(Lagopus leucura) which		South Fork Rock Creek,	
	region of comparison.	of recreating on this trail		could be present in the	are dependent on riparian		there are no rare habitats	
	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	would not be unique in the		study corridor.	vegetation in the alpine		in this LIA. The GB LIA	
		region of comparison.		Accordingly, after an	zone. However, when		contains one rare or	
		Other than the trail, there		analysis of the relevant	compared to the amount		specialized ecosystem	
		Is little to no access or		data, no fish ORVs are	of available habitat for this		(USFS 2009); peatiands.	
		other recreation amenities,		present in this segment.	species in the ROC, this		I nese areas are relatively	
		for non-trail based			does not rise to the level		small and scattered in the	
		for non-trail-based			of ORV. Accordingly, after		the lass common plants of	
		recreation along the			data no wildlife OBVc are		the Llinta Mountainer	
		segment. ROCK Lake is			data, no wildlie ORVs are		however, these species are	
		which contributes to the			present in this segment.		not considered to be river	
		recreational softing:					dependent There are no	
		however, this features is					administratively designated	
		not unique in the region of					special areas such as	
		comparison and would not					botanical areas, research	
		contribute to unique					natural areas significant	
		recreational opportunities					caves, or other areas with	
		or experiences, or result in					inherent ecological value in	
		the creek drawing visitors					the study corridor.	
		from outside the region of					Accordingly, after an	
		comparison for recreation.					analysis of the relevant	
		Accordingly, after an					data, no ecological ORVs	
		analysis of the relevant					are present in this segment.	
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						

Diven	S eenie	Descretional	Caslaria	F :-h		Historial	Faalariaal	Deterical
River		Recreational				Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanicai
Cottonwood	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	I here is no USEVVS	There is no USEVVS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	I here are no known
Стеек І	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		motorized area. The		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LIA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		analysis did not reveal any		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		distinguishing natural or		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		recreational amenities that		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		would draw a visitor to this		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There is one LTA	of Conservation Concern,
		segment over others in the		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After analyzing this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		region of comparison for		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	relevant data, no cultural	corridor; Parks Plateau	plant species in the study
		unique recreational		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	(PP). This LTA does not	corridor. There are no
		opportunities or		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	contain any rare or	administratively designated
		experiences. The segment		Forest Service-tracked fish	The Lowline Trail crosses		specialized ecosystems	special botanical areas in
		is less than a mile long and		species in the study	this study corridor, but		identified in USFS (2009).	the study corridor.
		there is little to no access		corridor. The study	does not cross the stream		There are no	Accordingly, after an
		or recreation amenities,		corridor is not an	segment. Presence of the		administratively designated	analysis of the relevant
		which limits visitors' ability		anadromous fish-bearing	trail in the study corridor		special areas, such as	data, no botanical ORVs
		to participate in water-		stream. Though the study	somewhat increases the		botanical areas, research	are present in this segment.
		based or water-related		corridor does not contain	degree of habitat		natural areas, significant	
		recreation. Observed		any occurrences of	fragmentation and		caves, or other areas with	
		streambed conditions also		nonindigenous aquatic	frequency of human		inherent ecological value in	
		indicate that flow is		species tracked by the	disturbance. Accordingly,		the study corridor.	
		ephemeral with likely no		USGS, this does not in and	after an analysis of the		Accordingly, after an	
		flow during the summer,		of itself rise to the level of	relevant data, no wildlife		analysis of the relevant	
		which prevents		an ORV. Accordingly, after	ORVs are present in this		data, no ecological ORVs	
		opportunities for water-		an analysis of the relevant	segment.		are present in this segment.	
		based recreation.		data, no fish ORVs are	-			
		Accordingly, after an		present in this segment.				
		analysis of the relevant		· · · · ·				
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fich	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Cottonwood	Not in SMS Class A	This segment is in an BOS	No relevant data available:	There is no LISEW/S	There is no LISEW/S	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek 2	Therefore no Scenic OBV	semi-primitive motorized	no known OBV identified	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
CICCR 2		area. The study area	no known Orty Identified.	critical babitat for fish	critical babitat for river	cultural resources most	Associations (ITA)	dependent federally-listed
		terminates at the Forest		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANE	state-listed or candidate
		Service boundary The		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		analysis did not reveal any		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USES	plant species plant Species
		distinguishing natural or		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009) The only I TA	of Conservation Concern.
		recreational amenities that		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		would draw a visitor to this		endangered fish species.	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor is the Avintaguin	plant species in the study
		segment over others in the		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC). This LTA	corridor. There are no
		region of comparison for		Conservation Concern. or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	contains one rare or	administratively designated
		unique recreational		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		specialized ecosystem	special botanical areas in
		opportunities or		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		identified in USFS (2009);	the study corridor.
		experiences. The segment		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		the spiked big sagebrush	Accordingly, after an
		is less than a mile long and		corridor is not an	features that would		community. This	analysis of the relevant
		there is no known access		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		community is identified as	data, no botanical ORVs
		or recreation amenities,		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		"rather rare" on the ANF,	are present in this segment.
		which limits visitors' ability		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		however no relevant data	
		to participate in water-		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		exists to determine if this	
		based or water-related		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		community occurs in the	
		recreation. Observed		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		study segment. There are	
		streambed conditions also		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		no administratively	
		indicate that flow is		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		designated special areas,	
		ephemeral with likely no		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wildlife ORVs are		such as botanical areas,	
		flow during much of the		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		research natural areas,	
		year, which further limits		data, no fish ORVs are			significant caves, or other	
		opportunities for water-		present in this segment.			areas with inherent	
		based and water-related					ecological value in the	
		recreation. Accordingly,					study corridor.	
		after an analysis of the					Accordingly, after an	
		relevant data, no known					analysis of the relevant	
		recreational ORVs were					data, no ecological ORVs	
		identified for this segment.					are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Cripple	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		motorized area. The		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		analysis did not reveal any		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		distinguishing natural or		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		recreational amenities that		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		would draw a visitor to this		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). The only LTA	of Conservation Concern,
		segment over others in the		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		region of comparison for		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor is the Anthro	plant species in the study
		unique recreational		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Plateau (AP). The AP LTA	corridor. There are no
		opportunities or		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	contains raw, erosive	administratively designated
		experiences. There is		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		slopes and ridges of the	special botanical areas in
		limited access to the		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		Green River Formation and	the study corridor.
		segment and no recreation		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		Uinta Formations which	Accordingly, after an
		amenities, which limits		corridor is not an	features that would		are habitat for plant	analysis of the relevant
		visitors' ability to		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		Species of Special Concern,	data, no botanical ORVs
		participate in water-based		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		including Goldrich blazing	are present in this segment.
		or water-related		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		star, Untermann daisy, and	
		recreation. Observed		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		green threadleaf. However,	
		streambed conditions also		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		these SCCs are not	
		indicate that flow is		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		considered river-	
		ephemeral with likely no		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		dependent. There are no	
		flow during the summer,		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		administratively designated	
		which prevents		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wildlife ORVs are		special areas, such as	
		opportunities for water-		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		botanical areas, research	
		based recreation.		data, no fish ORVs are			natural areas, significant	
		Accordingly, after an		present in this segment.			caves, or other areas with	
		analysis of the relevant					inherent ecological value in	
		data, no known					the study corridor.	
		recreational ORVs were					Accordingly, after an	
		identified for this segment.					analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Crystal	Approximately one-sixth of	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	the segment is in SMS Class	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
	A. Limited changes in	analysis did not reveal any		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	topography. Dramatic	distinguishing natural or		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	waters likely absent.	recreational amenities that		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	Vegetation nearly absent	would draw a visitor to this		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	for approximately half of	segment over others in the		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
	segment. Lacks soil/rock	region of comparison for		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	color diversity. Segment	unique recreational		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
	crossed by multiple dirt	opportunities or		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Dry Moraine (DM), and	corridor. There are no
	roads near each other.	experiences. The Dry		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Glacial Bottom (GB). The	administratively designated
	Nearly featureless	Gulch trail crosses the		Forest Service-tracked fish	Two Forest Routes, 119		SF and DM LTAs do not	special botanical areas in
	landscape in lower half of	creek providing trail-based		species in the study	and 227, as well as the Dry		contain any rare or	the study corridor.
	segment corridor.	access and recreation		corridor. The study	Gulch Trail, cross the study		specialized ecosystems	Accordingly, after an
		opportunities; however,		corridor is not an	corridor and stream		identified in USFS (2009).	analysis of the relevant
		the trail would not provide		anadromous fish-bearing	segment. Presence of these		The GB LTA contains one	data, no botanical ORVs
		unique recreational		stream. Though the study	routes in the study		rare or specialized	are present in this segment.
		experiences or		corridor does not contain	corridor reduces wildlife		ecosystem (USFS 2009);	
		opportunities compared		any occurrences of	habitat quality by disrupting		peatlands. These areas are	
		with those available		nonindigenous aquatic	the dispersal corridor, and		relatively small and	
		elsewhere in the region of		species tracked by the	increasing the degree of		scattered in the LTA, and	
		comparison. In addition to		USGS, this does not in and	habitat fragmentation and		include some of the less	
		the trail, there are OHV		of itself rise to the level of	frequency of human		common plants of the	
		trails within the study		an ORV. Accordingly, after	disturbance. Accordingly,		Uinta Mountains; however,	
		corridor. Observed		an analysis of the relevant	after an analysis of the		these species are not	
		streambed conditions also		data, no fish ORVs are	relevant data, no wildlife		considered to be river-	
		indicate that flow is		present in this segment.	ORVs are present in this		dependent. There are no	
		ephemeral with likely no			segment.		administratively designated	
		flow during most of the					special areas, such as	
		year. These observed					botanical areas, research	
		conditions do not support					natural areas, significant	
		outstanding or remarkable					caves, or other areas with	
		water-based of water-					the study corridor	
		opportunitios in this					Accordingly after an	
		sogmont Accordingly after					analysis of the relevant	
		an analysis of the relevant					data no ecological ORVs	
		data no known					are present in this segment	
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Death	All of segment is in SMS	This segment is in an ROS	Interesting formations but	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes five	Data examined included	There are no known
Valley	Class A. Variations in	roaded natural area. The	they don't appear	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
Creek	topography. Dramatic	creek is a tributary to	outstandingly remarkable in	critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources. Three	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	waters with rocks may be	Sheep Creek. The segment	the region of comparison.	species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	are prehistoric sites (two	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	present due to changing	of Sheep Creek where	Nearby Sheep Creek	corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	are considered eligible to	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	topography. Diverse	Death Valley Creek enters	Geologic Area has better	known populations of	no known river dependent	the NRHP and one is not	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	vegetation species, heights,	was inventoried in 2005	examples and easier access.	federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	eligible) including a rock	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
	patterns, colors, and	and found to be eligible for		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	shelter, one site includes	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	textures. Multiple soil and	inclusion in the WSR		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	both prehistoric and	corridor; Red Canyon	plant species in the study
	rock colors (tan, brown,	system for the presence of		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	historic components and is	(RC), and North Flank	corridor. There are no
	dark yellow, gray, orange,	recreation ORVs.		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	eligible to the NRHP, and	(NF). The RC and NF LTAs	administratively designated
	dark white). Moderate to	Observed streambed		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is	one is a historic site	do not contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
	high sinuosity through	conditions indicate low		species in the study	free from highways, roads,	considered not eligible to	specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
	canyon. Rock	levels of flow, particularly		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear	the NRHP. Many of these	identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
	outcrops/slides, hillsides,	compared with Sheep		corridor is not an	features that would	resources are located along	There are no	analysis of the relevant
	ridgelines, and terraces are	Creek. Flows do not		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat	Sheep Creek near where	administratively designated	data, no botanical ORVs
	visible. Striking viewpoints	appear sufficient to support		stream. The study	fragmentation and/or the	Death Valley Creek joins	special areas, such as	are present in this segment.
	likely available from road.	water-based recreation		corridor is tributary to	frequency of human	the larger drainage and	botanical areas, research	
	Almost no visible human	such as swimming or		Sheep Creek, which	disturbance, this does not	more closely relate to	natural areas, significant	
	disturbances, except for	fishing, or attract visitors		contains occurrences of	in and of itself rise to the	Sheep Creek. In addition,	caves, or other areas with	
	road at lower end of	for water-related		nonindigenous aquatic	level of an ORV.	the prehistoric rock shelter	inherent ecological value in	
	segment. Diverse landscape	recreation. When flow is		species tracked by the	Accordingly, after an	is located well above Death	the study corridor.	
	due to length of segment.	present, there is a			analysis of the relevant	Valley Creek, so it appears	Accordingly, after an	
	However, considered these	waterfall, which would		redside shiner; USGS	data, no wildlife ORVs are	these resources are not	analysis of the relevant	
	features collectively, the	contribute to a rare, but		2017), and it is assumed	present in this segment.	related. There are no	data, no ecological ORVs	
	visual setting along this	not unprecedented,		these species could be		historia values that are	are present in this segment.	
	segment is not rare,	experience in the region of		present in the study		nistoric values that are		
	unique, or exemplary in the	comparison. This feature		corridor. Accordingly, alter		unique, rare, exemplary, or		
	Therefore no Sconic OBV	the energy drawing		data no fich OP/(s are		outstandingly remarkable in		
	Therefore, no Scenic OKv.	the creek drawing		data, no lish ORVs are		the region of comparison,		
		the region of comparison		present in this segment.		historical OPVs wors		
		Recreation opportunities				identified for this segment		
		would be largely primitive				identified for this segment.		
		with no observed						
		developed recreation						
		amenities and little to no						
		access. Overall, the						
		experiences of recreating						
		in this corridor would not						
		be unique in the region of						
		comparison. Accordingly,						
		after an analysis of the						
		relevant data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
River Deep Creek	Scenic Upper half of segment is in SMS Class A. Limited changes in topography. Dramatic waters likely absent. Lacks vegetation diversity. Lacks soil color diversity. Northward views from segment of nearby prominent hillside.	Recreational This segment is in an ROS roaded natural area. The analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this short (0.5-mile long) segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreational opportunities or experiences. There is some OHV access to the segment, but no known recreation amenities. Observed streambed conditions also indicate that flow is ephemeral with likely no flow during most of the year, which prevents opportunities for water- based recreation and limits the attractiveness of the corridor for water-related recreation compared with other segments in the region of comparison. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs were	Geologic No relevant data available; no known ORV identified.	Fish There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no known populations of federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered fish species, fish Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked fish species in the study corridor. The study corridor is not an anadromous fish-bearing stream. Though the study corridor does not contain any occurrences of nonindigenous aquatic species tracked by the USGS, this does not in and of itself rise to the level of an ORV. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.	Wildlife There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no known river dependent raptor nests in the study corridor. There is no habitat for other river dependent wildlife species considered in this analysis. While the study corridor is free from highways, roads, trails, or other linear features that would increase habitat fragmentation and/or the frequency of human disturbance, this does not in and of itself rise to the level of an ORV. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no wildlife ORVs are present in this segment.	Historic/Cultural This segment includes no previously identified cultural resources, most likely because there have been limited or no previous archaeological surveys conducted in this area. After considering this absence of data, no cultural or historical ORVs were identified for this segment.	Ecological Data examined included spatial data for Land Type Associations (LTA) described in the ANF Ecosystem Diversity Evaluation Report (USFS 2009). There is one LTA present in the study corridor; South Face (SF). The SF LTA does not contain any rare or specialized ecosystems identified in USFS (2009). There are no administratively designated special areas, such as botanical areas, research natural areas, significant caves, or other areas with inherent ecological value in the study corridor. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no ecological ORVs are present in this segment.	Botanical There are no known occurrences of river dependent, federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no administratively designated special botanical areas in the study corridor. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no botanical ORVs are present in this segment.

Dowd Creek EligibleAll of segment is in SMS Class A. Limited changes in topography. Dramatic waters likely absent. SparseThis segment is in an ROS no known ORV identified.No relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS fishes and Amphibians on the Flaming Gorge RangerThere is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in theThis segment includes 23 previously identified cultural resources.Data examined included spatial data for Land Type described in the ANFThere is no known ORV identified spatial data for Land TypeThere is no known ORV identified topography. DramaticThere is no USFWS previously identified cultural resources.Data examined included spatial data for Land Type described in the ANFThere is no known ORV identified designated or proposed the Flaming Gorge RangerThere is no USFWS designated or proposed cultural resources.Data examined included spatial data for Land Type described in the ANFThere is no known ORV identified designated or proposed described in the ANFData examined included spatial data for Land Type described in the ANF	re are no known urrences of river endent, federally-listed, e-listed, or candidate atened or endangered
EligibleClass A. Limited changes in topography. Dramaticroaded natural area. The analysis did not reveal anyno known ORV identified.Fishes and Amphibians on the Flaming Gorge Rangerdesignated or proposed critical habitat for riverpreviously identifiedspatial data for Land Typeoccurre dependerwaters likely absent. Sparsedistinguishing natural or <th>urrences of river endent, federally-listed, e-listed, or candidate atened or endangered</th>	urrences of river endent, federally-listed, e-listed, or candidate atened or endangered
topography. Dramatic analysis did not reveal any waters likely absent. Sparse distinguishing natural or District, ANF (Peterson et dependent wildlife in the Nineteen are prehistoric described in the ANF state-list	endent, federally-listed, e-listed, or candidate atened or endangered
waters likely absent. Sparse distinguishing natural or District, ANF (Peterson et dependent wildlife in the Nineteen are prehistoric described in the ANF state-list	e-listed, or candidate atened or endangered
	atened or endangered
vegetation for most of recreational amenities that al. 2009)" noted that no study corridor. There are sites (10 are eligible to the Ecosystem Diversity threater	
segment. Lacks soil/rock would draw a visitor to this fish were detected in no known river dependent NRHP and nine are not Evaluation Report (USFS plant specified on the segment segment. Lacks soil/rock would draw a visitor to this fish were detected in the segment.	t species, plant Species
color diversity. Adjacent segment over others in the Dowd Spring. There is no raptor nests in the study eligible) several of which 2009). There are two LTAs of Constructions of Constructions of Constructions of Constructions and the study of Constructions of Co	onservation Concern,
highway parallel to segment region of comparison for USFWS designated or corridor. State Route 44 (a are lithic scatters, two present in the study or Forest	orest Service-tracked
for approximately one mile. unique recreational proposed critical habitat 2-lane highway), Forest other sites include both corridor; Greendale plant spectrum of the sites include both corridor of the sites include both corres of the sites	t species in the study
opportunities or for fish species in the study Routes 94 and 218, and the prehistoric and historic Plateau (GP) and Red corridor	idor. There are no
experiences. There is some corridor. There are no Dowd Mountain XC Ski components and are Canyon (RC). The GP and administ	inistratively designated
access to the segment, but known populations of Area are present in the eligible to the NRHP, and RC LTAs do not contain special b	ial botanical areas in
no known recreation federally-listed, state-listed, study corridor. Presence of two sites are historic and any rare or specialized the stud	study corridor.
amenities. Observed or candidate threatened or these routes in the study considered not eligible to ecosystem identified in Accordin	ordingly, after an
streambed conditions also endangered fish species, corridor reduces wildlife the NRHP. Twelve of the USFS (2009). There are no analysis	ysis of the relevant
indicate that flow is fish Species of habitat quality by disrupting NRHP-eligible prehistoric administratively designated data, no	, no botanical ORVs
ephemeral with likely no Conservation Concern, or the dispersal corridor, and sites are near Dowd Creek special areas, such as are pres	present in this segment.
flow during most of the Forest Service-tracked fish increasing the degree of and two largest prehistoric botanical areas, research	
year, which prevents species in the study habitat fragmentation and campsites surround Dowd natural areas, significant	
opportunities for water-	
based recreation and limits corridor is not an disturbance. The study creek), indicating long- inherent ecological value in	
the attractiveness of the anadromous fish-bearing corridor contains tall term, repeat usage of the the study corridor.	
corridor for water-related stream. The study willow (Salix spp.) habitat creek corridor during Accordingly, after an	
recreation compared with corridor is tributary to for riparian dependent prehistory. The sites clear analysis of the relevant	
other segments in the Carter Creek, which avian species. However, relationship to Dowd data, no ecological ORVs	
region of comparison. Contains several when compared to the Creek and the prehistoric are present in this segment.	
Accordingly, after an occurrences of amount of available nabitat occupation demonstrate	
analysis of the relevant nonindigenous aquatic for this species in the cultural or historic values	
data, no known species tracked by the ROC, this does not rise to that are unique, rare,	
identified for this segment	
2017) and it is assumed Amphibians on the Flaming Within the region of	
these species could be Corge Banger District comparison: therefore a	
present in the study ANE (Peterson et al. cultural or historical ORV	
corridor Accordingly after 2009)" noted that no was identified for this	
an analysis of the relevant amphibian species were segment	
data no fish ORVs are detected in Dowd Spring	
present in this segment or Dowd Hole	
Accordingly, after an	
analysis of the relevant	
data, no wildlife ORVs are	
present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Dry Fork	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		motorized and semi-		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		primitive motorized areas.		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		The creek is a tributary to		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		an unknown creek that was		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		inventoried in 2005 and		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		found not to be eligible for		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		inclusion in the WSR		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; the Avintaquin	plant species in the study
		system. Observed		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC) and Anthro	corridor. There are no
		streambed conditions		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Plateau (AP). The AC LTA	administratively designated
		indicate low levels of flow.		Forest Service-tracked fish	The Right Fork Lake		contains one rare or	special botanical areas in
		Flows do not appear		species in the study	Canyon Trail closely		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
		sufficient to support water-		corridor. The study	parallels this stream		identified in USFS (2009);	Accordingly, after an
		based recreation such as		corridor is not an	segment for nearly the		the spiked big sagebrush	analysis of the relevant
		swimming or fishing, or		anadromous fish-bearing	entire length, increasing the		community. This	data, no botanical ORVs
		attract visitors for water-		stream. Though the study	degree of habitat		community is identified as	are present in this segment.
		related recreation. The		corridor does not contain	fragmentation and		"rather rare" on the ANF.	
		Right Fork Lake Canyon		any occurrences of	frequency of human		Unknown if this community	
		trail parallels the creek		nonindigenous aquatic	disturbance. Accordingly,		occurs in the study	
		providing trail-based access		species tracked by the	after an analysis of the		segment. The AP LTA	
		and recreation		USGS, this does not in and	relevant data, no wildlife		contains raw, erosive	
		opportunities; however,		of itself rise to the level of	ORVs are present in this		slopes and ridges of the	
		the trail would not provide		an ORV. Accordingly, after	segment.		Green River Formation and	
		unique recreational		an analysis of the relevant			Uinta Formations which	
		experiences or		data, no fish ORVs are			are habitat for plant	
		opportunities compared		present in this segment.			Species of Special Concern,	
		with those available					including Goldrich blazing	
		elsewhere in the region of					star, Untermann daisy, and	
		comparison. In addition to					green threadleaf. However,	
		the trail, there are					these SCCs are not	
		numerous OHV trails					considered river-	
		within the study corridor.					dependent. There are no	
		Recreation opportunities					administratively designated	
		would be largely primitive,					special areas, such as	
		with no observed					botanical areas, research	
		developed recreation					natural areas, significant	
		amenities. Overall, the					caves, or other areas with	
		in this corridor would not					the study corridor	
		he unique in the region of					Accordingly offer an	
		comparison Accordingly					analysis of the relevant	
		after an analysis of the					data no ecological ORVs	
		relevant data no known					are present in this sogment	
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
East Fork	Not in SMS Class A	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USEWS	There is no USEWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Farm Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		area. The analysis did not		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		reveal any distinguishing		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		natural or recreational		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		amenities that would draw		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		a visitor to this segment		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
		over others in the region		or candidate threatened or	corridor. The study	area. After considering this	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		of comparison for unique		endangered fish species,	corridor contains habitat	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
		recreational opportunities		fish Species of	for White-tailed ptarmigan	or historical ORVs were	Uinta Bollie (UB), and	corridor. There are no
		or experiences. There is a		Conservation Concern, or	(Lagopus leucura) which	identified for this segment.	Alpine Moraine (AM). The	administratively designated
		trail immediately outside		Forest Service-tracked fish	are dependent on riparian		SF and UB LTAs do not	special botanical areas in
		the I/4-mile study		species in the study	vegetation in the alpine		contain any rare or	the study corridor.
		corridor, however, there		corridor. The study	zone. However, when		specialized ecosystems	Accordingly, after an
		are no roads or trails		corridor is not an	compared to the amount		identified in USFS (2009).	analysis of the relevant
		directly accessing the creek		anadromous fish-bearing	of available habitat for this		The AM LTA contains wet	data, no botanical ORVs
		and no known recreation		stream. Though the study	species in the ROC, this		meadows including poor	are present in this segment.
		amenities. Observed		corridor does not contain	does not rise to the level		fens, quaking bogs or	
		streambed conditions also		any occurrences of	of ORV. The study		floating mats, and	
		indicate that flow is		nonindigenous aquatic	corridor contains tall		sphagnum bogs are	
		ephemeral with likely no		species tracked by the	willow (Salix spp.) habitat		generally widespread in the	
		flow during most of the		USGS, this does not in and	for riparian dependent		LTA. Except for a	
		year, which prevents		of itself rise to the level of	avian species. However,		calcareous or rich fen in	
		opportunities for water-		an ORV. Accordingly, after	when compared to the		South Fork Rock Creek,	
		based recreation and limits		an analysis of the relevant	amount of available habitat		which is not in the study	
		the attractiveness of the		data, no fish ORVs are	for this species in the		corridor, there are no rare	
		corridor for water-related		present in this segment.	ROC, this does not rise to		habitats in this LTA. There	
		recreation compared with			the level of ORV. While		are no administratively	
		other segments in the			the study corridor is free		designated special areas,	
		region of comparison.			from highways, roads,		such as botanical areas,	
		Accordingly, after an			trails, or other linear		research natural areas,	
		analysis of the relevant			features that would		significant caves, or other	
		data, no known			increase habitat		areas with inherent	
		recreational ORVs were			fragmentation and/or the		ecological value in the	
		identified for this segment.			frequency of human		study corridor.	
					disturbance, this does not		Accordingly, after an	
					in and of itself rise to the		analysis of the relevant	
					level of an ORV.		data, no ecological ORVs	
					Accordingly, after an		are present in this segment.	
					analysis of the relevant			
					data, no wildlife ORVs are			
					Dresent in this segment.			

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
East Fork	All of segment is in SMS	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes	Data examined included	There are no known
Whiterocks	Class A. Limited changes in	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	three previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
River	topography. Dramatic	motorized area. The creek		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources. Two	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed.
	waters likely absent.	is a tributary to White		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	are prehistoric sites and	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	Vegetation nearly absent	Rocks Lake and the East		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	one other site exhibits	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	for approximately half of	Fork White Rocks Lake		known populations of	no known river dependent	both prehistoric and	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	segment. Limited soil color	River. The segment of East		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	historic components; these	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
	diversity. Views from lower	Fork White Rocks Lake		or candidate threatened or	corridor. The Uinta	sites are considered not	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	segment of upper segment	River where East Fork		endangered fish species,	Highline Trail crosses the	eligible to the NRHP.	corridor; Uinta Bollie (UB),	plant species in the study
	on hillside. Views from	Whiterocks River enters		fish Species of	study corridor and stream	Because these resources	and Alpine Moraine (AM).	corridor. There are no
	upper segment of lower	was inventoried in 2005		Conservation Concern, or	segment. Presence of the	are not eligible to the	The UB LTA does not	administratively designated
	segment and artificial lake.	and found to be eligible for		Forest Service-tracked fish	trail in the study corridor	NRHP and are at some	contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
	6	inclusion in the WSR		species in the study	increases the degree of	distance from the East Fork	specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
		system for the presence of		corridor. The study	habitat fragmentation and	of Whiterocks River, there	identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
		scenic ORVs. There is also		corridor is not an	frequency of human	is no indication of cultural	The AM LTA contains wet	analysis of the relevant
		a small dam at Whiterocks		anadromous fish-bearing	disturbance. The study	or historic values that are	meadows including poor	data, no botanical ORVs
		Lake. The river upstream		stream. The study	corridor contains habitat	unique, rare, exemplary, or	fens, quaking bogs or	are present in this segment.
		of the dam was inventoried		corridor is the portion of	for White-tailed ptarmigan	outstandingly remarkable in	floating mats, and	1 3
		in 2005 and found not to		East Fork Whiterocks	(Lagopus leucura) which	the region of comparison.	sphagnum bogs are	
		be eligible for inclusion in		River above Whiterocks	are dependent on riparian	Therefore, no cultural or	generally widespread in the	
		the WSR system.		Lake; the dam on the lake	vegetation in the alpine	historical ORVs were	LTA. Except for a	
		Observed streambed		prevents Colorado River	zone. However, when	identified for this segment.	calcareous or rich fen in	
		conditions indicate		cutthroat trout, which are	compared to the amount		South Fork Rock Creek,	
		perennial flow levels, which		present below the dam,	of available habitat for this		which is not in the study	
		could support some		from moving any further	species in the ROC, this		segment, there are no rare	
		localized water-based		upstream and into the	does not rise to the level		habitats in this LTA. There	
		recreation such as		study corridor. Nonnative	of ORV. The study		are no administratively	
		swimming or fishing. The		brook trout are stocked in	corridor contains tall		designated special areas,	
		segment is also crossed by		Whiterocks Lake.	willow (Salix spp.) habitat		such as botanical areas,	
		the Uinta Highline Trail,		Accordingly, after an	for riparian dependent		research natural areas,	
		which would provide		analysis of the relevant	avian species. However,		significant caves, or other	
		water-related, trail-based		data, no fish ORVs are	when compared to the		areas with inherent	
		recreation opportunities in		present in this segment.	amount of available habitat		ecological value in the	
		the study corridor. The			for this species in the		study corridor.	
		trail and setting are not			ROC, this does not rise to		Accordingly, after an	
		unique in the region of			the level of ORV.		analysis of the relevant	
		comparison and would not			Accordingly, after an		data, no ecological ORVs	
		likely draw recreationists			analysis of the relevant		are present in this segment.	
		from outside the region of			data, no wildlife ORVs are			
		comparison. Recreation			present in this segment.			
		opportunities would be						
		largely primitive, with no						
		observed developed						
		recreation amenities and						
		little to no access. Overall,						
		the experiences of						
		recreating in this corridor						
		would not be unique in the						
		region of comparison.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
		Accordingly, after an					<u> </u>	
		analysis of the relevant						
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						
Farm Creek	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes one	Data examined included	There are no known
	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		area. The analysis did not		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resourcean	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		reveal any distinguishing		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	historic log worm fence,	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		natural or recreational		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	which is considered not	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		amenities that would draw		known populations of	no known river dependent	eligible to the NRHP.	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		a visitor to this segment		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	Because this resource is	2009). There are four	of Conservation Concern,
		over others in the region		or candidate threatened or	corridor. Forest Route 416	not clearly related to Farm	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		of comparison for unique		endangered fish species,	is within the study corridor	Creek and is not eligible to	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
		recreational opportunities		fish Species of	for approximately two	the NRHP, therefore there	Uinta Bollie (UB), Alpine	corridor. There are no
		or experiences. There are		Conservation Concern, or	miles, and crosses the	are no clear cultural or	Moraine (AM), and Glacian	administratively designated
		some OHV trails directly		Forest Service-tracked fish	stream segment twice. This	historic values that are	Canyon (GC). The SF, UB,	special botanical areas in
		accessing the creek, but no		species in the study	route closely parallels the	unique, rare, exemplary, or	and GC LIAs do not	the study corridor.
		known recreation		corridor. The study	stream segment for	outstandingly remarkable in	contain any rare or	Accordingly, after an
		amenities. Observed		corridor is not an	approximately 0.25 mile	the region of comparison,	specialized ecosystems	analysis of the relevant
		streambed conditions also		anadromous fish-bearing	near its downstream end.	no cultural or historical	Identified in USFS (2009).	data, no botanical ORVs
		Indicate that flow is		stream. I nough the study	Presence of Forest Route	ORVS were identified for	The AM LTA contains wet	are present in this segment.
		epnemeral with likely no		corridor does not contain	416 In the study corridor	this segment.	fend availing here an	
		flow during most of the		any occurrences of	reduces wildlife habitat		fens, quaking bogs or	
		year, which prevents		nonindigenous aquatic	dispersel corridor, and		noating mats, and	
		based recreation and limits		LISCS this does not in and	increasing the degree of		sphaghum bogs are	
		the attractiveness of the		of itself rise to the level of	habitat fragmontation and		TA Except for a	
		corridor for water-related		an OBV Accordingly after	frequency of human		calcareous or rich fen in	
		recreation compared with		an analysis of the relevant	disturbance. The study		South Fork Bock Creek	
		other segments in the		data no fish ORVs are	corridor contains habitat		there are no rare habitats	
		region of comparison		present in this segment.	for White-tailed ptarmigan		in this ITA. There are no	
		Accordingly, after an		P	(Lagopus leucura) which		administratively designated	
		analysis of the relevant			are dependent on riparian		special areas, such as	
		data, no known			vegetation in the alpine		botanical areas, research	
		recreational ORVs were			zone. However, when		natural areas, significant	
		identified for this segment.			compared to the amount		caves, or other areas with	
					of available habitat for this		inherent ecological value in	
					species in the ROC, this		the study corridor.	
					does not rise to the level		Accordingly, after an	
					of ORV. Accordingly, after		analysis of the relevant	
					an analysis of the relevant		data, no ecological ORVs	
					data, no wildlife ORVs are		are present in this segment.	
					present in this segment.			

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Fivemile	All of segment is in SMS	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Class A. Simple changes in	roaded natural and semi-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
	topography. Modest water	primitive non-motorized		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	patterns with rocks likely	areas. The creek is a		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	present due to changing	tributary to an unknown		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	topography. Vegetation	creek, which was		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	mostly found on one side	inventoried in 2005 and		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
	of segment. Limited soil	found not to be eligible for		or candidate threatened or	corridor. US Route 191, a	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	color diversity. Negligible	inclusion in the WSR		endangered fish species,	2-lane rural highway,	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; the Avintaquin	plant species in the study
	sinuosity through canyon.	system. The analysis did		fish Species of	crosses the downstream	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC) and Anthro	corridor. There are no
	Rocks/slides, hillsides, and	not reveal any		Conservation Concern, or	end of this study corridor,	identified for this segment.	Plateau (AP). The AC LTA	administratively designated
	ridgelines are visible.	distinguishing natural or		Forest Service-tracked fish	just upstream of the		contains one rare or	special botanical areas in
	Common views likely	recreational amenities that		species in the study	confluence with the		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
	available from highway.	would draw a visitor to this		corridor. The study	unnamed stream in Left		identified in USFS (2009);	Accordingly, after an
	Almost no visible human	segment over others in the		corridor is not an	Fork Indian Canyon. Flows		the spiked big sagebrush	analysis of the relevant
	disturbances, except for	region of comparison for		anadromous fish-bearing	from Fivemile Creek are		community. This	data, no botanical ORVs
	highway at lower end of	unique recreational		stream. Though the study	directed under US Route		community is identified as	are present in this segment.
	the segment.	opportunities or		corridor does not contain	191 via a culvert. Presence		"rather rare" on the ANF.	
		experiences. The creek		any occurrences of	of the highway reduces		Unknown if this community	
		crosses under Highway		nonindigenous aquatic	wildlife habitat quality by		occurs in the study	
		191, however there is no		species tracked by the	disrupting dispersal		segment. The AP LTA	
		access to the segment from		USGS, this does not in and	corridor, and increasing		contains raw, erosive	
		the roadway and no		of itself rise to the level of	the degree of habitat		slopes and ridges of the	
		recreation amenities, which		an ORV. Accordingly, after	fragmentation and		Green River Formation and	
		nimits visitors admity to			disturbance. The study		Ointa Formations which	
		on water related		data, no isn ORVs are	corridor contains tall		Species of Special Concern	
		or water-related		present in this segment.	willow (Salix spp.) habitat		including Coldrich blozing	
		streambed conditions also			for riparian dependent		star. Untermann daisy and	
		indicate that flow is			avian species. However		green threadleaf However	
		aphemeral with likely no			this habitat is likely		these SCCs are not	
		flow during the summer			supported by flows in the		considered river-	
		which prevents			unnamed stream in Left		dependent. There are no	
		opportunities for water-			Fork Indian Canyon, and		administratively designated	
		based recreation.			thus is not associated with		special areas, such as	
		Accordingly, after an			the study segment.		botanical areas, research	
		analysis of the relevant			Accordingly, after an		natural areas, significant	
		data, no known			analysis of the relevant		caves, or other areas with	
		recreational ORVs were			data, no wildlife ORVs are		inherent ecological value in	
		identified for this segment.			present in this segment.		the study corridor.	
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Accordingly, after an	
							analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Grouse	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes 10	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		area. The analysis did not		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources. Nine	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		reveal any distinguishing		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	are prehistoric sites (six	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		natural or recreational		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	are considered not eligible	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		amenities that would draw		known populations of	no known river dependent	to the NRHP and three are	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		a visitor to this segment		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	eligible); most of these are	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
		over others in the region		or candidate threatened or	corridor. A number of	lithic scatters. There is also	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		of comparison for unique		endangered fish species,	Forest routes, including FR	one historic road from the	corridor; Parks Plateau	plant species in the study
		recreational opportunities		fish Species of	442 and 443, are present in	early twentieth century	(PP), South Face (SF), and	corridor. There are no
		or experiences. There are		Conservation Concern, or	the study corridor. Routes	that is considered not	Stream Piedmont (SP). The	administratively designated
		some OHV trails directly		Forest Service-tracked fish	closely parallel and cross	eligible to the NRHP.	PP, SF, and SP LTAs do not	special botanical areas in
		accessing the creek, but no		species in the study	the stream segment.	While these resources do	contain any rare or	the study corridor.
		known recreation		corridor. The study	Presence of these routes in	relate to Grouse Creek	specialized ecosystems	Accordingly, after an
		amenities. Observed		corridor is not an	the study corridor reduces	and indicate the area was	identified in USFS (2009),	analysis of the relevant
		streambed conditions also		anadromous fish-bearing	wildlife habitat quality by	used during prehistory,	except for wet meadows at	data, no botanical ORVs
		indicate that flow is		stream. Though the study	disrupting the dispersal	most of the sites are	Burnt Mill Spring and 77	are present in this segment.
		ephemeral with likely no		corridor does not contain	corridor, and increasing	ineligible and do not	Flat in the SP LTA, which	
		flow during the summer		any occurrences of	the degree of habitat	indicate the existence of	are not in the study	
		months, which limits		nonindigenous aquatic	fragmentation and	cultural or historic values	corridor. There are no	
		opportunities for water-		species tracked by the	frequency of human	that are unique, rare,	administratively designated	
		based recreation and the		USGS, this does not in and	disturbance. The study	exemplary, or	special areas, such as	
		attractiveness of the		of itself rise to the level of	corridor contains tall	outstandingly remarkable in	botanical areas, research	
		corridor for water-related		an ORV. Accordingly, after	willow (Salix spp.) habitat	the region of comparison	natural areas, significant	
		recreation compared with		an analysis of the relevant	for riparian dependent	Therefore, no cultural or	caves, or other areas with	
		other segments in the		data, no fish ORVs are	avian species. However,	historical ORVs were	inherent ecological value in	
		region of comparison.		present in this segment.	when compared to the	identified for this segment.	the study corridor.	
		Accordingly, after an			amount of available habitat		Accordingly, after an	
		analysis of the relevant			for this species in the		analysis of the relevant	
		data, no known			ROC, this does not rise to		data, no ecological ORVs	
		recreational ORVs were			the level of ORV.		are present in this segment.	
		identified for this segment.			Accordingly, after an			
					analysis of the relevant			
					data, no wildlife ORVs are			
					present in this segment.			

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Half Moon	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		and non-motorized areas.		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		The creek is a tributary to		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		an unknown creek, which		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		was inventoried in 2005		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		and found not to be eligible		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		for inclusion in the WSR		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		system. The analysis did		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; the Avintaquin	plant species in the study
		not reveal any		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC) and Anthro	corridor. There are no
		distinguishing natural or		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Plateau (AP). The AC LTA	administratively designated
		recreational amenities that		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		contains one rare or	special botanical areas in
		would draw a visitor to this		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
		segment over others in the		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		identified in USFS (2009);	Accordingly, after an
		region of comparison for		corridor is not an	features that would		the spiked big sagebrush	analysis of the relevant
		unique recreational		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		community. This	data, no botanical ORVs
		opportunities or		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		community is identified as	are present in this segment.
		experiences. The creek is		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		"rather rare" on the ANF.	
		accessible via primitive		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		Unknown if this community	
		OHV roads or trails, but		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		occurs in the study	
		there are no recreation		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		segment. The AP LIA	
		amenities. Observed		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		contains raw, erosive	
		streambed conditions also		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		slopes and ridges of the	
		indicate that flow is		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wildlife ORVs are		Green River Formation and	
		ephemeral with likely no		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		Uinta Formations which	
		flow during most of the		data, no fish ORVs are			are nabitat for plant	
		year, which prevents		present in this segment.			species of Special Concern,	
		opportunities for water-					including Goldrich Diazing	
		Accordingly offer on					star, Ontermain daisy, and	
		analysis of the relevant					these SCCs are not	
		data no known					considered river	
		recreational OBVs were					dependent. There are no	
		identified for this segment					administratively designated	
		identified for this segment.					special areas such as	
							botanical areas research	
							natural areas significant	
							caves or other areas with	
							inherent ecological value in	
							the study corridor	
							Accordingly, after an	
							analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Hominy	All of segment is in SMS	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes one	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Class A. Limited changes in	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	historic site that is	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
	topography. Dramatic	creek is a tributary to an		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	considered not eligible to	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	waters likely absent.	unknown creek that was		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	the NRHP. Because this	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	Vegetation nearly absent	inventoried in 2005 and		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	resource is not clearly	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	for approximately half of	found not to be eligible for		known populations of	no known river dependent	related to Hominy Creek,	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	segment. Lacks soil/rock	inclusion in the WSR		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	and therefore does not	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
	color diversity. Views from	system. Observed		or candidate threatened or	corridor. A number of	indicate the existence of	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	segment of adjacent	streambed conditions		endangered fish species,	Forest routes, including FR	cultural or historic values	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
	prominent hillsides. Dirt	indicate ephemeral flow		fish Species of	117, are present in the	that are unique, rare,	Parks Plateau (PP), and	corridor. There are no
	road crosses or parallel to	levels, which are not likely		Conservation Concern, or	study corridor. Routes	exemplary, or	Stream Canyon (SC). The	administratively designated
	segment in multiple	to support water-based		Forest Service-tracked fish	closely parallel and cross	outstandingly remarkable in	SF, PP, and SC LTAs do	special botanical areas in
	locations.	recreation such as		species in the study	the stream segment.	the region of comparison,	not contain any rare or	the study corridor.
		swimming or fishing. The		corridor. The study	Presence of these routes in	no cultural or historical	specialized ecosystems	Accordingly, after an
		segment is also crossed by		corridor is not an	the study corridor reduces	ORVs were identified for	identified in USFS (2009).	analysis of the relevant
		an unknown trail, which		anadromous fish-bearing	wildlife habitat quality by	this segment.	There are no	data, no botanical ORVs
		would provide water-		stream. The study	disrupting the dispersal		administratively designated	are present in this segment.
		related, trail-based		corridor is tributary to	corridor, and increasing		special areas, such as	
		recreation opportunities in		Farm Creek, which is poor	the degree of habitat		botanical areas, research	
		the study corridor. There		habitat for Colorado River	fragmentation and		natural areas, significant	
		are some OHV trails that		cutthroat trout; CRCT are	frequency of human		caves, or other areas with	
		provide access to the		not known from the study	disturbance. The study		inherent ecological value in	
		creek. The trails and		corridor. Though the	corridor contains tall		the study corridor.	
		natural setting are not		study corridor does not	willow (Salix spp.) habitat		Accordingly, after an	
		unique in the region of		contain any occurrences of	for riparian dependent		analysis of the relevant	
		comparison and would not		nonindigenous aquatic	avian species. However,		data, no ecological ORVs	
		likely draw recreationists		species tracked by the	when compared to the		are present in this segment.	
		from outside the region of		USGS, this does not in and	amount of available habitat			
		comparison. Recreation		of itself rise to the level of	for this species in the			
		opportunities would be		an ORV. Accordingly, after	ROC, this does not rise to			
		largely primitive, with no		an analysis of the relevant	the level of ORV.			
		observed developed		data, no fish ORVs are	Accordingly, after an			
		recreation amenities.		present in this segment.	analysis of the relevant			
		Overall, the experiences of			data, no wildlife ORVs are			
		recreating in this corridor			present in this segment.			
		would not be unique in the						
		Accordingly often an						
		Accordingly, alter an						
		data no known						
		recreational OPVe were						
		identified for this somert						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Honslinger	Approximately one-sixth of	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	A 2009 report "Status of	There is no USFWS	This segment includes 18	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	the segment is in SMS Class	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	Fishes and Amphibians on	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
Eligible	A. Limited changes in	creek is a tributary to		the Flaming Gorge Ranger	critical habitat for river	cultural resources.	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	topography. Dramatic	Carter Creek, which was		District, ANF (Peterson et	dependent wildlife in the	Seventeen are prehistoric	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	waters likely absent. Lacks	inventoried in 2005 and		al. 2009)" noted that no	study corridor. There are	sites, including rock	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	vegetation diversity. Lacks	found to be eligible for		fish were detected in	no known river dependent	shelters and artifact	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	soil/rock color diversity.	inclusion in the WSR		Dowd Spring. There is no	raptor nests in the study	scatters12 are considered	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
	Multiple dirt roads cross or	system for the presence of		USFWS designated or	corridor. There is no	eligible to the NRHP and	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	parallel to segment in	scenic ORVs. Observed		proposed critical habitat	habitat for other river	five are not eligible. One	corridor; Greendale	plant species in the study
	multiple locations.	streambed conditions		for fish species in the study	dependent wildlife species	additional site was an	Plateau (GP) and Red	corridor. There are no
		indicate ephemeral flow		corridor. There are no	considered in this analysis.	historic road constructed	Canyon (RC). The GP and	administratively designated
		levels, which would not		known populations of	A number of Forest routes,	by the Civilian	RC LTAs do not contain	special botanical areas in
		support water-based		federally-listed, state-listed,	including FR 007, 218, 221,	Conservation Corps	any rare or specialized	the study corridor.
		recreation such as		or candidate threatened or	366, 539, and 640, are	(CCC) and considered not	ecosystem identified in	Accordingly, after an
		swimming or fishing. The		endangered fish species,	present in the study	eligible to the NRHP.	USFS (2009). There are no	analysis of the relevant
		segment is accessible by		fish Species of	corridor. Routes closely	Because many of these	administratively designated	data, no botanical ORVs
		OHV trails, which would		Conservation Concern, or	parallel and cross the	resources are eligible to	special areas, such as	are present in this segment.
		provide access and water-		Forest Service-tracked fish	stream segment. Presence	the NRHP, have a clear	botanical areas, research	
		related recreation		species in the study	of these routes in the study	relationship to Leona	natural areas, significant	
		opportunities in the study		corridor. The study	corridor reduces wildlife	Creek demonstrate use of	caves, or other areas with	
		corridor. However, the		corridor is not an	habitat quality by disrupting	the area from prehistory to	inherent ecological value in	
		trails and natural setting		anadromous fish-bearing	the dispersal corridor, and	the early twentieth	the study corridor.	
		are not unique in the		stream. The study	Increasing the degree of	century, there are cultural	Accordingly, after an	
		region of comparison and		Corridor is tributary to	fraguency of human	or historic values that are	analysis of the relevant	
		recreationists from outside		Carter Creek, which	disturbanco Accordingly	outstandingly remarkable in	data, no ecological OKVS	
		the region of comparison			after an analysis of the	the region of comparison	are present in this segment.	
		Recreation opportunities			rolovant data, no wildlife	Therefore a cultural or		
		would be largely primitive		species tracked by the	ORVs are present in this	historical OBV was		
		with no observed		LISGS (including rainbow	segment	identified for this segment		
		developed recreation		and brook trout: USGS	Segment.	identified for this segment.		
		amenities. Overall, the		2017), and it is assumed				
		experiences of recreating		these species could be				
		in this corridor would not		present in the study				
		be unique in the region of		corridor. Accordingly, after				
		comparison. Accordingly,		an analysis of the relevant				
		after an analysis of the		data, no fish ORVs are				
		relevant data, no known		present in this segment.				
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
K P Creek	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	roaded natural and semi-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		primitive non-motorized		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		areas. The analysis did not		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		reveal any distinguishing		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		natural or recreational		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		amenities that would draw		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		a visitor to this segment		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		over others in the region		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; the Avintaquin	plant species in the study
		of comparison for unique		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC) and Anthro	corridor. There are no
		recreational opportunities		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Plateau (AP). The AC LTA	administratively designated
		or experiences. There is		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		contains one rare or	special botanical areas in
		minimal access to the		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
		segment and no recreation		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		identified in USFS (2009);	Accordingly, after an
		amenities, which limits		corridor is not an	features that would		the spiked big sagebrush	analysis of the relevant
		visitors' ability to		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		community. This	data, no botanical ORVs
		participate in water-based		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		community is identified as	are present in this segment.
		or water-related		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		"rather rare" on the ANF.	
		recreation. The segment is		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		Unknown if this community	
		an ephemeral drainage and		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		occurs in the study	
		observed streambed		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		segment. The AP LTA	
		conditions indicate that		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		contains raw, erosive	
		there is no surface flow		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		slopes and ridges of the	
		during much of the year,		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wiidilfe ORVs are		Green River Formation and	
		which prevents		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		Ointa Formations which	
		opportunities for water-		data, no lish ORVs are			are habitat for plant	
		Accordingly often on		present in this segment.			including Coldrich bloging	
		analysis of the relevant					star Untermann daisy and	
		data no known					groop throadloaf However	
		recreational ORVs were					these SCCs are not	
		identified for this segment					considered river-	
		identified for this segment.					dependent. There are no	
							administratively designated	
							special areas, such as	
							botanical areas, research	
							natural areas, significant	
							caves, or other areas with	
							inherent ecological value in	
							the study corridor.	
							Accordingly, after an	
							analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	
River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
---------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------------
Lake Creek	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
1	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		and non-motorized areas.		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		The analysis did not reveal		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		any distinguishing natural		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		or recreational amenities		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		that would draw a visitor		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
		to this segment over		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		others in the region of		endangered fish species.	habitat for other river	absence of data. no cultural	corridor: South Face (SF).	plant species in the study
		comparison for unique		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Parks Plateau (PP), and	corridor. There are no
		recreational opportunities		Conservation Concern. or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Stream Canyon (SC). The	administratively designated
		or experiences. The		Forest Service-tracked fish	The Lake Mountain Trail is		SF. PP. and SC LTAs do	special botanical areas in
		segment is accessible by		species in the study	present in this study		not contain any rare or	the study corridor.
		OHV trails and is near the		corridor. The study	corridor, but does not		specialized ecosystems	Accordingly, after an
		Lake Mountain Trail, which		corridor is not an	cross the stream segment.		identified in USES (2009).	analysis of the relevant
		would provide access and		anadromous fish-bearing	Presence of the trail in the		There are no	data, no botanical ORVs
		water-related recreation		stream. Though the study	study corridor somewhat		administratively designated	are present in this segment.
		opportunities in and near		corridor does not contain	increases the degree of		special areas, such as	
		the study corridor.		any occurrences of	habitat fragmentation and		botanical areas, research	
		However, the trails and		nonindigenous aquatic	frequency of human		natural areas, significant	
		natural setting are not		species tracked by the	disturbance. Accordingly.		caves, or other areas with	
		unique in the region of		USGS, this does not in and	after an analysis of the		inherent ecological value in	
		comparison and would not		of itself rise to the level of	relevant data, no wildlife		the study corridor.	
		likely draw recreationists		an ORV. Accordingly, after	ORVs are present in this		Accordingly, after an	
		from outside the region of		an analysis of the relevant	segment.		analysis of the relevant	
		comparison. Recreation		data, no fish ORVs are			data, no ecological ORVs	
		opportunities would be		present in this segment.			are present in this segment.	
		largely primitive, with no						
		observed developed						
		recreation amenities.						
		Observed streambed						
		conditions indicate that						
		there is no surface flow						
		during much of the year.						
		which prevents						
		opportunities for water-						
		based recreation						
		Accordingly, after an						
		analysis of the relevant						
		data no known						
		recreational OBVs were						
		identified for this segment						
Lake Creek	Not in SMS Class A	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USEWS	There is no USEWS	This segment includes 10	Data examined included	There are no known
$\frac{1}{2}$	Therefore no Scenic ORV	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
-		creek is the only known		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources Fight	Associations (ITA)	dependent federally-listed
		tributary to Green Lake		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	are prehistoric sites (five	described in the ANF	state-listed or candidate
		There are developed		corridor. There are no	study corridor There are	are considered not eligible	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		recreation amenities		known populations of	no known river dependent	to the NRHP and three are	Evaluation Report (USES	plant species, plant Species
		including cabins, picnic		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	eligible) and most of these	2009). There is one LTA	of Conservation Concern,

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
-		areas, playground, a small		or candidate threatened or	corridor. A number of	are lithic scatters. There is	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		marina, and the Red		endangered fish species.	routes, including State	also one historic site	corridor: Greendale	plant species in the study
		Canyon Lodge. The creek		fish Species of	Route 44 (a 2-lane	eligible to the NRHP and	Plateau (GP). The GP LTA	corridor. There are no
		enters the lake near these		Conservation Concern. or	highway). Forest Routes	one historic irrigation ditch	does not contain any rare	administratively designated
		amenities: however, there		Forest Service-tracked fish	95, 371, and 372, and the	in Red Canyon considered	or specialized ecosystem	special botanical areas in
		are no other observed		species in the study	Canvon Rim Trail are	not eligible. One of the	identified in USFS (2009).	the study corridor.
		amenities upstream of this		corridor. The study	present in the study	resourcesthe historic	There are no	Accordingly, after an
		area. Observed streambed		corridor is not an	corridor and/or cross the	irrigation ditchis related	administratively designated	analysis of the relevant
		conditions indicate		anadromous fish-bearing	stream segment. Presence	to Lake Creek 2: however.	special areas, such as	data, no botanical ORVs
		perennial flow levels, which		stream. Though the study	of these routes in the study	the site is not eligible to	botanical areas, research	are present in this segment.
		could support localized		corridor does not contain	corridor reduces wildlife	the NRHP and the other	natural areas, significant	
		water-based recreation		any occurrences of	habitat quality by disrupting	sites do not clearly relate	caves, or other areas with	
		such as swimming or		nonindigenous aquatic	the dispersal corridor, and	to Lake Creek 2. After	inherent ecological value in	
		fishing. In addition to		species tracked by the	increasing the degree of	consideration of this	the study corridor	
		access via several Forest		USGS, this does not in and	habitat fragmentation and	relevant data, particularly	Accordingly, after an	
		Service routes near Green		of itself rise to the level of	frequency of human	that the one related site is	analysis of the relevant	
		Lake the segment is also		an ORV Accordingly after	disturbance. The study	not considered not eligible	data no ecological ORVs	
		accessible via OHV trails		an analysis of the relevant	corridor contains tall	to the NRHP and therefore	are present in this segment	
		which would provide		data no fish ORVs are	willow (Salix spp.) habitat	does not indicate the		
		additional water-related		present in this segment	for riparian dependent	existence of cultural or		
		trail-based recreation			avian species. However	historic values that are		
		opportunities in the study			when compared to the	unique, rare, exemplary, or		
		corridor Beyond the			amount of available habitat	outstandingly remarkable in		
		developed area at Green			for this species in the	the region of comparison.		
		Lake, recreation			ROC, this does not rise to	no cultural or historical		
		opportunities along the			the level of ORV	ORVs were identified for		
		creek would be largely			Accordingly, after an	this segment.		
		primitive, with no observed			analysis of the relevant			
		developed recreation			data, no wildlife ORVs are			
		amenities. While there are			present in this segment.			
		recreation amenities at			F			
		Green Lake, perennial flow.						
		and access to the creek.						
		the creek is ancillary to						
		these amenities and not the						
		focal point. Recreation						
		opportunities and						
		experiences are directed						
		toward Green Lake. The						
		overall experience of						
		recreating in the Lake						
		Creek corridor upstream						
		of Green Lake would not						
		be unique in the region of						
		comparison. Moreover.						
		aside from Green Lake.						
		there are no distinguishing						
		scenic or natural features						
		within the corridor						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
INITEI	Scenic	compared with other	Geologic		•••idine	Thistoric/Cultural		Dotanical
		compared with other						
		comparison that would						
		draw a visitor to the crock						
		Accordingly offer an						
		Accolulingly, alter all						
		data no known						
		data, no known						
		identified for this some of						
			NI			This second in the day of the	Determined in ded	The second second second
	Thorefore, no Sconic OBV	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	I nere is no USFVVS	I nere is no USPVVS	This segment includes two	Data examined included	There are no known
3	Therefore, no scenic OKv.		no known OKV identified.	designated of proposed	designated of proposed	previously identified	Associations (LTA)	des anderst federally listed
		primitive non-motorized		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resourcesone	Associations (LTA)	dependent, rederally-listed,
		areas. This is the upper		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	historic site considered		state-listed, or candidate
		reach of the creek, which is		corridor. I nere are no	study corridor. There are	eligible to the INKHP and	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		the only known tributary		Known populations of	no known river dependent	one prenistoric site	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant species
		to Green Lake. There are		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	considered not eligible to	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		developed recreation		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	the INKHP. Because these	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		amenities at Green Lake,		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	resources are not clearly	corridor; I rout slope (15),	plant species in the study
		but none observed along		fish species of	dependent wildlife species	related to Lake Creek 3,	and Greendale Plateau	corridor. There are no
		Lake Creek 3. Recreation		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	and therefore do not	(GP). The GP LTA does	administratively designated
		opportunities along the		Forest Service-tracked fish	A number of routes,	indicate the existence of	not contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
		creek would be largely		species in the study	including State Route 44 (a	cultural or historic values	specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
		primitive. Observed		corridor. The study	2-lane highway), Forest	that are unique, rare,	Identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
		streambed conditions		corridor is not an	Routes 29, and the Lake	exemplary, or	The IS LIA does contain	analysis of the relevant
		indicate ephemeral flow		anadromous fish-bearing	Creek XC Ski Trail are	outstandingly remarkable in	specialized and rare	data, no botanical ORVs
		levels, which would not		stream. I nough the study	present in the study	the region of comparison,	nabitats, including fens and	are present in this segment.
		support water-based		corridor does not contain	corridor and/or cross the	no cultural or historical	floating mats, nowever,	
		recreation. The segment		any occurrences of	stream segment. Presence	ORVs were identified for	these habitats are in the	
		crosses under Highway 44		nonindigenous aquatic	of these routes in the study	this segment.	1 S9 which is not in the	
		and is accessible via OHV		species tracked by the	corridor reduces wildlife		study corridor. There are	
		trails, which would provide		USGS, this does not in and	habitat quality by disrupting		no administratively	
		access to the study		of itself rise to the level of	the dispersal corridor, and		designated special areas,	
		corridor. While there are		an ORV. Accordingly, after	increasing the degree of		such as botanical areas,	
		recreation amenities at		an analysis of the relevant	habitat fragmentation and		research natural areas,	
		Green Lake, there are little		data, no fish ORVs are	frequency of human		significant caves, or other	
		to no water-based or		present in this segment.	disturbance. Accordingly,		areas with inherent	
		water-related recreation			after an analysis of the		ecological value in the	
		opportunities and			relevant data, no wildlife		study corridor.	
		experiences along this			ORVs are present in this		Accordingly, after an	
		segment. The overall			segment.		analysis of the relevant	
		experience of recreating in					data, no ecological ORVs	
		the Lake Creek corridor					are present in this segment.	
		upstream of Green Lake						
		would not be unique in the						
		region of comparison.						
		Moreover, aside from						
		Green Lake, there are no						
		distinguishing scenic or						
		natural features within the						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
		corridor compared with						
		other segments in the						
		region of comparison that						
		would draw a visitor to the						
		creek. Accordingly, after an						
		analysis of the relevant						
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						
Leona	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	A 2009 report "Status of	There is no USFWS	This segment includes 11	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	roaded natural and semi-	no known ORV identified.	Fishes and Amphibians on	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		primitive non-motorized		the Flaming Gorge Ranger	critical habitat for river	cultural resources. Ten are	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		areas. The creek is a		District, ANF (Peterson et	dependent wildlife in the	prehistoric sites (six are	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		tributary to Burnt Creek,		al. 2009)" noted that only 3	study corridor. There are	considered eligible to the	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		which was inventoried in		individual fish were	no known river dependent	NRHP and four are not	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		2005 and found not to be		detected, all nonnative	raptor nests in the study	eligible), most of which are	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		eligible for inclusion in the		brook trout. No CRCT	corridor. There is no	lithic scatters or rock	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		WSR system. Observed		observed, though they are	habitat for other river	shelters. There is also one	corridor; Trout Slope (TS),	plant species in the study
		streambed conditions		relatively abundant in the	dependent wildlife species	site with both prehistoric	and Greendale Plateau	corridor. There are no
		indicate low, but likely		basin.	considered in this analysis.	and historic occupations	(GP). The GP LTA does	administratively designated
		perennial flow levels, which			State Route 44 (a 2-lane	that is considered eligible	not contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
		could support primitive			highway), and the Leona	to the NRHP. Because	specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
		water-related recreation.			Spring-Manila Park Trail are	many of these resources	identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
		The creek passes under			present in the study	are ineligible to the NRHP,	The IS LIA does contain	analysis of the relevant
		Highway 44, but there does			corridor and cross the	and do not clearly have a	specialized and rare	data, no botanical ORVs
		not appear to be any other			stream segment. Presence	significant relationship to	habitats, including fens and	are present in this segment.
		roads, primitive roads, or			of these routes in the study	Leona Creek other than to	floating mats, nowever,	
		There are no observed			corridor reduces wildlife	demonstrate the area was	TS9 which is not in the	
		developed recreation			the dispersal corridor and	used in prenistory, there is	study corridor There are	
		amonitios in the corridor			increasing the degree of	historic values that are	no administrativoly	
		There do not appear to be			habitat fragmontation and	unique rare exemplary or	designated special areas	
		any distinguishing scenic or			frequency of human	outstandingly remarkable in	such as botanical areas	
		natural features within the			disturbance. A 2009 report	the region of comparison	research natural areas	
		corridor compared with			"Status of Fishes and	Therefore, no cultural or	significant caves, or other	
		other segments in the			Amphibians on the Flaming	historical ORVs were	areas with inherent	
		region of comparison that			Gorge Ranger District.	identified for this segment.	ecological value in the	
		would draw a visitor to the			ANF (Peterson et al.		study corridor.	
		creek. Accordingly, after an			2009)" noted that no		Accordingly, after an	
		analysis of the relevant			amphibian species were		analysis of the relevant	
		data, no known			detected in Leona Spring,		data, no ecological ORVs	
		recreational ORVs were			in the study corridor.		are present in this segment.	
		identified for this segment.			Accordingly, after an			
					analysis of the relevant			
					data, no wildlife ORVs are			
					present in this segment.			

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Limestone	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		segment is an outlet of an		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		unknown lake and tributary		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		to another, which		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		contributes to the scenic		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		conditions along the		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There is one LTA	of Conservation Concern.
		segment. Overall, however.		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		the analysis did not reveal		endangered fish species.	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor: Limestone Hills	plant species in the study
		any distinguishing natural		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	(LH). This LTA does not	corridor. There are no
		or recreational amenities		Conservation Concern. or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	contain any rare or	administratively designated
		that would draw a visitor		Forest Service-tracked fish	A number of Forest routes.		specialized ecosystems	special botanical areas in
		to this segment over		species in the study	including FR 062		identified in USFS (2009).	the study corridor.
		others in the region of		corridor. The study	(Stringham Cabin Road).		There are no	Accordingly, after an
		comparison for unique		corridor is not an	and the Limestone Trail		administratively designated	analysis of the relevant
		recreational opportunities		anadromous fish-bearing	parallel the stream segment		special areas such as	data no botanical ORVs
		or experiences. The		stream. Though the study	in the study corridor.		botanical areas, research	are present in this segment.
		Limestone Trail and other		corridor does not contain	Presence of these routes in		natural areas significant	
		OHV trails are within the		any occurrences of	the study corridor reduces		caves or other areas with	
		1/4-mile study corridor		nonindigenous aquatic	wildlife habitat quality by		inherent ecological value in	
		which would provide		species tracked by the	disrupting the dispersal		the study corridor	
		water-related trail-based		USGS this does not in and	corridor and increasing		Accordingly after an	
		recreation opportunities in		of itself rise to the level of	the degree of habitat		analysis of the relevant	
		the study corridor		an ORV Accordingly after	fragmentation and		data no ecological ORVs	
		However, the trails and		an analysis of the relevant	frequency of human		are present in this segment	
		natural setting are not		data no fish ORVs are	disturbance Accordingly			
		unique in the region of		present in this segment	after an analysis of the			
		comparison and would not		present in this segment.	relevant data no wildlife			
		likely draw recreationists			ORVs are present in this			
		from outside the region of			segment			
		comparison Recreation			segment.			
		opportunitios would be						
		largely primitive with po						
		algely primitive, with no						
		recreation amonities						
		Observed streambed						
		conditions also indicato						
		that flow is ophomoral with						
		likely no flow during the						
		summer which provents						
		summer, which prevents						
		opportunities for water-						
		the attractiveness of the						
		corridor for water related						
		recreation compared with						
		other sogments in the						
		rogion of comparison						
		Accordingly often an						
		Accordingly, after an						
		analysis of the relevant						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						
Little Water	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes five	Data examined included	There are no known
	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		area. The analysis did not		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, all of	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		reveal any distinguishing		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	which are prehistoric sites	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		natural or recreational		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	and mostly lithic scatters.	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		amenities that would draw		known populations of	no known river dependent	Four of these are	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		a visitor to this segment		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	considered not eligible to	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		over others in the region		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	the NRHP and one is	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		of comparison for unique		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	considered eligible.	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
		recreational opportunities		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	Because most of these	and Stream Piedmont (SP).	corridor. There are no
		or experiences. There is		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	resources are ineligible to	The SF and SP LTAs do not	administratively designated
		minimal access to the		Forest Service-tracked fish	Murray Springs Road	the NRHP and do not	contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
		segment and no known		species in the study	crosses the study corridor	clearly relate to Little	specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
		recreation amenities.		corridor. The study	and the stream segment.	Water, there is no	identified in USFS (2009),	Accordingly, after an
		Observed streambed		corridor is not an	Presence of this road in the	indication of cultural or	except for wet meadows at	analysis of the relevant
		conditions indicate that		anadromous fish-bearing	study corridor reduces	historic values that are	Burnt Mill Spring and 77	data, no botanical ORVs
		there is little to no surface		stream. Though the study	wildlife habitat quality by	unique, rare, exemplary, or	Flat in the SP LTA, which	are present in this segment.
		flow during much of the		corridor does not contain	disrupting the dispersal	outstandingly remarkable in	are not in the study	
		year, which prevents		any occurrences of	corridor, and increasing	the region of comparison.	corridor. There are no	
		opportunities for water-		nonindigenous aquatic	the degree of habitat	Therefore, no cultural or	administratively designated	
		based recreation and the		species tracked by the	fragmentation and	historical ORVs were	special areas, such as	
		attractiveness of the		USGS, this does not in and	frequency of human	identified for this segment.	botanical areas, research	
		corridor for water-related		of itself rise to the level of	disturbance. Accordingly,		natural areas, significant	
		recreation compared with		an ORV. Accordingly, after	after an analysis of the		caves, or other areas with	
		other segments in the		an analysis of the relevant	relevant data, no wildlife		inherent ecological value in	
		region of comparison.		data, no fish ORVs are	ORVs are present in this		the study corridor.	
		Accordingly, after an		present in this segment.	segment.		Accordingly, after an	
		analysis of the relevant					analysis of the relevant	
		data, no known					data, no ecological ORVs	
		recreational ORVs were					are present in this segment.	
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Minnie	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		area. The analysis did not		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		reveal any distinguishing		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		natural or recreational		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		amenities that would draw		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		a visitor to this segment		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		over others in the region		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		of comparison for unique		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; the Avintaquin	plant species in the study
		recreational opportunities		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC) and Anthro	corridor. There are no
		or experiences. There is		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Plateau (AP). The AC LTA	administratively designated
		minimal access to the		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		contains one rare or	special botanical areas in
		segment and no known		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
		recreation amenities, which		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		identified in USFS (2009);	Accordingly, after an
		limits visitors' ability to		corridor is not an	features that would		the spiked big sagebrush	analysis of the relevant
		participate in water-based		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		community. This	data, no botanical ORVs
		or water-related		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		community is identified as	are present in this segment.
		recreation. The segment is		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		"rather rare" on the ANF,	
		an ephemeral drainage and		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		however no relevant data	
		observed streambed		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		exists to determine if this	
		conditions indicate that		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		community occurs in the	
		there is no surface flow		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		study segment. The AP	
		during much of the year,		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		LIA contains raw, erosive	
		which prevents		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wildlife ORVs are		slopes and ridges of the	
		opportunities for water-		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		Green River Formation and	
		based recreation and the		data, no isn ORVs are			Ointa Formations which	
		attractiveness of the		present in this segment.			are nabitat for plant	
		corridor for water-related					including Coldrich bloging	
		other sogments in the					star Untermann daisy and	
		rogion of comparison					groon throadloaf However	
		Accordingly after an					these SCCs are not	
		analysis of the relevant					considered river-	
		data no known					dependent. There are no	
		recreational OBVs were					administratively designated	
		identified for this segment					special areas such as	
		identified for this segment.					botanical areas research	
							natural areas significant	
							caves, or other areas with	
							inherent ecological value in	
							the study corridor	
							Accordingly, after an	
							analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Mosby	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Ćreek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
	,	creek is also in a roadless		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		area. The analysis did not		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		reveal any distinguishing		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		natural or recreational		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		amenities that would draw		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are four	of Conservation Concern.
		a visitor to this segment		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		for primitive recreation		endangered fish species.	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor: Parks Plateau	plant species in the study
		opportunities over others		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	(PP), South Face (SF),	corridor. There are no
		in the region of		Conservation Concern. or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Alpine Moraine (AM), and	administratively designated
		comparison. The Lake		Forest Service-tracked fish	A number of Forest routes.		Stream Canyon (SC). The	special botanical areas in
		Mountain Trail is within the		species in the study	including FR 104 and 451.		PP. SE and SC I TAs do	the study corridor.
		1/4-mile study corridor		corridor. The study	are present in the study		not contain any rare or	Accordingly after an
		which would provide		corridor is not an	corridor. The Lake		specialized ecosystems	analysis of the relevant
		water-related trail-based		anadromous fish-bearing	Mountain Trail is also		identified in USES (2009)	data no botanical ORVs
		recreation opportunities in		stream Though the study	present in the study		The AM LTA contains wet	are present in this segment
		the study corridor		corridor does not contain	corridor and crosses the		meadows including poor	
		However, the trail and		any occurrences of	stream segment Presence		fens quaking bogs or	
		natural setting are not		nonindigenous aquatic	of these routes in the study		floating mats and	
		unique in the region of		species tracked by the	corridor reduces wildlife		sphagnum bogs are	
		comparison and would not		LISGS this does not in and	habitat quality by disrupting		generally widespread in the	
		likely draw recreationists		of itself rise to the level of	the dispersal corridor and		ITA Except for a	
		from outside the region of		an ORV Accordingly after	increasing the degree of		calcareous or rich fen in	
		comparison Recreation		an analysis of the relevant	habitat fragmentation and		South Fork Bock Creek	
		opportunities would be		data no fish ORVs are	frequency of human		which is not located in the	
		largely primitive with no		present in this segment	disturbance Accordingly		study corridor, there are	
		observed developed		present in this segment.	after an analysis of the		no rare babitats in this	
		recreation amenities			relevant data no wildlife		ITA There are no	
		Other than the Lake			ORVs are present in this		administratively designated	
		Mountain Trail there is			segment		special areas such as	
		limited access to the creek			Segment.		botanical areas research	
		Observed streambed					natural areas significant	
		conditions also indicate					caves or other areas with	
		that flow is enhemeral with					inherent ecological value in	
		likely no flow during the					the study corridor	
		summer which prevents					Accordingly after an	
		opportunities for water-					analysis of the relevant	
		based recreation and limits					data no ecological ORVs	
		the attractiveness of the					are present in this segment	
		corridor for water-related					are present in this segment.	
		recreation compared with						
		other segments in the						
		region of comparison						
		Accordingly after an						
		analysis of the relevant						
		data no known						
		rocrostional OPVa ware						
		identified for this sogment						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
North Skull	Approximately one-fifth of	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes four	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	the segment is not in SMS	roaded natural and semi-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
Eligible	Class A. Moderate changes	primitive motorized areas.		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, all of	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	in topography. Dramatic	The creek is a tributary to		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	which are NRHP-eligible	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	waters with rocks may be	Flaming Gorge. Observed		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	prehistoric sites, including	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	present due to changing	streambed conditions		known populations of	no known river dependent	rare prehistoric storage	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	topography. Moderate	indicate ephemeral flows		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	features and a possible	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
	vegetation species, heights,	that would not support		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	burial. There appears to be	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	patterns, colors, and	water-based recreation or		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	cultural or historic values	corridor; Red Canyon	plant species in the study
	textures. Multiple soil and	attract visitors for water-		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	that are unique, rare,	(RC), Structural Grain	corridor. There are no
	rock colors (tan, brown,	related recreation. At the		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	exemplary, or	(SG), and North Flank	administratively designated
	dark yellow, gray, dark	headwaters, there is an		Forest Service-tracked fish	Forest Route 088 crosses a	outstandingly remarkable in	(NF). The RC, SG, and NF	special botanical areas in
	white). Slight sinuosity,	anticline geologic feature		species in the study	portion of the study	the region of comparison	LTAs do not contain any	the study corridor.
	following hillside contours.	that would contribute to a		corridor. The study	corridor, but does not	based on these rare,	rare or specialized	Accordingly, after an
	Hillsides, lake, ridgeline,	rare, but not		corridor is not an	cross the stream segment.	NRHP-eligible resources	ecosystem identified in	analysis of the relevant
	and Green River are	unprecedented, scenic and		anadromous fish-bearing	Presence of the route in	related to North Skull	USFS (2009). There are no	data, no botanical ORVs
	visible. Viewpoints available	recreational experience in		stream. Though the study	the study corridor reduces	Creek. Therefore, a	administratively designated	are present in this segment.
	from road/trail on top of	the region of comparison.		corridor does not contain	wildlife habitat quality by	cultural or historical ORV	special areas, such as	
	hill. Almost no visible	Recreation opportunities		any occurrences of	disrupting the dispersal	was identified for this	botanical areas, research	
	human disturbances.	would be largely primitive,		nonindigenous aquatic	corridor, and increasing	segment.	natural areas, significant	
	However, considered	with no observed		species tracked by the	the degree of habitat		caves, or other areas with	
	collectively, the visual	developed recreation		USGS, this does not in and	fragmentation and		inherent ecological value in	
	setting along this segment	amenities. The creek is		of itself rise to the level of	frequency of human		the study corridor.	
	is not rare, unique, or	accessible via OHV trails.		an ORV. Accordingly, after	disturbance. A portion of		Accordingly, after an	
	exemplary in the region of	Overall, the experiences of		an analysis of the relevant	the study corridor is in the		analysis of the relevant	
	comparison. Therefore, no	recreating in this corridor		data, no fish ORVs are	Bear Top Mountain		data, no ecological ORVs	
	Scenic ORV.	would not be exceptionally		present in this segment.	Bighorn Sheep		are present in this segment.	
		unique in the region of			Management Area. This			
		comparison and would not			area is subject to targeted			
		draw recreationists from			management for bighorn			
		outside the region.			sheep; however, this is not			
		Accordingly, after an			a river dependent species.			
		analysis of the relevant			Accordingly, after an			
		data, no known			analysis of the relevant			
		recreational ORVs were			data, no wildlife ORVs are			
		identified for this segment.			present in this segment.			

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Pigeon	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Water	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
Creek		area. The study segment		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		ends at the National Forest		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		boundary. The analysis did		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		not reveal any		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		distinguishing natural or		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		recreational amenities that		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		would draw a visitor to this		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
		segment over others in the		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	and Dry Moraine (DM).	corridor. There are no
		region of comparison for		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	The SF and DM LTAs do	administratively designated
		unique recreational		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		not contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
		opportunities or		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
		experiences. There are no		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
		known recreation		corridor is not an	features that would		There are no	analysis of the relevant
		amenities, which limits		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		administratively designated	data, no botanical ORVs
		visitors' ability to		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		special areas, such as	are present in this segment.
		participate in water-based		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		botanical areas, research	
		or water-related		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		natural areas, significant	
		recreation. The creek is		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		caves, or other areas with	
		accessible via Pigeon Creek		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		inherent ecological value in	
		Road. Observed streambed		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		the study corridor.	
		conditions indicate that		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		Accordingly, after an	
		there is little to no surface		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wildlife ORVs are		analysis of the relevant	
		flow during much of the		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		data, no ecological ORVs	
		year, which prevents		data, no fish ORVs are			are present in this segment.	
		opportunities for water-		present in this segment.				
		based recreation and the						
		attractiveness of the						
		corridor for water-related						
		recreation compared with						
		other segments in the						
		region of comparison.						
		Accordingly, after an						
		analysis of the relevant						
		data, no known						
		recreational OKVS were						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Poison	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		motorized area. The		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		analysis did not reveal any		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		distinguishing natural or		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		recreational amenities that		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		would draw a visitor to this		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). The only LTA	of Conservation Concern,
		short (0.4-mile long)		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		segment over others in the		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor is the Avintaguin	plant species in the study
		region of comparison for		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC). This LTA	corridor. There are no
		unique recreational		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	contains one rare or	administratively designated
		opportunities or		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		specialized ecosystem	special botanical areas in
		experiences. There is no		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		identified in USFS (2009);	the study corridor.
		observed access to the		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		the spiked big sagebrush	Accordingly, after an
		segment and no known		corridor is not an	features that would		community. This	analysis of the relevant
		recreation amenities.		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		community is identified as	data, no botanical ORVs
		Observed streambed		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		"rather rare" on the ANF,	are present in this segment.
		conditions also indicate		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		however no relevant data	
		that flow is ephemeral with		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		exists to determine if this	
		likely no surface flow		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		community occurs in the	
		during most of the year,		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		study segment. There are	
		which prevents		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		no administratively	
		opportunities for water-		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		designated special areas,	
		based recreation and limits		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wildlife ORVs are		such as botanical areas,	
		the attractiveness of the		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		research natural areas,	
		corridor for water-related		data, no fish ORVs are			significant caves, or other	
		recreation compared with		present in this segment.			areas with inherent	
		other locations in the					ecological value in the	
		region of comparison.					study corridor.	
		Accordingly, after an					Accordingly, after an	
		analysis of the relevant					analysis of the relevant	
		data, no known					data, no ecological ORVs	
		recreational ORVs were					are present in this segment.	
		identified for this segment.						
Red Creek	All of segment is in SMS	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
	Class A. Limited changes in	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
	topography. Dramatic	motorized area. The creek		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
	waters likely during flash	is a tributary to the Green		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	floods. Lacks vegetation	River. The segment of the		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	diversity. Lacks soil/rock	Green River where Red		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	color diversity. Views from	Creek enters was		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
	segment of adjacent	inventoried in 2005 and		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	prominent hillsides and	found to be eligible for		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; Red Canyon (RC)	plant species in the study
	Green River.	inclusion in the WSR		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	and Structural Grain (SG).	corridor. There are no
		system for the presence of		Conservation Concern. or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	The RC and SG LTAs do	administratively designated
		scenic ORVs. Observed		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		not contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
		streambed conditions		species in the study	free from highways, roads.		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
		indicate potential perennial		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
		flow levels, which would		corridor is not an	features that would		There are no	analysis of the relevant

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural
		support limited water-		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat	
		based recreation, such as		stream. The study	fragmentation and/or the	
		swimming or fishing,		corridor is tributary to the	frequency of human	
		especially at the terminus		Green River, which	disturbance, this does not	
		with the Green River and		contains several	in and of itself rise to the	
		during periods of higher		occurrences of	level of an ORV.	
		flow. There is a small camp		nonindigenous aquatic	Accordingly, after an	
		site in the corridor near		species tracked by the	analysis of the relevant	
		the Green River, which is		USGS (including rainbow	data, no wildlife ORVs are	
		accessible by an OHV		trout, Channel catfish,	present in this segment.	
		trails. Upstream, there are		burbot, white sucker,		
		no other known recreation		creek chub, and New		
		amenities to support		Zealand mudsnail; USGS		
		water-related recreation		2017), and it is assumed		
		opportunities in the study		these species could be		
		corridor. Access to the		present in the study		
		upper reaches of the		corridor. Accordingly, after		
		segment would be		an analysis of the relevant		
		challenging due to the		data, no fish ORVs are		
		rugged topography of the		present in this segment.		
		channel. The scenic values				
		of this corridor are high;				
		however, the natural				
		setting is exemplary of				
		other landscapes in the				
		region of comparison and				
		would not likely attract				
		recreationists from outside				
		the region of comparison				
		for water-based or water-				
		related opportunities.				
		Overall, the experiences of				
		recreating in this corridor				
		would not be unique in the				
		region of comparison.				
		Accordingly, after an				
		analysis of the relevant				
		data, no known				
		recreational ORVs were				
		identified for this segment.				

Ecological	Botanical
administratively designated	data, no botanical ORVs
special areas, such as	are present in this segment.
botanical areas, research	
natural areas, significant	
caves, or other areas with	
inherent ecological value in	
the study corridor.	
Accordingly, after an	
analysis of the relevant	
data, no ecological ORVs	
are present in this segment	
are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Revnolds	All of segment is in SMS	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USFWS	There is no USEWS	This segment includes one	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Class A. Varving and	semi-primitive non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
	moderate changes in	motorized area. The creek		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resourcea	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed.
	topography. Deep narrow	is a tributary to Dry Fork		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	prehistoric site considered	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	stream near headwaters at	Creek, which was		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	not eligible to the NRHP.	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	Reynolds Meadow. Diverse	inventoried in 2005 and		known populations of	no known river dependent	Because this resource is	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	vegetation species, heights,	found not to be eligible for		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	not clearly related to	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
	patterns, colors, and	inclusion in the WSR		or candidate threatened or	corridor. The study	Reynolds Creek, and	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	textures. Most of segment	system. The headwaters of		endangered fish species,	corridor contains habitat	therefore does not indicate	corridor; Uinta Bollie (UB),	plant species in the study
	is forested with	the creek are a small lake		fish Species of	for White-tailed ptarmigan	the existence of cultural or	and Alpine Moraine (AM).	corridor. There are no
	intermittent openings.	in a U-shape glaciated		Conservation Concern, or	(Lagopus leucura) which	historic values that are	The UB LTA does not	administratively designated
	Multiple soil and rock	valley, which has high		Forest Service-tracked fish	are dependent on riparian	unique, rare, exemplary, or	contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
	colors (tan, brown, gray,	scenic value, but is		species in the study	vegetation in the alpine	outstandingly remarkable in	specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
	rust). Rock outcrops/slides,	common in the region of		corridor. The study	zone. However, when	the region of comparison,	identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
	hillsides, lake, ridgeline, and	comparison. Observed		corridor is not an	compared to the amount	no cultural or historical	The AM LTA contains wet	analysis of the relevant
	alpine terrain are visible.	streambed conditions		anadromous fish-bearing	of available habitat for this	ORVs were identified for	meadows including poor	data, no botanical ORVs
	Almost no visible human	indicate ephemeral flow		stream. An approximately	species in the ROC, this	this segment.	fens, quaking bogs or	are present in this segment.
	disturbances. Considering	levels, which are not likely		I-kilometer long portion	does not rise to the level		floating mats, and	
	these features collectively,	to support water-based		(Fish ID 14060002cd008)	of ORV. The study		sphagnum bogs are	
	along with available photo	recreation. Recreation		of the study segment	corridor contains tall		generally widespread in the	
	imagery, the visual setting	opportunities would be		starting at the confluence	willow (Salix spp.) habitat		LTA. Except for a	
	along this segment is not	largely primitive, with no		with Dry Fork and	for riparian dependent		calcareous or rich fen in	
	rare, unique, or exemplary	observed developed		extending upstream is	avian species. However,		South Fork Rock Creek,	
	in the region of	recreation amenities or		considered excellent	when compared to the		which is not in the study	
	comparison. Therefore, no	points of access. Overall,		habitat for Colorado River	amount of available habitat		segment, there are no rare	
	Scenic ORV.	the primitive recreation		cutthroat trout, however,	for this species in the		habitats in this LTA. There	
		experiences available in this		this does not in and of	ROC, this does not rise to		are no administratively	
		corridor are not unique in		itself rise to the level of an	the level of ORV. While		designated special areas,	
		the region of comparison.		ORV. Though the study	the study corridor is free		such as botanical areas,	
		Accordingly, after an		corridor does not contain	from highways, roads,		research natural areas,	
		analysis of the relevant		any occurrences of	trails, or other linear		significant caves, or other	
		data, no known		nonindigenous aquatic	features that would		areas with innerent	
		recreational ORVs were		species tracked by the	Increase nabitat		ecological value in the	
		identified for this segment.		USGS, this does not in and	fragmentation and/or the		study corridor.	
				of itself rise to the level of	frequency of numan		Accordingly, after an	
				an ORV. Accordingly, alter	in and of itself rise to the		data no ocological OPVa	
				data no fish OPVs are	lovel of an OPV		data, no ecological ORVS	
				bresent in this segment	Accordingly after an		are present in this segment.	
					analysis of the relevant			
					data no wildlife ORVs are			
					present in this segment			

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Sixmile	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	semi-primitive motorized	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		and non-motorized areas.		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		The creek is a tributary to		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		an unknown creek, which		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		was inventoried in 2005		known populations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		and found not to be eligible		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		for inclusion in the WSR		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		system. The analysis did		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; the Avintaquin	plant species in the study
		not reveal any		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	Canyon (AC) and Anthro	corridor. There are no
		distinguishing natural or		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	Plateau (AP). The AC LTA	administratively designated
		recreational amenities that		Forest Service-tracked fish	While the study corridor is		contains one rare or	special botanical areas in
		would draw a visitor to this		species in the study	free from highways, roads,		specialized ecosystem	the study corridor.
		segment over others in the		corridor. The study	trails, or other linear		identified in USFS (2009);	Accordingly, after an
		region of comparison for		corridor is not an	features that would		the spiked big sagebrush	analysis of the relevant
		unique recreational		anadromous fish-bearing	increase habitat		community. This	data, no botanical ORVs
		opportunities or		stream. Though the study	fragmentation and/or the		community is identified as	are present in this segment.
		experiences. The creek is		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		"rather rare" on the ANF.	
		accessible via primitive		any occurrences of	disturbance, this does not		Unknown if this community	
		OHV roads or trails, but		nonindigenous aquatic	in and of itself rise to the		occurs in the study	
		there are no recreation		species tracked by the	level of an ORV.		segment. The AP LTA	
		amenities. Observed		USGS, this does not in and	Accordingly, after an		contains raw, erosive	
		streambed conditions also		of itself rise to the level of	analysis of the relevant		slopes and ridges of the	
		Indicate that flow is		an ORV. Accordingly, after	data, no wiidlife ORVs are		Green River Formation and	
		epnemeral with likely no		an analysis of the relevant	present in this segment.		Ointa Formations which	
		now during most of the		data, no lish ORVs are			are habitat for plant	
		year, which prevents		present in this segment.			including Coldrich blazing	
		based recreation					star Untermann daisy and	
		Accordingly after an					green threadleaf However	
		analysis of the relevant					these SCCs are not	
		data no known					considered river-	
		recreational OBVs were					dependent. There are no	
		identified for this segment					administratively designated	
							special areas, such as	
							botanical areas, research	
							natural areas, significant	
							caves, or other areas with	
							inherent ecological value in	
							the study corridor.	
							Accordingly, after an	
							analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Spring	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek I	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	three previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		study segment ends at the		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources. One of	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		National Forest boundary.		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	the resources is a the	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		The analysis did not reveal		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	NRHP-listed segment of	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		any distinguishing natural		known populations of	no known river dependent	Carter Road (NR 354), a	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		or recreational amenities		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	former military road that	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern,
		that would draw a visitor		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	ran from Fort Bridger,	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		to this segment over		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	Wyoming to Fort	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
		others in the region of		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	Thornbough near present	and Moenkopi Hills (MH).	corridor. There are no
		comparison for unique		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	day Vernal, Utah. The road	The SF LTA does not	administratively designated
		recreational opportunities		Forest Service-tracked fish	A number of Forest routes,	was constructed in 1881	contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
		or experiences. There are		species in the study	including FR 044 (Taylor	and included significant use	specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
		no known recreation		corridor. The study	Mountain Road), 436, 429,	until 1924 with mining	identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
		amenities, which limits		corridor is not an	and 437, are present in the	traffic and a means for	The MH LTA contains	analysis of the relevant
		visitors' ability to		anadromous fish-bearing	study corridor. Routes	residents to access the	innerently erosive strata	data, no botanical ORVs
		participate in water-based		stream. I nough the study	closely parallel and cross	Ashley Valley. I hree cabin	Such as the Ducheshe	are present in this segment.
		or water-related		corridor does not contain	the stream segment.	sites, one powder	River, Morrison, and	
		recreation. The creek is		any occurrences of	the study corridor roduces in	magazine, and a sawmin are	Moenkopi Formations,	
				nonindigenous aquatic	wildlife babitat quality by	also associated with this	the Llinte Mountains and	
		streambed conditions		LISCS this doos not in and	disrupting the dispersal	include an historic phone	on the ANE These	
		indicate that there is little		of itself rise to the level of	corridor and increasing	line considered not eligible	formations provide habitat	
		to no surface flow during		an OBV Accordingly after	the degree of habitat	to the NRHP and an	for several endemic plant	
		much of the year, which		an analysis of the relevant	fragmentation and	historic site eligible to the	species such as Dinosaur	
		prevents opportunities for		data no fish ORVs are	frequency of human	NBHP Because these	buckwheat short-flower	
		water-based recreation and		present in this segment	disturbance Accordingly	resources are not clearly	cryptanth Lake Fork gilia	
		the attractiveness of the			after an analysis of the	related to Spring Creek L	shrubby bedstraw, thrifty	
		corridor for water-related			relevant data, no wildlife	and therefore do not	goldenweed, thickleaf	
		recreation compared with			ORVs are present in this	indicate the existence of	penstemon, and Huber	
		other segments in the			segment.	cultural or historic values	pepperweed. However.	
		region of comparison.				that are unique, rare,	these plant species are not	
		Accordingly, after an				exemplary, or	considered to be river	
		analysis of the relevant				outstandingly remarkable in	dependent. There are no	
		data, no known				the region of comparison,	administratively designated	
		recreational ORVs were				no cultural or historical	special areas, such as	
		identified for this segment.				ORVs were identified for	botanical areas, research	
		_				this segment.	natural areas, significant	
							caves, or other areas with	
							inherent ecological value in	
							the study corridor.	
							Accordingly, after an	
							analysis of the relevant	
							data, no ecological ORVs	
							are present in this segment.	

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
Spring	All of segment is in SMS	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes 11	Data examined included	There are no known
Creek 2	Class A. Varving changes in	roaded natural and semi-	no known ORV identified	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
Eligible	topography. Minor water	primitive motorized areas		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources. Ten are	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed.
	feature present. Diverse	It is within a roadless area.		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	prehistoric sites (eight are	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	vegetation species, heights.	The creek is a tributary to		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	considered eligible to the	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	patterns, colors, and	Flaming Gorge, At over 7		known populations of	no known river dependent	NRHP and two are not	Evaluation Report (USES	plant species, plant Species
	textures. Multiple soil and	miles, the segment is one		federally-listed, state-listed.	raptor nests in the study	eligible), most of which are	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern.
	rock colors (tan. brown.	of the longest of the		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	artifact scatters or rock	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	dark yellow, gray, rust,	inventoried waters. The		endangered fish species.	habitat for other river	shelters. There is also one	corridor: Red Canyon	plant species in the study
	orange, dark white).	corridor contains areas of		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	site with both prehistoric	(RC). Greendale Plateau	corridor. There are no
	Moderate to high sinuosity.	high scenic values, which		Conservation Concern. or	considered in this analysis.	and historic occupations	(GP), and North Flank	administratively designated
	Rock outcrops/slides,	are exemplary of the		Forest Service-tracked fish	State Route 44 (a 2-lane	that is considered eligible	(NF). The RC, GP, and NF	special botanical areas in
	hillsides, ridgelines,	landscape throughout		species in the study	highway), and Forest	to the NRHP. Nine of the	LTAs do not contain any	the study corridor.
	meadows, and Flaming	much of the region of		corridor. The study	Routes 93 and 363 are	NRHP-eligible sites are	rare or specialized	Accordingly, after an
	Gorge Reservoir are	comparison. Portions of		corridor is not an	present in the study	near the creek and include	ecosystem identified in	analysis of the relevant
	visible. Viewpoints available	the creek are accessible via		anadromous fish-bearing	corridor and cross the	prehistoric storage	USFS (2009). There are no	data, no botanical ORVs
	where two roads cross	Forest Service roads. The		stream. Though the study	stream segment. Presence	structures and rock	administratively designated	are present in this segment.
	segment. Almost no visible	creek crosses under		corridor does not contain	of these routes in the study	shelters that demonstrate	special areas, such as	
	human disturbances,	Highway 44, but a large		any occurrences of	corridor reduces wildlife	long-term usage of the	botanical areas, research	
	except for road crossings.	grade difference does not		nonindigenous aquatic	habitat quality by disrupting	drainage during prehistory.	natural areas, significant	
	Diverse landscape due to	support easy access from		species tracked by the	the dispersal corridor, and	The prehistoric use of the	caves, or other areas with	
	length of segment.	the roadway. Where the		USGS, this does not in and	increasing the degree of	Spring Creek 2 corridor as	inherent ecological value in	
	However, considering	creek terminates at Flaming		of itself rise to the level of	habitat fragmentation and	a significant resource	the study corridor.	
	these features collectively,	Gorge, there is a boat		an ORV. Accordingly, after	frequency of human	indicates there are cultural	Accordingly, after an	
	along with available photo	ramp, trailer parking area,		an analysis of the relevant	disturbance. Accordingly,	or historic values that are	analysis of the relevant	
	imagery, this combination	and restroom facility.		data, no fish ORVs are	after an analysis of the	unique, rare, exemplary, or	data, no ecological ORVs	
	of features is not unique,	These recreation amenities		present in this segment.	relevant data, no wildlife	outstandingly remarkable	are present in this segment.	
	rare, or exemplary in the	are oriented toward			ORVs are present in this	within the region of		
	region of comparison.	Flaming Gorge and not			segment.	comparison; therefore, a		
	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	Spring Creek 2. Observed				cultural or historical ORV		
		streambed conditions				was identified for this		
		indicate ephemeral flows				segment.		
		that would not support						
		water-based recreation or						
		attract visitors for water-						
		related recreation.						
		Upstream of the boat ramp						
		area, recreation						
		opportunities would be						
		largely primitive, with no						
		observed developed						
		recreation amenities. Aside						
		from the recreation						
		opportunities at the boat						
		ramp, of which Spring						
		Creek 2 is ancillary, the						
		experiences of recreating						
		in this corridor would not						
		be exceptionally unique in						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
		the region of comparison and would not draw recreationists from outside the region. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs were identified for this segment.						
Squaw Creek	Not in SMS Class A. Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	This segment is in an ROS semi-primitive non- motorized area. The analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreational opportunities or experiences. There is very limited access to the segment and no known recreation amenities, which limits visitors' ability to participate in water-based or water-related recreation. The segment is an ephemeral drainage and observed streambed conditions indicate that there is no surface flow during much of the year, which prevents opportunities for water- based recreation and the attractiveness of the corridor for water-related recreation compared with other segments in the region of comparison. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no known recreational ORVs were identified for this segment.	Proximity to Red Mountain was considered but the mountain is outside of the river corridor.	There is no USEVVS designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no known populations of federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered fish species, fish Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked fish species in the study corridor. The study corridor is not an anadromous fish-bearing stream. Though the study corridor does not contain any occurrences of nonindigenous aquatic species tracked by the USGS, this does not in and of itself rise to the level of an ORV. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no fish ORVs are present in this segment.	There is no USEVVS designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no known river dependent raptor nests in the study corridor. The study corridor contains habitat for White-tailed ptarmigan (Lagopus leucura) which are dependent on riparian vegetation in the alpine zone. However, when compared to the amount of available habitat for this species in the ROC, this does not rise to the level of ORV. While the study corridor is free from highways, roads, trails, or other linear features that would increase habitat fragmentation and/or the frequency of human disturbance, this does not in and of itself rise to the level of an ORV. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no wildlife ORVs are present in this segment.	This segment includes no previously identified cultural resources, most likely because there have been limited or no previous archaeological surveys conducted in this area. After considering this absence of data, no cultural or historical ORVs were identified for this segment.	Data examined included spatial data for Land Type Associations (LTA) described in the ANF Ecosystem Diversity Evaluation Report (USFS 2009). There are three LTAs present in the study corridor; South Face (SF), Uinta Bollie (UB), and Alpine Moraine (AM). The SF and UB LTAs do not contain any rare or specialized ecosystems identified in USFS (2009). The AM LTA contains wet meadows including poor fens, quaking bogs or floating mats, and sphagnum bogs are generally widespread in the LTA. Except for a calcareous or rich fen in South Fork Rock Creek, there are no rare habitats in this LTA. There are no administratively designated special areas, such as botanical areas, research natural areas, significant caves, or other areas with inherent ecological value in the study corridor. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no ecological ORVs are present in this segment	There are no known occurrences of river dependent, federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no administratively designated special botanical areas in the study corridor. Accordingly, after an analysis of the relevant data, no botanical ORVs are present in this segment.

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
The Seeps	Not in SMS Class A.	This segment is in an ROS	No relevant data available;	There is no USFWS	There is no USFWS	This segment includes one	Data examined included	There are no known
-	Therefore, no Scenic ORV.	roaded natural area. The	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
		analysis revealed this as		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resourcean	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed,
		being a typical drainage		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	historic transmission line	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
		with no distinguishing		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	considered not eligible to	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
		natural or recreational		known populations of	no known river dependent	the NRHP. Because this	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
		amenities that would draw		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	resource is clearly not	2009). There are three	of Conservation Concern,
		a visitor to this segment		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	related to The Seeps, and	LTAs present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
		over others in the region		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	therefore does not indicate	corridor; South Face (SF),	plant species in the study
		of comparison for unique		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	the existence of cultural or	Parks Plateau (PP), and	corridor. There are no
		recreational opportunities		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	historic values that are	Stream Canyon (SC). The	administratively designated
		or experiences. There little		Forest Service-tracked fish	US Route 191, a 2-lane	unique, rare, exemplary, or	SF, PP, and SC LTAs do	special botanical areas in
		to no access to the		species in the study	rural highway, parallels the	outstandingly remarkable in	not contain any rare or	the study corridor.
		segment and no known		corridor. The study	stream segment in the	the region of comparison,	specialized ecosystems	Accordingly, after an
		recreation amenities, which		corridor is not an	study corridor. Presence of	no cultural or historical	identified in USFS (2009).	analysis of the relevant
		limits visitors' ability to		anadromous fish-bearing	the highway reduces	ORVs were identified for	There are no	data, no botanical ORVs
		participate in water-based		stream. Though the study	wildlife habitat quality by	this segment.	administratively designated	are present in this segment.
		or water-related		corridor does not contain	disrupting dispersal		special areas, such as	
		recreation. Observed		any occurrences of	corridor, and increasing		botanical areas, research	
		streambed conditions		nonindigenous aquatic	the degree of habitat		natural areas, significant	
		indicate that there is low		species tracked by the	fragmentation and		caves, or other areas with	
		or no surface flow during		USGS, this does not in and	frequency of human		inherent ecological value in	
		much of the year, which		of itself rise to the level of	disturbance. Accordingly,		the study corridor.	
		prevents opportunities for		an ORV. Accordingly, after	after an analysis of the		Accordingly, after an	
		water-based recreation and		an analysis of the relevant	relevant data, no wildlife		analysis of the relevant	
		the attractiveness of the		data, no fish ORVs are	ORVs are present in this		data, no ecological ORVs	
		corridor for water-related		present in this segment.	segment.		are present in this segment.	
		recreation compared with						
		other segments in the						
		region of comparison.						
		Accordingly, after an						
		analysis of the relevant						
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						

River	Scenic	Recreational	Geologic	Fish	Wildlife	Historic/Cultural	Ecological	Botanical
West Fork	Approximately one-fifth of	This segment crosses ROS	No relevant data available:	There is no USEWS	There is no USEWS	This segment includes no	Data examined included	There are no known
Farm Creek	the segment is not in SMS	roaded natural and non-	no known ORV identified.	designated or proposed	designated or proposed	previously identified	spatial data for Land Type	occurrences of river
1	Class A. Simple changes in	motorized areas. The		critical habitat for fish	critical habitat for river	cultural resources, most	Associations (LTA)	dependent, federally-listed.
	topography. Modest water	creek is a tributary to Farm		species in the study	dependent wildlife in the	likely because there have	described in the ANF	state-listed, or candidate
	patterns with rocks likely	Creek, which was		corridor. There are no	study corridor. There are	been limited or no	Ecosystem Diversity	threatened or endangered
	present due to changing	inventoried in 2005 and		known dodulations of	no known river dependent	previous archaeological	Evaluation Report (USFS	plant species, plant Species
	topography. Mixed	found not to be eligible for		federally-listed, state-listed,	raptor nests in the study	surveys conducted in this	2009). There are two LTAs	of Conservation Concern.
	vegetation species, heights,	inclusion in the WSR		or candidate threatened or	corridor. There is no	area. After considering this	present in the study	or Forest Service-tracked
	patterns, colors, and	system. There is an		endangered fish species,	habitat for other river	absence of data, no cultural	corridor; Parks Plateau	plant species in the study
	textures. Most of segment	escarpment near the		fish Species of	dependent wildlife species	or historical ORVs were	(PP), and Stream Canyon	corridor. There are no
	is forested. Moderate soil	creek's terminus with Farm		Conservation Concern, or	considered in this analysis.	identified for this segment.	(SC). The PP and SC LTAs	administratively designated
	and rock colors (tan,	Creek that has high scenic		Forest Service-tracked fish	Three Forest Routes, 117,	6	do not contain any rare or	special botanical areas in
	brown, and gray).	value; however, this type of		species in the study	293, and 349, are present		specialized ecosystems	the study corridor.
	Negligible sinuosity	geologic feature is common		corridor. The study	in the far upstream end of		identified in USFS (2009).	Accordingly, after an
	through canyon. Rock	within the region of		corridor is not an	the study corridor, but do		There are no	analysis of the relevant
	outcrops/slides, hillsides,	comparison and would not		anadromous fish-bearing	not cross the stream		administratively designated	data, no botanical ORVs
	and ridgelines are visible.	likely draw a visitor to this		stream. The study corridor	segment. Presence of these		special areas, such as	are present in this segment.
	Striking viewpoints likely	segment over others in the		is tributary to Farm Creek,	routes in the study		botanical areas, research	
	available. Almost no visible	region of comparison. The		which is poor habitat for	corridor reduces wildlife		natural areas, significant	
	human disturbances.	creek is not readily		Colorado River cutthroat	habitat quality by disrupting		caves, or other areas with	
		accessible via road,		trout; CRCT are not	the dispersal corridor, and		inherent ecological value in	
		primitive road or trail and		known from the study	increasing the degree of		the study corridor.	
		there are no recreation		corridor. Though the study	habitat fragmentation and		Accordingly, after an	
		amenities. Observed		corridor does not contain	frequency of human		analysis of the relevant	
		streambed conditions also		any occurrences of	disturbance. Accordingly,		data, no ecological ORVs	
		indicate that flow is		nonindigenous aquatic	after an analysis of the		are present in this segment.	
		ephemeral with likely no		species tracked by the	relevant data, no wildlife			
		flow during most of the		USGS, this does not in and	ORVs are present in this			
		year, which further		of itself rise to the level of	segment.			
		prevents opportunities for		an ORV. Accordingly, after				
		water-based recreation.		an analysis of the relevant				
		Overall, the primitive		data, no fish ORVs are				
		recreation experiences		present in this segment.				
		available in this corridor						
		are not unique in the						
		region of comparison.						
		Accordingly, after an						
		analysis of the relevant						
		data, no known						
		recreational ORVs were						
		identified for this segment.						

West Fork Farm CreekNot in SMS Class A.This segment is in an ROS semi-primitive non- motorized area. The analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unjque recreationalNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river study corridor. There are no known populations of recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unjque recreationalNo relevant data available; no known ORV identified.There is no USFWS designated or proposed critical habitat for river toritical habitat for river sudy corridor. There are no no known river dependent raptor nests in the study or candidate threatened or endangered fish species, fish Species ofThere is no USFWS designated or proposed designated or proposed toritical habitat for river sudy corridor. There are no known river dependent area. After considering this absence of data, no cultural or historical ORVs wereData examined included to data for Land Type described in the ANF to de study corridor. There are no known river dependent raptor nests in the study area. After considering this absence of data, no cultural or historical ORVs wereData examined included to ada for Land Type to add for Land Type described in the ANF2009). There are three region of comparison for unjque recreationalNo relevant data available; no known river dependent endangered fish species, fish Species ofThere is no USFWS designated or proposed no known river dependent raptor nests in the study or histo	There are no known occurrences of river dependent, federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
Farm CreekTherefore, no Scenic ORV.semi-primitive non- motorized area. The analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreationalno known ORV identified.designated or proposed critical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no known populations of endangered fish species, fish Species ofpreviously identified cultural resources, most tabitat for river designated or proposed critical habitat for river dependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no known river dependent raptor nests in the study corridor. The study corridor. The study corridor. The study corridor. The study corridor. The study 	occurrences of river dependent, federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
2motorized area. The analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unjque recreationalcritical habitat for fish species in the study corridor. There are no known populations of or candidate threatened or endangered fish species, of for White-tailed ptarmigancultural resources, most cultural resources, mostAssociations (LTA)du described in the ANF st to described in the ANF2analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unjque recreationalcritical habitat for fish species in the study 	dependent, federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
analysis did not reveal any distinguishing natural or recreational amenities thatspecies in the study corridor. There are no known populations of federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or region of comparison for unjque recreationallikely because there have been limited or nodescribed in the ANF Ecosystem Diversitystdependent wildlife in the study corridor. There are no known river dependentlikely because there have been limited or nodescribed in the ANF Ecosystem Diversitystdescribed in the ANFstststudy corridor. There are no known river dependentbeen limited or noEcosystem Diversitythvould draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unjque recreationalor candidate threatened or endangered fish species, fish Species ofcorridor contains habitat for White-tailed ptarmiganabsence of data, no cultural 	state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
distinguishing natural or recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreationalcorridor. There are no known populations of federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered fish species, fish Species ofstudy corridor. There are no known river dependent raptor nests in the study corridor. The studybeen limited or no previous archaeological surveys conducted in this area. After considering this absence of data, no cultural or historical ORVs werethunique recreationalfish Species offor White-tailed ptarmigan 	threatened or endangered plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
recreational amenities that would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreationalknown populations of federally-listed, state-listed, or candidate threatened or endangered fish species, fish Species ofno known river dependent raptor nests in the study corridor. The studyprevious archaeological surveys conducted in this area. After considering this absence of data, no cultural or historical ORVs wereEvaluation Report (USFS of 	plant species, plant Species of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreational would draw a visitor to this segment over others in the fish Species of fish Species of for White-tailed ptarmigan for White-tailed ptarmigan or historical ORVs were or historical ORVs were Vinta Bollie (UB), and torridor to this or historical ORVs were	of Conservation Concern, or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
segment over others in the region of comparison for unique recreational corridate threatened or corridor. The study corridor. The study area. After considering this LTAs present in the study or endangered fish species, for White-tailed ptarmigan or historical ORVs were Unita Bollie (UB), and corridor.	or Forest Service-tracked plant species in the study corridor. There are no
region of comparison for endangered fish species, for bistorical ORVs were Uinta Bollie (UB), and ccuriation of the species of	plant species in the study corridor. There are no
unique recreational fish Species of for White-tailed ptarmigan or historical ORVs were Unita Bollie (UB), and Co	corridor. There are no
opportunities or Conservation Concern, or (Lagopus leucura) which identified for this segment. Alpine Moraine (AM). The ad	administratively designated
experiences. There very Forest Service-tracked fish are dependent on riparian SF and UB LTAs do not sp	special botanical areas in
limited access to the species in the study vegetation in the alpine contain any rare or the	the study corridor.
segment and no known corridor. The study zone. However, when specialized ecosystems Ar	Accordingly, after an
recreation amenities, which corridor is not an compared to the amount identified in USFS (2009). an	analysis of the relevant
limits visitors' ability to anadromous fish-bearing of available habitat for this The AM LIA contains wet da	data, no botanical ORVs
participate in water-based stream. Though the study species in the ROC, this meadows including poor ar	are present in this segment.
or water-related corridor does not contain does not rise to the level fens, quaking bogs or	
recreation. The segment is any occurrences of of ORV. Accordingly, after floating mats, and	
an ephemeral drainage and nonindigenous aquatic an analysis of the relevant spnagnum bogs are	
observed streambed species tracked by the data, no wildlife ORVs are generally widespread in the	
conditions indicate that USGS, this does not in and present in this segment.	
there is no surface flow of itself rise to the level of calcareous or rich fen in calcareous or rich fen in	
an OKV. Accordingly, alter	
which prevents $data$ no fish OP/s are	
based recreation and the	
administrative designated	
special all eas, such as	
recreation compared with	
other segments in the	
region of comparison	
Accordingly after an	
analysis of the relevant	
data, no known	
recreational ORVs were	
identified for this segment.	