



Forest Service
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Blue Mountains Wilderness Evaluation Report

Malheur, Wallowa-Whitman and Umatilla National Forests

May 2025

Evaluation ID: 1001.....	1
Evaluation ID: 1002.....	11
Evaluation ID: 1003.....	20
Evaluation ID: 1004.....	30
Evaluation ID: 1005.....	39
Evaluation ID: 1006.....	47
Evaluation ID: 1007.....	56
Evaluation ID: 1008.....	65
Evaluation ID: 1009.....	74
Evaluation ID: 1010.....	82
Evaluation ID: 1022.....	91
Evaluation ID: 2001.....	99
Evaluation ID: 2002.....	108
Evaluation ID: 2003.....	116
Evaluation ID: 2004.....	125
Evaluation ID: 2005.....	134
Evaluation ID: 2006.....	143
Evaluation ID: 2007.....	152
Evaluation ID: 2008.....	161
Evaluation ID: 2010.....	170
Evaluation ID: 2013.....	179
Evaluation ID: 2014.....	189
Evaluation ID: 2015.....	198
Evaluation ID: 2016.....	208
Evaluation ID: 2017.....	217

Evaluation ID: 2018.....	225
Evaluation ID: 2019.....	233
Evaluation ID: 2020.....	242
Evaluation ID: 2021.....	251
Evaluation ID: 2023.....	260
Evaluation ID: 2024.....	270
Evaluation ID: 2025.....	279
Evaluation ID: 2026.....	288
Evaluation ID: 2027.....	298
Evaluation ID: 2028.....	308
Evaluation ID: 2029.....	318
Evaluation ID: 2030.....	327
Evaluation ID: 2031.....	336
Evaluation ID: 2032.....	345
Evaluation ID: 4002.....	355
Evaluation ID: 4003.....	364
Evaluation ID: 4004.....	373
Evaluation ID: 4005.....	382
Evaluation ID: 4006.....	391
Evaluation ID: 4007.....	400
Evaluation ID: 4009.....	409
Evaluation ID: 4010.....	418
Evaluation ID: 4011.....	427
Evaluation ID: 4012.....	436
Evaluation ID: 4013.....	444
Evaluation ID: 4014.....	453
Evaluation ID: 5012.....	462
Evaluation ID: 6030.....	471

This page intentionally left blank

Evaluation ID: 1001

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

No

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

5994 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The evaluation area is within the 2024 Telephone Fire burned area. Portions of the evaluation polygon were within high fire intensity areas where the vegetation is not expected to recover to a natural pre-burn condition and portions burned at low intensity and are expected to recover naturally.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Evaluation area is within the active Pine Creek grazing allotment. There are several range related water developments and range improvements. Range allotment boundary fences exist within the area. Many fire suppression and post-fire rehabilitation activities/interventions (dozer lines, fuel breaks, etc.) were implemented within the evaluation area due to the 2024 Telephone Fire. Due to the small size of the evaluation area and the concentration of human interventions, ecological changes are noticeable.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Entire evaluation area is within the active Pine Creek grazing allotment. There are several range related water developments and range improvements. Range allotment boundary fences exist within the area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	Yes
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above? Unknown

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The evaluation area contains existing closed, decommissioned and Maintenance Level 2 roads, as well as areas where cross-country motorized use is currently allowed and known to occur. Impacts of motorized recreation on solitude are pervasive regardless of screening because the public drive on roads and cross-country in this evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): The Craft Cabin Trail, a non-motorized trail bisects the evaluation area. The trailhead consists of a kiosk and an improved parking/turnaround. Visitor use logs show the trail as being lightly used and encounters with other people at the trailhead and along the trail are few with hunting season (September through November) being an exception. The trail follows the bottom of a canyon, so topography likely provides screening.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? Unable to determine extent of screening. Assumed cross-country travel impacts on solitude are pervasive.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is a non-motorized trail, however use is light. The area is popular for hunting, including on horseback.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout.

SIZE

Acres: 5994

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains several precontact lithic scatters and a culturally modified tree. Many of the sites are either eligible or potentially eligible to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Malheur National Forest is open to motorized cross-country travel. This type of use is known to occur, and management is difficult due to the gentle terrain in most of the area. The entire area is within the active Pine Creek grazing allotment.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unauthorized, and difficult to manage use is known to occur on numerous closed or decommissioned roads within the evaluation area.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The majority of the evaluation area overlaps with the Pine Creek Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):

There are private lands contiguous to the evaluation area near the NW, NE, SW and SE corners. The eastern and southern boundaries of the area are contiguous to lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management that have been determined to possess wilderness character (LWC).

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? None.

“Unknown” Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why “Unknown” was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: There are private lands that are contiguous to the evaluation area but access to those lands through Forest Service managed lands is unknown. No documented legal rights of way or easements exist.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

Evaluation ID: 1002

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

9715 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): Evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment where associated range improvements exist. Fire suppression activities and post fire rehabilitation activities are ongoing due to the 2024 Whiskey Mountain/Falls Fires. However, these are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Grazing/range improvements.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” Unknown

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): The northeastern corner of the evaluation area contains many Maintenance Level 1 roads. The evaluation area is surrounded by existing open and closed roads that stop at the area's boundaries. A previous land exchange now prevents motorized access to the northern portion of the evaluation area where previous unauthorized cross-country motorized use was known to occur. This same use is known to occur in the west half of the evaluation area with heavier use during hunting season (September-November).

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Topography would make cross-country motorized travel difficult in the southern portion of the evaluation area.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? Unable to determine full extent of screening. Assumed impacts on solitude are limited due to difficulty of cross-country travel in a portion of the area.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area? One Cluster

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular for hunting, including on horseback from September-November because of the lack of a road system.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 9715

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations

No

Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains several precontact lithic scatters and historic archaeology sites. Sites that have been evaluated have been determined eligible to the National Register of Historic Places but have not been listed.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes

Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The entire evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment. The Malheur National Forest is open to motorized cross-country travel. Cross-country motorized use is known to occur in the west half of the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	Yes

Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics

No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The majority of the evaluation area overlaps with the Utey Butte Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. This area is within an Area of Known Wolf Activity (AWKA). Any future project proposals must be consulted with Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):

There are private lands contiguous to the evaluation area along the northern and eastern boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area has high recreational value for hunters because of the lack of roads. Currently there are no outfitter/guides permitted in this area but due to recent wildfires, the expectation of such requests is high.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 50% - 74%

Evaluation ID: 1003

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

7072 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
 Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
 About half of the evaluation area is within the active Bluebucket and Central Malheur grazing allotments. Grazing practices are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: The southeast corner of the evaluation area is within the Cliff Knox treatment area where planned treatments include juniper removal funded by mule deer initiative funds. This project is in late planning stages and implementation is expected to occur in 2025.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Associated grazing/range improvements within the area are few and would not be noticeable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Unknown

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The Malheur River Trail is a non-motorized trail that is popular in summer months by hikers and is used year-round by horse users and permittees. The likelihood of seeing or hearing others is high along the trail especially during peak use seasons. The canyon's steep walls provide opportunities for a visitor to get away from the sights and sounds of others outside of high use seasons and the opportunities for solitude are plentiful away from the developed trail.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Topography in the area would make cross-country motorized travel difficult.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Malheur River canyon runs from the northwest corner of the evaluation area to the southwest corner. There is a developed non-motorized trail that follows the river. Fly fishing in the Malheur River for bull trout is a popular primitive type of recreation known to occur. Use on the trail is higher in summer months. The area offers scenic views of the surrounding landscape and rivers.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 7072

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains several precontact lithic scatters, a culturally modified tree (unevaluated), and a logging mill (eligible). Sites that have been evaluated have been determined eligible to the National Register of Historic Places. Some sites have not yet been evaluated but are potentially eligible to the NRHP. Bull trout, a species listed as threatened, are known to exist in the Malheur Wild and Scenic River.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Malheur National Forest is open to motorized cross-country travel. The extent of motorized cross-country use in this area is unknown. The area overlaps with portions of active grazing allotments.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Congressionally designated Malheur Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor runs from the northwest corner of the evaluation area to the southwest corner. The Malheur Wild and Scenic River was designated in 1988 through the Omnibus Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (Public Law 100-557). Most of the evaluation area overlaps with the Malheur River Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Malheur Wild and Scenic River extends beyond the evaluation area's boundaries to the north. The IRA boundary extends beyond the boundaries of the evaluation area on the northwestern, southwestern and southeastern corners. The southern boundary of the evaluation area is adjacent to privately owned lands, land managed by the BLM and the BLM designated Bluebucket Wilderness Study Area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This evaluation area is split between ranger districts. If the area planned for juniper removal and other harvest activities was removed the area would fall below 5000 acres and would not be practicable to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics. The private lands to the south are planned to be fenced by the landowners.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.): The evaluation area could be redrawn to remove areas with planned juniper removal and harvests within the Cliff-Knox project area. The new area would be well below 5000 acres and would not be of sufficient size to manage as recommended wilderness.

Evaluation ID: 1004

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

No

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

8608 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The evaluation area has seen a regular and frequent interval of wildfire, so the plant communities have not had the chance to recover.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge
What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Entire evaluation area is within the Murders Creek Wild Horse and Burro Territory where there is an emergency gather being planned due to the lack of vegetation from recent wildfire. Obvious ecological changes from wild horse management are possible but extent is unknown. Most of the evaluation unit overlaps with the Shaketable Inventoried Roadless Area and the entire evaluation area is within the burned area from the 2024 Rail Ridge Fire. Fire suppression actions including fuel breaks, dozer lines, etc. and stabilization and rehabilitation efforts are ongoing. The evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are NOT causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes**

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment where associated range improvements such as constructed water developments and fences exist.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	Yes
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The evaluation area contains closed roads that continue to experience unauthorized use. Malheur National Forest is open to cross-country motorized use and is known to occur throughout the evaluation area. There are several outfitter/guides permitted in the area. There are several user-created unauthorized routes that are heavily used and difficult to manage. There are 2 constructed guzzlers within the evaluation area that are maintained for wildlife.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No. This is a heavily used area during hunting season (September-November) and is a popular area for outfitters/guides.

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area provides opportunities for hiking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 8608

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No

Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There are several precontact lithic scatter sites and a couple of historic archaeological sites including an irrigation ditch and a rock feature in the evaluation area. None have been evaluated; all are considered potentially eligible to the NRHP. Murder's Creek is identified critical habitat for steelhead. There are two guzzlers within the area that are maintained for wildlife.

Other features of value reference data source(s): Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes.

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes

Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Malheur National Forest is open to cross-country motorized travel. Evaluation area is within the active Murder's Creek grazing allotment. There are numerous outfitter/guides permitted in the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No

Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The 385-acre Shaketable Research Natural Area is within the evaluation unit. The evaluation area overlaps with the Shaketable Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. The entire evaluation unit is within the Murders Creek Wild Horse and Burro Territory.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%
What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	Yes
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The western boundary of the evaluation area is adjacent to lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management that have been determined to possess wilderness character (LWC) and state lands within the Phillip W. Schneider Wildlife Area. There are private lands adjacent to the evaluation area along the northwest corner and the southern border.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area would be difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics due to traffic entering USFS lands from the popular Phillip W. Schnieder Wildlife Area. There is a seasonal closure within the state wildlife area, however cross-country travel is known to occur on USFS lands and is difficult to manage. Closed roads surrounding the evaluation area experience unauthorized use and is difficult to manage.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

Evaluation ID: 1005

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

No

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

639 acres

Other Features of Value

Unknown

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The evaluation area is a parcel that was acquired through a land exchange. Stumps from past timber harvests are prevalent throughout the area.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found NOT to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Past timber harvests within evaluation area created stumps that are obvious. The area is within a larger active grazing allotment and associated range improvements such as water developments are present.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Past timber harvests and associated roads are prevalent throughout the area. Water developments and other range improvements exist within evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The evaluation area contains a high concentration of roads where motorized use is known to frequently occur. The area is generally flat with little topographic or vegetative screening.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? No, opportunities do not exist in this area.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 639

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No. The area is not in unimpaired condition currently and due to the previous use and activities in the area before acquisition, preserving the use in an unimpaired condition is not practicable.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Unknown
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Other features of value reference data source(s): Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected: The area has not been surveyed for cultural resources because it was recently acquired from private ownership.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value?

Unknown

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a

short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The area abuts the Strawberry Mountain Wilderness area on the south and west boundaries and private lands along the northern boundary.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area was acquired through a land exchange. This area has been identified by the forest as a very difficult area to manage due to the motorized access into the existing wilderness area.

"Unknown" Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access through this parcel to private lands is unknown.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

Evaluation ID: 1006

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

11743 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The evaluation area has seen a regular and frequent interval of wildfire, so the plant communities have not been able to recover.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes. The

area has burned many times, and has seen regular fire intervals, about every 8 years. Recognizing fire is a natural process, the degradation to the natural plant communities in the area would be noticeable.

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): Entire evaluation area is within the Murders Creek Wild Horse and Burro Territory where there is an emergency gather being planned due to the lack of vegetation from recent wildfire. Obvious ecological changes from wild horse management are possible but extent is unknown. Most of the evaluation unit overlaps with the Dry Cabin Inventoried Roadless Area and the entire evaluation area is within the burned area from the 2024 Rail Ridge Fire. Fire suppression actions including fuel breaks, dozer lines, etc. and stabilization and rehabilitation efforts are ongoing. The evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment. There are documented invasions of non-native vegetation species in the creek corridors.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are NOT causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes**

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment where associated range improvements such as constructed water developments and fences exist.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes. The extent of grazing related improvements that exist within the area is not substantially noticeable.

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes. Overall, the area appears natural after considering the degraded plant communities and some noticeable improvements in the area.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The evaluation area contains closed roads that continue to experience unauthorized use. Cross-country motorized travel occurs throughout the evaluation area. There are several outfitter/guides permitted in the area. There are several user-created unauthorized routes that are heavily used and difficult to manage.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No. This is a heavily used area during hunting season (September-November) and is a popular area for outfitters/guides.

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Hunting, including with outfitter/guides.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 11743

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No

High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is one historic and one precontact lithic scatter in the unit. Neither site has been evaluated for eligibility to the National Register of Historic Places.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Malheur National Forest

is open to cross-country motorized use. Evaluation area is within the active Aldrich grazing allotment. There are numerous outfitter/guides permitted in the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: About 70% of the evaluation area overlaps with the Dry Cabin Inventoried Roadless Area

regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. Nearly half of the evaluation unit overlaps with the Murders Creek Wild Horse and Burro Territory.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	Yes
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The majority of the evaluation area overlaps with the Dry Cabin Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294 and the IRA extends beyond the boundary of the evaluation area. The Wild Horse and Burro Territory extends beyond the boundaries of the evaluation unit. The western boundary is adjacent to the BLM designated Aldrich Mountain Wilderness Study Area, other lands managed by the BLM and private lands. The area is also adjacent to state lands within the Phillip W. Schneider Wildlife Area on the western boundary.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area would be difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics due to traffic entering USFS lands from the popular Phillip W. Schnieder Wildlife Area. There is a seasonal closure within the state wildlife area however cross-country travel is known to occur on USFS lands and is difficult to manage. Closed roads surrounding the evaluation area experience unauthorized use and is difficult to manage.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

Evaluation ID: 1007

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes if reshaped

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

19658 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): This area has experienced historical high intensity wildfire at regular intervals. The vegetation has changed from a dominant lodgepole and mahogany community to dead and downed and ceanothus plant community. There are large plantation style patches throughout the evaluation area from previous fire rehabilitation efforts.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found NOT to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

The evaluation area contains a section with valid existing mineral rights, but the extent of obvious ecological changes is unknown. The evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment where associated range improvements (water developments) exist. A portion of the area has undergone hazardous fuel reduction/fire related management activities. Fuel breaks and rehabilitated dozer lines from past fires are still visible.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are NOT causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Areas previously rehabilitated and revegetated after fires have an unnatural "plantation" style appearance. Motorized single track trails exist within evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): The evaluation area is within a vacant grazing allotment.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes if reshaped to remove the portions containing previous vegetation treatments with a "plantation" style appearance.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): Developed motorized trails within the evaluation area effects opportunities for solitude. Cross-country motorized travel is difficult due to a heavy dead and downed vegetative component but known to occur. Low vegetation and topography would not provide much screening from the sights and sounds of others.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Because of the heavy dead and downed vegetative component, cross-country motorized travel is very low, opportunities for solitude could be found away from the trail.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No. Areas located away from designated motorized trails could provide opportunities for solitude. This is one of few areas on the forest that cross-country motorized travel is not known to occur because of the heavy dead and downed vegetative component.

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is popular for geocaching. The area is generally difficult to access which creates a draw for people seeking this unique type of recreation.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

SIZE

Acres: 19658

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There are 2 historic archaeological sites (carved tree and rock feature and one trail) within the evaluation area. The sites are either eligible or potentially eligible to the NRHP.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is a designated motorized trail that runs from the southwest corner to the northeast corner. Malheur National Forest is also open to cross-country motorized travel. The area is within a vacant grazing allotment, however current grazing authorization and use was unknown at the time of evaluation.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. The area would be difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics due to the designated motorized trails within and surrounding the area.

Evaluation ID: 1008

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes if reshaped

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

22253 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes if reshaped

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The far eastern edge of the evaluation area is within the Laycock Creek Firewise Project Area (Coal Pit Creek Area) where active logging and pre-commercial thinning treatments are occurring. Otherwise, the area appears natural.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No if reshaped to remove the area within the Laycock Creek Firewise Project Area (Coal Pit Creek Area).

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): The area is within an active grazing allotment and associated water developments exist. Due to the steep and inaccessible terrain, materials to build these developments had to be flown in by helicopter.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): Not applicable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes if reshaped

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): None.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Malheur National Forest is open to cross-country motorized travel however the topography in most of this evaluation area prevents it. There is a designated motorized trail within the area (Fields Peak Trail) and a non-motorized trail (McClellan Trail/Riley Peak Trail). There is known ATV use on Bills Peak in the west side of the area. This area is a permitted area for outfitter/guides and is within a hunt unit open to bighorn sheep.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes. While the area is open to motorized cross-country travel, the area is steep and mostly inaccessible except for on the Fields Peak Trail.

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is steep and mostly inaccessible except by foot. The area is also within a hunt unit open to bighorn sheep.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 22253

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains several precontact lithic scatters. The archaeological sites are either eligible or have not been evaluated for eligibility. The area also contains whitebark pine, a threatened plant species. Management of whitebark pine is via non-motorized means. There is an old lookout tower on the very edge of the evaluation area and Fields Peak is a geologic feature of interest.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No

Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The entire area is within an active grazing allotment but has been determined mostly unsuitable for cattle grazing due to the extreme topography. The area is open to cross-country motorized travel, but that type of use is very low due to the topography except in the far northern part of the area where trails leave the private onto USFS lands. There are valid outfitter/guide permits in this area and the Eastern Oregon Trail Alliance has expressed interest in working with the Forest Service to establish authorized trail use on Riley Peak/McClellan Trail.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is some known unauthorized user created trails that leave adjacent private lands onto forest lands and preventing access is difficult.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No

Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: A portion of the evaluation area overlaps with the McClellan Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No

Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'

No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The northern border of the evaluation area is adjacent to private lands and lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management that have been determined to possess wilderness character.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The historic cross-country motorized use in the area is difficult to keep out however terrain makes that use difficult. The trails that leave the private lands to the north near Cinnabar Mountain are hard to manage because of where they access FS land through private land.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes if reshaped. To preserve the area's wilderness characteristics, the area within the Laycock Creek Firewise project area and the area containing the Fields Peak motorized trail should be removed.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 1009

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

6378 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): This area is within an old burn scar from previous wildfire. Fuel breaks and other fire suppression activities are present and may be obvious. Old logging relics may be visible.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): The evaluation area is within a vacant grazing allotment that is not actively being used. Few associated fences exist and those are not well maintained.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): Although cross-country travel is difficult due to the dense vegetation component and steep topography, there are some user-created routes that are well traveled.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a

short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No. Cross-country motorized travel is known to occur in the southwest corner however use is very light. The terrain in the rest of the evaluation area and lack of roads within the area makes cross-country travel difficult.

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is remote and mostly accessed by foot or on horseback. There are some unauthorized motorized user-created routes within the area that are well traveled, and that use is increasing with the advancements in motorized vehicles. Primitive types of recreation are known to occur in the area, but this area is not sought out for those uses.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 6378

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Whitebark pine (threatened) is known to exist in the evaluation area. There is one culturally significant site, a pictograph that is eligible to the NRHP.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Malheur National Forest is open to cross-country motorized travel and this use is known to occur only in the southwestern corner. Thick lodgepole, dense vegetation and topography makes cross-country travel in the rest of the area difficult.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Nearly 75% of the evaluation area overlaps with the Baldy Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes. This area could be managed to preserve wilderness characteristics but could be difficult due to the concentration of motorized routes and cross-country motorized use surrounding the area.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 1010

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

9384 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes if reshaped

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): The area is within an active grazing allotment with only one constructed range feature. The evaluation area has seen very little fire and largely appears natural.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): One associated range improvement (water development) exists within the evaluation area and would not be obvious.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There is a designated ATV route, the Dixie Creek ATV Trail, that nearly splits the evaluation unit in half. Terrain forces people to stay on the trail and not venture cross-country. The trail experiences heavy use during hunting season. Cross-country motorized travel is very limited or non-existent due to

terrain. Those seeking solitude can find opportunities within the unit away from the motorized trail.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular during hunting season due to lack of roads and topography.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 9384

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains several sites related to historic mining, logging, railroad or precontact lithic scatter. There is one Historic Property of Religious and Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSIT) identified by the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) within the area. Several sites have not been evaluated for NRHP eligibility and some have been evaluated and determined not eligible. There is a Research Natural Area that overlaps the evaluation area.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge, Tribal Input/Indigenous Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment. The Malheur National Forest is open to cross-country motorized travel. There are several placer mining claims in the southeast corner of the evaluation area. There is a designated motorized ATV trail, the Dixie Creek ATV trail that splits the area nearly in half.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: A portion of the evaluation area overlaps with Dixie Butte Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. There is a 230-acre Research Natural Area within the southwest portion of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Research Natural Area in the southwestern portion of the evaluation area extends beyond the boundary. The RNA is nearly split in half by the evaluation areas boundary line.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? Access to the placer mining claims in the southeast corner may affect the ability to manage the area to preserve wilderness characteristics.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes if reshaped. The area could reasonably be managed to preserve the wilderness characteristics if the areas providing access to, and the placer mining claims were removed.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 1022

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

668 acres

Other Features of Value

No

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No. This area was burned in a wildfire in the 1990s and has since recovered to a natural appearing state.

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No

Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The evaluation area is within the active Rail grazing allotment.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: The area contains visible stumps from historical harvests. There is a grazing boundary let down fence in the southern portion that is maintained by the permittee.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes. Although there are some human interventions and improvements in the area, overall, it appears natural.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): This area experiences the highest use during hunting season. The evaluation area would provide the same opportunities for solitude that the adjacent Strawberry Mountain Wilderness provides.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Evaluation area provides the same opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation that the adjacent Strawberry Mountain Wilderness provides.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

SIZE

Acres: 668

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes. Preservation of the area, if evaluated as an addition to the existing adjacent wilderness, is practicable.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	No
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? No

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Malheur National Forest is open to cross-country motorized travel however this use could be managed to preserve wilderness characteristics in the area. The evaluation area is within an active grazing allotment and fences are maintained by the permittee.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses?

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.

while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No

Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area shares its western boundary with the existing Strawberry Mountain Wilderness.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This evaluation area is within the boundaries of the Upper Bear Lake Project. Project components include fuel reduction treatments and harvest.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2001

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

3700 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The evaluation polygon is within the active Bull Run allotment however the grazing practices do not affect the naturalness of the plant communities.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No

Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
There are spring developments scattered throughout the evaluation unit associated with grazing, but they do not detract from naturalness.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	Yes
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The area is steep and mostly inaccessible by motorized vehicles. There are old mining features visible on the landscape and 225 active claims within the area. There is a large gold exploration project just

outside the evaluation on the northwest edge that has been authorized that effects solitude. Results of that exploration project could have a major effect on solitude.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No.

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is mostly used for hunting, the rest of the year is low use.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 3700

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No. The area is adjacent to the Monument Rock Wilderness area, connected only by a short 3/10-mile edge on the southwest corner. With the active mining claims within the area, it would not be practicable to manage in an unimpaired condition.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains several pre-contact lithic scatters and historic logging features including railroads.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the active Bull Run grazing allotment. Permittees have rights to access the area to maintain range improvements. There are 225 active mining claims within the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area overlaps with the Bull Run Inventoried Roadless Area that is regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes

National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Bull Run IRA boundary extends beyond the boundary of the evaluation area. The Monument Rock Wilderness area is adjacent to the evaluation polygon in the southwest corner along an edge 3/10 mile in length. There are private lands adjacent to the evaluation area to the east.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? There is a lot of dead and downed "blow down" vegetation throughout the area from previous fires. Cross-country motorized use would be possible but not likely. The management of the area depends heavily on the results of the gold exploration project just outside the boundary to the northwest.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No, due to reasons described above.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2002

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

572 acres

Other Features of Value

No

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The area is within the active Bull Run grazing allotment, but grazing practices do not deter from apparent naturalness.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The steep topography and dense vegetation limits the motorized use in the area however there is a closed road in the

western half of the area that may still experience some motorized use. The evaluation polygon is small at only 572 acres.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is mostly used for hunting and mining activities. There are 42 active claims within the area but no operating mines. The closed road that leads to Mud Lake Spring may still experience some motorized use.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 572

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	No
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? No.

There are 42 active mining claims in the area but no operating mines. No historic mining features exist in this area.

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes

Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the active Bull Run grazing allotment. There are 42 active mines and there is a closed route that leads to Mud Lake Spring. Wallowa Whitman National Forest is open to cross-country motorized travel but the terrain and vegetation in this area mostly prevents that type of use.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?

Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No

National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area overlaps with the Bull Run Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No

Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The area is adjacent to the Monument Rock Wilderness area on the southern boundary.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area?

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2003

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

7261 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There has been previous fuels treatments, thinning projects and prescribed burning in this evaluation area. All treatments were located along roads, including several temporary roads. This area is within a portion of the Baker City Municipal Watershed.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Unknown
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: The evaluation area is within Baker City Municipal Watershed and associated watershed infrastructure is unknown. Past fuels treatments may be noticeable along existing and temporary roads within area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

"Unknown" Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected: Area is within Baker City Municipal Watershed and the extent of associated watershed infrastructure is unknown.

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	Unknown
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The area is secluded and scenic on top of the ridge. Civilization is visible but one would feel separated from development. There is heavy ATV use on fringes of the polygon that affects solitude. The fence line road is heavily used by motorized users. Motorcycle use is common and frequent above the tree line where vegetation thins out. The area is popular for snowmobiling in the wintertime.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected: Specifics on infrastructure related to the Baker City Municipal Watershed is unknown but are assumed to exist.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Access to the watershed is restricted. This is within a permitted area for outfitters/guides but is not an area heavily used for that.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 7261

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area has been identified as whitebark pine habitat, a threatened species. There are some pre-contact lithic scatters and historical mining features in the area. Historic and cultural sites are protected.

The area is within the Baker City Municipal Watershed, a vital resource for the Baker City community.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	Yes
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There are 26 active mining claims in the area. Baker City Municipal Watershed overlaps the evaluation polygon so access to infrastructure is legally established. This is within a permitted area for outfitter/guides and there is a private land parcel along the eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within the Twin Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Twin Mountain IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There is a private parcel on the eastern boundary of the evaluation area, along Elk Creek.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? This area is a popular and desired area for continued snowmobile use in the wintertime.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. This area would be difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics due to access needs and continued operation of the municipal watershed and snowmobile use in the wintertime.

Evaluation ID: 2004

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

6592 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The evaluation area is within the active Bourne grazing allotment, however grazing practices are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice?

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are some waste pile features from previous mining activity in the northeast portion of the area, but an average member of the public would likely not notice them. There are 40 active mining claims but no currently active operations.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): There is a fair amount of unauthorized motorized use in the area that is difficult to manage. There are many closed roads to the south of the area that still experience unauthorized use affecting solitude.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Hunting is a known primitive type of recreation in the area.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 6592

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, historic mining features including ditches and roads. The McCully Fork is the upper reach for the municipal watershed for the community of Sumpter.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? Private lands removed from the evaluation area created unnatural and difficult to manage boundaries to the south and northeast.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within a portion of the active Bourne grazing allotment to the east. There is a closed (ML1) road that is used administratively to access a repeater site and lookout tower just outside the northern boundary of the evaluation area. The road experiences unauthorized motorized use by the public and restricting that use is difficult. Motorized encroachment into the adjacent North Fork John Day Wilderness area from this road has been difficult to manage. There are 40 active mining claims within the area, mostly concentrated in the southern half.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's

wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:
The evaluation area overlaps with the Twin Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The area is adjacent to the North Fork John Day Wilderness area on its northern boundary. It overlaps with the Twin Mountain IRA and there are private parcels to the northwest and south that abut the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

“Unknown” Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why “Unknown” was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access needs/rights to the adjacent private lands to the northwest and south are unknown.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

Evaluation ID: 2005

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

28941 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are some historical mining features in the area, rock piles that would likely appear natural to a member of the public.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Some lakes within the area contain dams that are managed by water rights owners. There are maintained trails leading to these lakes. There are 143 active mining claims, only 1 is consistently but minimally worked.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes. Although there are features and improvements that may be noticeable, the area is large enough at nearly 29,000 acres, overall, the area appears natural.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	Yes
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): This evaluation area is popular for many activities. The North River Road provided access through the area and is open to motorized use. A local 4x4 group has expressed desire for continued use of the road because of the unique quality of the ride it provides. It was not historically a motorized route but has since been opened and authorized for this use. Anthony Lakes Ski Area advertises this area as a preferred route. There is heavy mountain bike use in the area on the trail system. Anthony Lakes Ski Area is authorized to manage Nordic trails and bike trails in the area. Dutch Flat is open to bicycle use; a previous motorized closure has expired so motorized use is now allowed. There is considerable snowmobile use along the southern border of the area. The area is large enough to find places of solitude. The area offers high quality scenic value.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? Unknown

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area offers unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation such as Nordic skiing. The current use of the area is heavy on motorized and mechanized recreation and there is a great desire to continue that type of recreation.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes. The area offers unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation such as Nordic skiing. The current use of the area is heavy on motorized and mechanized recreation and there is a great desire to continue that type of recreation as the area is unique to those types of uses in this area as well (downhill mountain biking).

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Unknown

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

SIZE

Acres: 28941

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations

No

Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, cairns and historic mining and logging features.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	Yes
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within a portion of the active Bourne grazing allotment. There are 143 active mining claims and 1 is consistently (minimally) worked. There is a popular motorized trail and is a permitted area for the Anthony Lakes Ski Area to manage Nordic trails and mountain bike trails. There are private water rights on many of the lakes within the area where the infrastructure is maintained by the water rights owner. The area abuts many private land parcels and access from those parcels to/from mining claims is unknown.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No

Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The designated North Powder Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor is within the evaluation area. Dutch Flat Creek was determined as suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System and is within the boundaries of the evaluation area. The area also overlaps with the Twin Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is adjacent to the existing North Fork John Day Wilderness area along its western boundary. The Twin Mountain IRA extends beyond the evaluation area's boundary. There are parcels of private land scattered around the southern boundary and the entire eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? The area is popular amongst the motorized and mountain biking communities.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area offers an array of opportunities unique to the forest, both non-motorized and motorized.

"Unknown" Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access needs/rights for the private lands is unknown.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. This area would be very difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics with its current uses. There is a desire to continue all current uses and there are many existing legally established rights within the area.

Evaluation ID: 2006

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

18121 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Some historic mines and prospects within the evaluation area but are not obvious and overall appear natural.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are some historic mines and prospects within the evaluation area but are not obvious and overall appear natural. There are 79 active mining claims, mostly on the western edge near Bourne with a few scattered in the southeastern portion of the area.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are some managed reservoirs and associated infrastructure and diversion ditches within the evaluation area that the water masters adjust for agriculture use downstream. There are 79 active mining claims, mostly on the western edge near Bourne with a few scattered in the southeastern portion of the area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): All trails within the evaluation area are open to motorized use. Marble Pass Road is open to the public. Snowmobiling is a popular activity throughout the whole evaluation area in the wintertime. The Elkhorn Crest Trail is open to single track motorized use and bicycles. The evaluation polygon is within a permitted outfitter/guiding area.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):
Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is within a hunting unit open for mountain goat.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

SIZE

Acres: 18121

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is identified as Whitebark pine habitat, a threatened species. There area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, cairns, historic mining and logging features. The eastern portion contains approximately 3300 acres of the Baker City municipal watershed, a vital resource to the Baker City community.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area? One Cluster

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	Yes
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There are 79 active mining claims in the evaluation area, mostly near Bourne with a few scattered throughout the southeast corner. There is a court ordered road right-of-way in the northwest corner. All trails are open to motorized use, the Marble Pass Road is open to the public. The area is within a permitted area for outfitters/guides where mountain goats are found. There are numerous private water rights on reservoirs within the polygon with access needs.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Evaluation area overlaps with the Twin Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area that is regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Twin Mountain IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundary. There are small parcels of lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management along the northeastern corner. There are abutting private lands along the boundary from the west side, up around the northern boundary to the eastern boundary.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The 2 highest peaks on the Ranger District are found within this evaluation area. The area is heavily used for snowmobiling in the winter months.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. This area would be difficult to manage given its current uses, desire to continue those uses by the public and the motorized trail systems within this polygon.

Evaluation ID: 2007

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

10080 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
There are 15 active mining claims within the area but no proposed or active plans. The area is within the Chicken Hill grazing allotment that is not being actively grazed.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names,

locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Any range improvements associated with grazing would not be noticeable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN the evaluation area?**

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): The area is mostly inaccessible by vehicles due to the terrain and topography. No trails that are authorized for motorized use exist, however there is some known unauthorized motorized use of the area.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is isolated and remote. It is not located on the way to any destination; people would go to this area for a specific reason. Plans to expand the non-motorized trail that runs from the south to the north up to the Grande Ronde River is ongoing. The area is popular for hiking and hunting. Creeks in the area are unique and of interest to users.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 10080

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area has been identified as critical habitat for steelhead. There are known pre-contact lithic scatters and historic mining and logging features throughout the area.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area takes in a small portion of the Chicken Hill grazing allotment, but it is not actively being grazed. There are 15 active mining claims but there are no proposed or active plans on any of them. The area is an outfitter/guide permitted area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.

while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area overlaps with the Upper Grande Ronde Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Upper Grande Ronde IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundary.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? There are some scenic overlooks just outside the polygon boundary that offer unique scenic views. The evaluation area is surrounded by many closed roads that still experience unauthorized use. Most of the use in this area occurs during hunting season or by woodcutters. Old Camp Carson Mine is just outside the evaluation area. The headwaters of the Grande Ronde River are within the boundary. There is an ongoing road relocation and watershed enhancement project just outside the evaluation area.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. The area experiences some unauthorized motorized use due to the concentration of closed roads surrounding the polygon. Although the use is limited by terrain, this use would make it difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics.

Evaluation ID: 2008

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

9020 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The evaluation area is within the active East Pine Valley allotment, but the grazing practices are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There is a historic Forest Service cabin at Horse Lake that is maintained and used by the grazing permittee for hay storage.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There is some unauthorized cross-country motorized travel, but topography and vegetation could provide screening where one could find some opportunities for solitude.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude?

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is popular for elk hunting. There are no natural features that attract people, largely an undiscovered area of the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular in the wintertime for snowmobiling.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

SIZE

Acres: 9020

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains some pre-contact lithic scatters and historic mining and logging features including a cabin, ditches and roads. There are historic ditches that are still used to divert water up and over terrain to the valley below.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value?

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted use area. Wallowa-Whitman is open to cross-country motorized travel and there is some known cross-country use by ATV/UTVs. Popular area for snowmobile uses in the wintertime. The Lake Fork Creek area diversion ditches require motorized access for maintenance.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within the Lake Fork Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Lake Fork IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g.,

names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? This area is popular for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire among the public to retain this current use in the area.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. This area would be difficult to manage the cross-country and wintertime motorized use.

Evaluation ID: 2010

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

14036 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Not applicable.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: This area is within the municipal watershed for the city of La Grande. Buildings associated with

watershed management, located at the dam are maintained/owned by the City of LaGrande and they have a right and a need to access to them.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): Not applicable.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Access to the watershed is restricted to non-motorized travel. There are some non-motorized trails within the area and it's a popular location for elk hunting. Beaver Creek is a desired dispersed camp spot for stock users and permitted outfitter/guides.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Because access is limited within the watershed to non-motorized travel it is a desired location for elk hunting and hiking. There is some known equestrian use, and some e-bike use in the area.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 14036

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, historic grazing, mining and forest service features and is within the municipal watershed for the city of LaGrande, a vital resource for the community.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY**NON-FEDERAL LAND****Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area?** Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific non-Federal lands within the evaluation area (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There is a private inholding in the northern portion of the evaluation area with access needs.

How much of the evaluation area is non-Federal land? 0% - 24%**What is the spatial distribution of non-Federal lands within the evaluation area?** One Occurrence**Non-Federal lands reference data source(s):** GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge**What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?** None.**LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES**

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	Yes
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Outfitters/guides are permitted to operate in this area. There are access needs to a private inholding in the northern portion and the city of LaGrande maintains access rights to the watershed infrastructure.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Beaver Creek Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:
Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Beaver Creek IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundary. There is a private parcel adjacent to the southeastern corner and a private inholding in the northern portion of the area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area is within the Ladd Canyon/Dry Canyon Travel Management Area where motorized use is restricted.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes. The area could reasonably be managed to preserve wilderness characteristics but would have to allow for some existing uses that would be non-compliant with wilderness designation or would require special authorizations because of the municipal watershed.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2013

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes if reshaped

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

5447 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): There are some noticeable past thinning and fuel reduction treatments in the area. Log decks from previous harvests burned over in a wildfire and no vegetation has recovered due to the intense heat. These bare areas appear unnatural.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes?

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Past thinning and fuel reduction treatments are noticeable. There is an irrigation canal in the eastern portion of the area that would be noticeable.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No if reshaped.

Which parts of the evaluation area are affected? Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area should be redrawn to exclude the unnatural canal. Motorized/mechanized use is authorized to maintain this development.

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Past thinning and fuel reduction treatments, signs of past harvest and Wallowa Valley irrigation canal are all noticeable improvements within the area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes if reshaped to exclude the canal boundary as described above.

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes if reshaped as discussed above.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): This area is popular for a variety of uses including cross-country skiing, bicycles, backcountry skiing, hiking and snowmobiling in the winter months. Wallowa Lake Tramway is just to the north of the evaluation area so it would be difficult to find screening from the sights and sounds of others.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is popular for cross country and backcountry skiing. There is a Forest Service hut for backcountry skiers. There is a popular hiking trail from Wallowa Lake. This area does not see a lot of motorized use because the steep and rocky terrain prevents it, although some motorized use occurs in the limited areas where terrain and vegetation make accessibility possible. There are 3 permitted backcountry operators in the Ferguson Ridge area. Wing Ridge is used for training purposes.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is popular for mountain biking. There are not a lot of opportunities for this type of recreation on the forest, so this area is sought out for this use.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 5447

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Unknown
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters and historic logging features including cabins and camps.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected: May be some sensitive plant species within evaluation area but exact locations and extent is unknown.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Wallowa Lake Tram operators are authorized to use the ML1 Mount Howard Road for administrative purposes. There are multiple special use permits in the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Little Sheep Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances?

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes

National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness along its western boundary. The Little Sheep IRA extends beyond the evaluation area's boundary. Although it's not within lands considered "wildland urban interface" this evaluation area is near the Joseph/Wallowa Lake community, so wildland fire suppression is of great concern.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? The area is popular for snowmobile use in the winter months and is a unique area for mountain biking opportunities. There is a public desire to retain these uses.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. This area would be difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics due to the current and historic use, and public desire to retain such uses.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2014

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

5971 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Evaluation area is within the active Marr Flat grazing allotment. Impacts from grazing are evident in the lower end where cattle tend to congregate.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are several fences and range related improvements (water developments) scattered throughout the area that would be noticeable. There is a portion of the evaluation area that falls within the Morgan Nesbit Forest Resiliency Project that is planned for implementation in 2025. Treatments that could impact naturalness include commercial thinning, non-commercial thinning and prescribed burning.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes. Even considering the human interventions (existing and planned) and the ecological impacts, the area overall appears natural. The area is mostly on a steep hillside and is difficult to access.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): This area is popular for snowmobiling in the winter months for those seeking challenge. The area is steep and densely vegetated so one could find opportunities for solitude.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There may be opportunities for

primitive and unconfined recreation in this area, but users are not known to seek those here. Snowmobiling is known to occur on ridges where topography and vegetation allows.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 5971

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, a historic trail (Road Canyon Historic Route).

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific non-Federal lands within the evaluation area (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There is one private inholding in the northern portion of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area is non-Federal land? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of non-Federal lands within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the active Marr Flat grazing allotment. Access to the private inholding is unknown.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):

There are private parcels along the eastern boundary of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

"Unknown" Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access rights/needs to the private inholding in the northern portion of the evaluation area are unknown.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. The size, shape and configuration of this area would make it difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics. If reshaped to a manageable configuration it would be less than 5000 acres in size.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2015

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

10301 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Not applicable.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The area is within the active West Minam and Indian Creek grazing allotments. Grazing practices are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No

Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple areas, but not throughout.

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: The Breshears OHV Trail System is in this evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There have been previous thinning treatments in the area, but an average member of the public would not notice them. The Mount Fanny communication tower/site is inside the evaluation area polygon but has been cherry stemmed out of the lands being evaluated

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes

Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): The Breshears OHV Trail System is located within this evaluation area. This trail system sees heavy use from July-October.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Not applicable.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a

short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is sought out for berry picking, forest product gathering, mushroom picking, hunting, and dispersed camping.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? No.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 10301

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The viewshed from the OHV rim trails offers scenic views of the Grande Ronde Valley. The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters. There are 2 Research Natural Areas within the evaluation area; one in the northeast corner that extends beyond the evaluation area's boundary and one on the eastern edge. This evaluation area is just north of the watershed boundary for the community of Cove. Bridge Creek is a possible contributor to the watershed.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No

Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within the active West Minam and Indian Creek grazing allotments. There is a motorized OHV trail system (Breshears OHV Trail System) within the boundaries. Access to the private lands along the western edge is unknown.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No

Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The area is within the Castle Ridge Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. There are 2 Research Natural Areas that fall within the evaluation area boundary; one in the northeast corner and one along the eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The area is within the Castle Ridge Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. Two Research Natural Areas lay within the boundaries of the evaluation polygon. The area is bound by private lands along the western edge.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? There is large public desire and a long-standing history and relationship with the EOATV Association to continue access and use of the OHV trail system.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The evaluation area is separated from the Eagle Cap Wilderness area by the 6220 road. The road is rough but traveled. There is a planning effort for road maintenance/improvements to access the Mount Fanny communication site. There are many roads (open and closed) that surround the polygon. There are limited access points into the polygon. Eastern Oregon ATV Association helps manage the OHV trail system.

"Unknown" Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access rights/needs to the private lands along the western boundary are unknown.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes if reshaped. To preserve wilderness characteristics the OHV trail system would have to be removed.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2016

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

9393 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Not applicable.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? None

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There is an extensive OHV trail system (Mount Emily OHV Riding Area) within the evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): There is an OHV trail system (Mount Emily OHV Riding Area) within the evaluation area. The OHV trail system within the area is extensive and heavily used. Although topography and vegetation prohibit much off-road unauthorized use the sights and sounds from the trail system are pervasive. There are also several outfitter/guides permitted to operate in the area during hunting seasons.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Not applicable.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This is a sought-after area for dispersed camping, berry picking and big game hunting. It is within a limited issue hunt unit.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? No.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 9393

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There are known rare plants within the Indian Rock area and possible Whitebark pine (threatened) habitat. Indian

Rock Viewpoint is just outside the polygon and is a culturally important area. The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters and historic logging and grazing features including campsites and stock driveways.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Mount Emily OHV Trail

System is within the boundaries of the evaluation area and the trail system extends beyond the area's boundary. There are several outfitter/guides permitted to operate in the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Five Points Creek, found to be eligible for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers

System is within the evaluation area. The area overlaps with the Mount Emily Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The "eligible" Five Points Creek extends beyond the evaluation area boundary to the southwest. The Mount Emily IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundary and there is one private parcel that is adjacent to the evaluation area boundary on the very southern end.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This evaluation polygon is separated from the neighboring Umatilla National Forest by a road and associated buffer. There are tribal considerations near Indian Rock Overlook. The area experiences heavy use from August until the snow prevents access, usually late October-November. There is a scenic view of the west side of Grande Ronde Valley from the ridgeline. There is a communications site just outside the polygon boundary to the north.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2017

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

10559 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): All trails within evaluation are non-motorized. Trails are used by bicycles. There is a heavy concentration of open roads along the polygon boundary to the north but none that extend into the evaluation area.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area offers opportunities for hiking, hunting, equestrian use in hard to access places and some people have been observed kayaking Bear Creek on inflatable kayaks.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 10559

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, cairns and some historic grazing features. Bear Creek was identified as habitat for bull trout, a sensitive species.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Bull trout in Bear Creek.

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Access to the private lands that abut the evaluation area on the far eastern edge are unknown.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:
The evaluation area overlaps with the Huckleberry Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness along the southern boundary. The Huckleberry IRA extends beyond the evaluation area's boundary. There is private property that is adjacent to the evaluation area on the far eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

“Unknown” Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why “Unknown” was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access to the private lands to the far east of the evaluation area's boundary is unknown. No legally established rights of way or easements were found.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2018

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

1319 acres

Other Features of Value

No

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The evaluation area is within the Standley/Huckleberry grazing allotment but is not actively being grazed. Grazing practices are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No. There is no motorized use in the evaluation area due to terrain. The evaluation polygon is small at just over 1300 acres and less than 1 mile in width. The sights and sounds from the high concentration of roads just outside the evaluation area cannot be screened out.

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? No, opportunities do not exist in this area. The area is known to be used for dispersed camping related to hunting and firewood cutting.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 1319

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes. The area could be preserved and used in an unimpaired condition because of the difficult of access due to terrain.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	No
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? No

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Standley/Huckleberry grazing allotment, but it is not actively being grazed.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's

wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Huckleberry Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%
What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	Yes
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area shares its western boundary with the Eagle Cap Wilderness. The private lands to the north of the evaluation polygon were purchased by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and have been designated as part of the Minam River Wildlife Area. Huckleberry IRA extends beyond the evaluation area's boundary.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2019

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

No

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

28086 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): There is a high concentration of non-native invasive plant species in the Big Sheep area.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge
 What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): The area is within active grazing allotments with many associated water developments and fences. Many old roadbeds are visible and do not appear natural.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No

Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Associated grazing improvements including water developments and fences are apparent throughout the evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No

Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are roads along the ridges, but access is limited because of all the private lands within and around the evaluation area. The only public access into the area is from the bottom near Bear Creek Gulch. The area used to get a lot of springtime use as this area warms up and loses snow earlier than much of the forest but since public access changed and is now very limited, use is very low.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes. There are some areas within the polygon where opportunities for solitude could be found but they are few. The private lands within and surrounding the evaluation area could affect those opportunities.

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? No. Due to very limited access and the shape and configuration of the area, this area does not provide opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 28086

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Native threatened and endangered plants were identified within the area. High elevation lakes provide good shorebird habitat.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist **WITHIN** the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Unknown
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within an active grazing allotment. Access to many private parcels within and surrounding the area is unknown. No legal rights of way or easements were found.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.

while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Deadhorse and Sheep Divide Inventoried Roadless Areas regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area contains many private parcels within and around the boundaries. There is one very small section of BLM-managed lands along the western boundary that were determined to not possess wilderness character. The Deadhorse and Sheep Divide IRAs extend beyond the evaluation area's boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

“Unknown” Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why “Unknown” was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access rights/needs to the many private parcels within the evaluation area are unknown. No legally recorded rights of way or easements were found.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. Due to the shape and configuration of the evaluation polygon from the private inholdings and private lands surrounding the area, it would be difficult to manage to preserve the wilderness characteristics, reshaping would not change manageability.

Evaluation ID: 2020

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

13534 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Evaluation area is within the active Tope Creek grazing allotment. There are some associated range improvements but none that would cause obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice?

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Grazing associated range improvements within the area are few enough that they would not be noticeable to the public.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?"

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): There is a developed ATV trail within the evaluation area. Steep terrain prevents cross-country motorized travel from the ATV trail. The evaluation area is surrounded by private lands and motorized routes.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within the Sled Springs hunt unit, but this area is not heavily used for hunting.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 13534

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre contact lithic scatters, cairns, some historic trails and remnants of a railroad.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	Yes
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within the active Tope Creek grazing allotment. There is a motorized ATV trail within the area and access to private lands in the northern portion.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Tope Creek Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No

National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Tope Creek IRA boundary extends beyond the evaluation area boundary. There are private lands that abut the evaluation area along the western, northern and eastern and the southern boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Public expressed a concern for access to adjacent private lands, proximity to private lands and structures and the need for continued motorized access for grazing permittees.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The area was identified as winter range for wildlife and there is an old growth preserve scattered in the lower half of the evaluation area.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2021

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes if reshaped

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

7103 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
 Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
 The evaluation area is within the Swamp Creek and Table Mountain grazing allotments. There are documented cases of non-native invasive plant species on benches.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are several ATV trails and old roads in the lower portion of the evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Grazing associated range improvements exist within the area but not to an extent that would be obvious to a member of the public.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes if reshaped. There are several ATV trails and old roads in the lower portion of the evaluation area. If those were removed the area would appear natural.

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There are a number of ATV trails in the lower portion of the evaluation area near Cougar Creek. The steep terrain in the area would provide screening from the sights and sounds of others if the area containing ATV trails in the lower portion was removed.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Not applicable.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Visitors are known to use this area for wood

cutting and hunting. There is no longer access to Joseph Creek Trail because it has washed out and has not been maintained.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 7103

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Joseph Creek was identified as high quality and important habitat for Steelhead, a protected fish species. The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters, cairns and rock shelters. There is a Research Natural Area in the northern portion of the area.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within

the Table Mountain and Swamp Creek grazing allotments. There are designated motorized ATV trails in the lower portion.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Joseph Creek Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor are within the evaluation area

boundary. The area is within the Joseph Canyon Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Joseph Creek Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor extends beyond the evaluation area boundary. The Joseph Canyon IRA boundary also extends beyond the evaluation area. There are BLM-managed lands to the north that were determined to not possess wilderness character and there are private parcels of land that abut the area along the southeast, southern and western boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? There is a road leaving private lands onto FS-managed lands that is not maintained, and no public access allowed.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2023

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

8141 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are several water management ditches within evaluation area that the ditch company services and needs continued access to. There are 44 active mining claims and one recently reclaimed adit.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Evaluation area is within the Sheep Creek, Boulder Creek and Eagle Valley grazing allotments, actively being grazed but not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are several water management ditches throughout the evaluation area. There are 44 active mining claims and one recently reclaimed adit in T6S, R44E, sec 9. There is some non-compliant mining activity in the area. Baker County has a valid easement that extends beyond the evaluation boundary from the trailhead to access a mine outside of the polygon. The area is within active grazing allotments with associated range improvements.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public?** Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN the evaluation area?**

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No

Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)

Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails throughout the area. The 7745-550 road is open to motorized travel. ATVs use roads leading to the Bennet Peak area during berry and mushroom season and there is known local use at Two Color Lake.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation in this area include berry picking, mushroom picking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 8141

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is a planned effort to reintroduce steelhead into the Eagle Creek Wild and Scenic River. Area is identified as Whitebark pine habitat, a threatened species. The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters as well as historic mining, logging and forest service features including roads, ditches and cabins. There is a research natural area that extends into the evaluation area on the far eastern edge. Important watershed features include regularly maintained water management ditches.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge, No Data

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No

Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within multiple grazing allotments; there are 44 active mining claims and one recently reclaimed adit; there is known cross country motorized use by ATV/UTVs and Wallowa Whitman National Forest is open to cross-country travel. Snowmobile use is high in portions of the area where topography and vegetation density does not deter the use. The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted area. One ski permit outfitter is authorized to maintain a permanent yurt for their guiding service and resupply is via snowmobile. A road near Cornucopia is an access point to Simmons Creek for mining and outfitter/guide motorized use. A legal and valid right of way was issued to Baker County to access mine beyond trailhead.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes

State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. The designated Eagle Creek Wild and Scenic River is within the evaluation boundary. The East Eagle Creek was determined as suitable for inclusion in the WSR System and is within the boundaries. There is a research natural area that extends into the evaluation area on the far eastern edge. The evaluation area overlaps with the Boulder Peak, Little Eagle Meadows and the Reservoir Inventoried Roadless Areas., regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No

Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):

Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, Eagle Creek designated Wild and Scenic River, East Eagle Creek (determines suitable for inclusion into WSRS) and the research natural area all extend beyond the evaluation area boundaries. Private lands border the evaluation along the eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Parts of this area are popular and offer unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire by the public to retain this type of use.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.): Current uses in this area would be difficult to

manage and wilderness characteristics could not be protected with current uses. There is also public desire to retain current uses of the area.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2024

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

363 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): There are several water management ditches within evaluation area that the ditch company services and needs continued access to.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are NOT causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): The evaluation area is within active grazing allotments but not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:
Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There are some non-motorized trails throughout the area. .

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area.

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation in this area include berry picking, mushroom picking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 363

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters as well as historic mining, logging and forest service features

including roads, ditches and cabins. Important watershed features include water management ditches that are maintained.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural

sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Snowmobile use is high in portions of the area where topography and vegetation density does not prohibit the use. The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

**SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO
AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO
MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS**

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. The evaluation area overlaps

with the Boulder Peak Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:
Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):
Eagle Cap Wilderness Area, Eagle Creek designated Wild and Scenic River, East Eagle Creek (determines suitable for inclusion into WSRS) and the research natural area all extend beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are 2 small parcels of BLM lands along the northwestern edge that were determined to not possess wilderness character and there are private lands that abut the evaluation area to the southeast and northwest. The evaluation area boundary comes very close to the community of Cornucopia which is heavy with mining activity.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Parts of this area are popular and offer unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire by the public to retain this type of use.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.): Due to the current wintertime motorized use and public desire to continue such use, and the area being so small in size, the ability to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics is not practicable.

Evaluation ID: 2025

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

3052 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? No.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No

Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

There are water management ditches within evaluation area that the ditch company services and needs continued access to. Evaluation area is within active grazing allotments but not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are several water management ditches throughout the evaluation area. There are 29

active mining claims in the area. The area is within an active grazing allotment with associated range improvements.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): Not applicable.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails throughout the area.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation in this area include berry picking, mushroom picking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 3052

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes

Research natural areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters as well as historic mining, logging and forest service features including roads, ditches and cabins.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes
How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes

Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within multiple grazing allotments; there are 29 active mining claims. Snowmobile use is high in portions of the area where topography and vegetation density does not prohibit the use. The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No

Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Little Eagle Meadows Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): Contiguous with Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. There are private lands adjacent to the evaluation area along the southwestern and western edges.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Parts of this area are popular and offer unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire by the public to retain this type of use.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 25% - 49%

Evaluation ID: 2026

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

1713 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes

Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are water management ditches within evaluation area that the ditch company services and needs continued access to.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are NOT causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Evaluation area is within active grazing allotments but not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:
There are several water management ditches throughout the evaluation area. There are active mining claims in the area. The area is within active grazing allotments with associated range improvements.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trail sin the southeast portion of the evaluation area. The area is popular in the wintertime for snowmobiling and there is an administrative area just outside the evaluation area to the southeast along West Eagle Creek. The area offers opportunities for solitude.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation in this area include berry picking, mushroom picking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 1713

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No. The size, shape and configuration to the existing wilderness would make it difficult to preserve in an unimpaired condition considering current uses.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters as well as historic mining relics. Important watershed features include water management ditches that are maintained.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within active grazing allotments; there are active mining claims and known cross country motorized use by ATV/UTVs and snowmobiles in the wintertime. Wallowa Whitman National Forest is open to cross-country travel. Snowmobile use is high in portions of the area where topography and vegetation density does not prohibit the use. The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. The evaluation area overlaps with the Boulder Peak Inventoried Roadless Area., regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?

Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):
Eagle Cap Wilderness Area is adjacent to the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Parts of this area are popular and offer unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire by the public to retain this type of use.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 25% - 49%

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.): The size and shape of this polygon would be difficult to manage as an addition to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. Its adjacent boundary is only along the northeast corner.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2027

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

3084 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes

Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):
There are several water management ditches within evaluation area that the ditch company services and needs continued access to.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):
Evaluation area is within active grazing allotments but not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are several water management ditches throughout the evaluation area. There are a number of water management ditches throughout the evaluation area. There are 93 active mining claims and one proposal in the Norway Basin area above Cornucopia for an exploration project that is currently being analyzed. There is some non-compliant mining activity in the area. Baker County has a valid easement that extends beyond the evaluation boundary from the trailhead to access a mine outside of the polygon. The area is within active grazing allotments with associated range improvements.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No

Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails throughout the area. ATVs use the roads during berry and mushroom season. The area offers opportunities for solitude.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation in this area include berry picking, mushroom picking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 3084

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No. The area is adjacent to the Cornucopia area heavy with mining activity and private lands. With the private lands and roads and trails that lead to the evaluation area's boundary, this area would be difficult to manage to preserve its character and use in an unimpaired condition.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters as well as historic mining, logging and forest service features including roads ditches and cabins.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge, No Data

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes
How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within active grazing allotments; there are 93 active mining claims and a proposed exploration project being analyzed; there is known cross country motorized use by ATV/UTVs, and Wallowa Whitman National Forest is open to cross-country travel. Snowmobile use is high in portions of the area where topography and vegetation density does not prohibit the use. The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted area. A road near Cornucopia is an access point to Simmons Creek for mining and outfitter/guide motorized use.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. The evaluation area overlaps with the Little Eagle Meadows Inventoried Roadless Area., regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):

Eagle Cap Wilderness Area is adjacent to the evaluation area along the northern edge. Private lands are adjacent to the evaluation area to the northeast. The evaluation area boundary comes very close to the community of Cornucopia which is heavy with mining activity.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Parts of this area are popular and offer unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire by the public to retain this type of use.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.): The size, shape and location (next to the community of Cornucopia) of the evaluation polygon would make it difficult to manage to preserve wilderness characteristics.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 2028

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

5921 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes

Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
There are several water management ditches within evaluation area that the ditch company services and needs continued access to.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Evaluation area is within active grazing allotments but not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There are several water management ditches throughout the evaluation area. There are 127 active mining claims and one proposal in the Norway Basin area above Cornucopia for an exploration project that is currently being analyzed. There is some non-compliant mining activity in the area. The area is within active grazing allotments with associated range improvements.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No

Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails throughout the area. ATVs use the roads during berry and mushroom season and there is known snowmobile use in the wintertime. The area offers opportunities for solitude.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unique opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation in this area include berry picking, mushroom picking and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 5921

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations

Yes

Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters as well as historic mining features including roads, ditches and waste piles. There is a research natural area that extends into the evaluation area on the far northeastern edge. Important watershed features include water management ditches that are maintained.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	Yes
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within multiple grazing allotments; there are 127 active mining claims and a proposed exploration project being analyzed; there is known cross country motorized use by ATV/UTVs and Wallowa Whitman National Forest is open to cross-country travel. Snowmobile use is high in portions of the area where topography and vegetation density does not prohibit the use. The area is within an outfitter/guide permitted area. One ski permit outfitter is authorized to maintain a permanent yurt for their guiding service and resupply is via snowmobile. A road near Cornucopia is an access point to Simmons Creek for mining and outfitter/guide motorized use.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness Area. There is a research natural area that extends into the evaluation area in the far northeastern corner. The evaluation area overlaps with the Reservoir Inventoried Roadless Areas., regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	Unknown

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):

Eagle Cap Wilderness Area and research natural area all extend beyond the evaluation area boundaries. Private lands are adjacent to the evaluation area to the south and southwest. The evaluation area boundary comes very close to the community of Cornucopia which is heavy with mining activity.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Parts of this area

are popular and offer unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime and there is a general desire by the public to retain this type of use.

“Unknown” Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why “Unknown” was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: The Cornucopia community is very close to the southeastern edge of the evaluation area. Unknown if that area is considered WUI.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 25% - 49%

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area’s wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.): The proximity to the community of Cornucopia and mining activity there would make it difficult to manage to preserve the wilderness characteristics of this area.

Evaluation ID: 2029

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

3609 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The area is within the active Pole Creek grazing allotment, but grazing practices are not causing obvious ecological changes.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): This is a permitted area for outfitters/guides. There is some ATV use up the 580 road but the use is light. Snowmobile use is popular in the wintertime. Encroachment into the adjacent wilderness area by snowmobile is difficult to manage.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is used for hunting due to the limited motorized use outside of the winter months.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 3609

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Unknown
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area contains pre-contact lithic scatters and historic grazing, mining and forest service features such as trails, roads and ditches. The Catherine Creek Ditch funnels water from higher elevations down to the Keating Valley.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Provide a short rationale that explains why "Unknown" was selected: This area may be potential wolverine habitat, a threatened species. Exact identified habitat unknown.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	Unknown

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Pole Creek grazing allotment and is a permitted area for outfitters/guides. Access via motorized equipment is necessary to maintain the Catherine Creek Ditch; legally established access rights are unknown.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? Access via motorized equipment is necessary to maintain the Catherine Creek Ditch; legally established access rights are assumed.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Area is within the Catherine Creek Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed):
Evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness area and the Catherine Creek IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g.,

names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? This area is popular and offers unique opportunities for snowmobile use in the wintertime. There is public desire to retain this type of use.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? Managing snowmobile encroachment into the wilderness is difficult. This management would likely get worse if the wilderness boundary were adjusted to include this evaluation area. There are several closed roads that meet the boundary opposite the wilderness area.

“Unknown” Explanation

Provide a short rationale that explains why “Unknown” was selected in response to any of the manageability questions above: Access via motorized equipment is necessary to maintain the Catherine Creek Ditch; legally established access rights are assumed.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

Evaluation ID: 2030

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

1921 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? No.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)

No

Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

The area is within the Catherine Creek and Mill Creek grazing allotments but are not actively being grazed. No obvious ecological changes noted.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): There are some past fuel treatments within the area but would not be noticeable to a member of the public.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): Not applicable.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails that lead into the Eagle Cap Wilderness area. Use in this area is very

low, very little sign of people or camps in the area. There are some closed roads that lead to the evaluation area's boundary but the use on them is also low to non-existent.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Unknown.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make? Due to the lack of motorized recreation and lack of people known to recreate here, there could be opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation but nothing was specifically identified.

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 1921

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?	
Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is assumed to contain pre-contact lithic scatters and historical mining, logging and forest service features but none were specifically identified.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? The area is assumed to contain pre-contact lithic scatters and historical mining, logging and forest service features but none were specifically identified.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?
Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist **WITHIN** the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Catherine Creek and Mill Creek grazing allotments but are not actively being grazed.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The evaluation area overlaps with the Upper Catherine Creek Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable.

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is contiguous to the Eagle Cap Wilderness area on the eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g.,

names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Not applicable

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? None.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The existing wilderness boundary follows a ridgeline; a topographic feature that is easy to distinguish on the ground. If the boundary changed to align with this evaluation polygon boundary it would not follow any distinguishable topographic features.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 2031

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

1421 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Not applicable.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)

No

Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

The area is within the Catherine Creek and Mill Creek grazing allotments but are not actively being grazed. No obvious ecological changes noted.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? No.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): There are some past fuel treatments within the area but would not be noticeable to a member of the public.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails that lead into the Eagle Cap Wilderness area. Use in this area is very

low, very little sign of people or camps in the area. There are some closed roads that lead to the evaluation area's boundary but the use on them is also low to non-existent.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Due to the lack of motorized recreation and lack of people known to recreate here, there could be opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation but nothing was specifically identified.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 1421

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is assumed to contain pre-contact lithic scatters and historical mining, logging and forest service features but none were specifically identified.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist **WITHIN** the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Catherine Creek and Mill Creek grazing allotments but are not actively being grazed.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Upper Catherine Creek Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness area on the eastern edge.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The existing wilderness boundary follows a ridgeline; a topographic feature that is easy to distinguish on the ground. If the

boundary changed to align with this evaluation polygon boundary it would not follow any distinguishable topographic features.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.):

Evaluation ID: 2032

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

2390 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No

Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): The area is within the Catherine Creek and Mill Creek grazing allotments but are not actively being grazed. No obvious ecological changes noted.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are some past fuel treatments within the area but would not be noticeable to a member of the public.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There are some non-motorized trails that lead into the Eagle Cap Wilderness area. Use in this area is very low, very little sign of people or camps in the area. There are some closed roads that lead to the evaluation area's boundary but the use on them is also low to non-existent.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Due to the lack of motorized recreation and lack of people known to recreate here, there could be opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation but nothing was specifically identified.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 2390

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? Yes

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research natural areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No
None	

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is assumed to contain pre-contact lithic scatters and historical mining, logging and forest service features but none were specifically identified.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural

sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Catherine Creek and Mill Creek grazing allotments but are not actively being grazed.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The evaluation area overlaps with the Little Creek Inventoried Roadless Area, regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is adjacent to the Eagle Cap Wilderness area on the eastern edge. There are 2 small BLM parcels and some private lands in the northwest corner that abut the area. The adjacent BLM parcels were determined to not possess wilderness character.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The existing wilderness boundary follows a ridgeline; a topographic feature that is easy to distinguish on the ground. If the boundary changed to align with this evaluation polygon boundary it would not follow any distinguishable topographic features.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Provide a short rationale to support your conclusion, including descriptions of specific modifications of the evaluation area boundary that may support management to preserve

the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., increase setbacks, remove roads/trails, narrow areas, slivers, or other portions, etc.):

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4002

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

No

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

5688 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): There are documented pervasive cases of invasive grasses (diffuse knapweed and North Africa Grass) to an extent that would be noticeable.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found NOT to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	Yes
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): The area is within the Swale Creek grazing allotment and there some associated range improvements that would be noticeable. Previous fires in 2007 and 2018 created some containment lines that have been rehabbed but are still noticeable on the ground. The invasive grasses within the area are pervasive and have impacted overall naturalness of this area.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Grazing related range improvements would be noticeable.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): This area experiences unauthorized motorized use and there are many known user-created well-traveled routes that are apparent. The topography of the area makes cross-country, unauthorized use possible and common. Terrain could provide some screening.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular for hunting.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 5688

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area was

identified as critical habitat for steelhead, a protected fish species. The area contains prehistoric and historic cultural resources. None have been researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief

descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Swale Creek grazing allotment and the area experiences unauthorized cross-country motorized use.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The evaluation area overlaps with the Skookum Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	Yes
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	Yes
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Skookum IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundary. The area crosses ranger districts, both within the Umatilla National Forest. The southern end of the area is bordered by BLM-managed lands that have been determined to possess wilderness character (LWC). The BLM lands to the south have a motorized trail system where access onto Forest Service-managed lands is difficult to manage. There is a private parcel to the southeast and a parcel of state-managed land to the south.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. The area would be difficult to manage to preserve it's wilderness characteristics due to the unauthorized motorized use and access from the adjacent BLM-managed lands to the south.

Evaluation ID: 4003

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

6444 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There are ongoing fire rehabilitation activities within the area from the 2024 Battle Mountain Complex fires. The area is within the Ditch Creek and Thompson grazing allotments, but the main canyon is excluded from grazing.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes. There are no motorized routes within the evaluation area and the steep terrain hinders unauthorized motorized use. There are no trail systems.

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area offers opportunities for shed hunting, big game viewing including big horn sheep.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 6444

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Visitors can view bighorn sheep, a species that is locally rare. The Potamus Canyon has been referred to as the "mini-Grand Canyon" and there is a developed viewpoint for this viewshed feature just outside the evaluation area. The area contains pre-historic and historic cultural resources, some of which are historic properties. None have been researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs), but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Scattered Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Ditch Creek and Thompson grazing allotments, but the main canyon is excluded from grazing.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area overlaps with the Potomus Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	Yes
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	Yes
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Potomus IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. The evaluation area crosses ranger districts, both within the Umatilla National Forest boundaries. BLM-managed lands to the south have been determined to possess wilderness character (LWC) and there is a parcel that is state-managed to the south. Private lands connect at the southeast corner of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 4004

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

5368 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
The evaluation area is within the active Texas Bar allotment. Grazing associated range improvements exist within the area but are not causing obvious ecological changes that would be obvious.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:
Grazing associated range improvements within the Texas Bar grazing allotment.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Grazing associated range improvements within the Texas Bar grazing allotment.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public?** Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN the evaluation area?**

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating “screening?” Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): The evaluation area is surrounded by roads. There is a heavily used motorized trail that bisects the evaluation area. Although topography could provide some screening, the sights and sounds from motorized uses would be pervasive, thereby affecting the opportunities for solitude.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist but it is unknown if visitors recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Due to the small size, proximity to surrounding roads and the motorized trail that bisects the evaluation area, opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation may exist in this area.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 5368

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is critical steelhead habitat within the evaluation area. The 52 Road Scenic byway runs along the southern border of the area. There area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Texas Bar grazing allotment. There is a motorized trail that bisects the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the South Fork Tower Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?

Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The South Fork Tower IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are private lands along the northern border of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? There is strong public support for managing for other uses of the area and to mitigate impacts from wildfire.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? There are projects within the evaluation area that are in planning stated including timber stand improvements, fuels reduction and vegetation management and managing planted areas.

**Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the
area**

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4005

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

21993 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Some commercial/noncommercial harvest along southern boundary around The Knob would be obvious.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?"

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There is a motorized trail within the evaluation area that is no longer maintained. Some unauthorized motorized use is known to occur on ridgetops in the area. Topography provides some screening.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Scattered Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular for hunting. It is within a hunt unit that is difficult to draw, and limited tags are issued. It is considered a trophy unit for elk. There are roads on the ridgetops but not heavily used.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?

75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 21993

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	Yes
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Gray Rock provides a unique and important viewshed offering unique views of the Grande Ronde Valley. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is within the active Spring Mountain allotment where it is grazed with sheep. The use is not extensive. There are no associated range improvements in the area. There is a motorized trail not depicted on the map that makes a loop out on Huckleberry Mountain. It is not maintained. The area is popular amongst permitted outfitter/guides because of the desirable and limited issue hunting tags.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Hellhole Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to

protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Hellhole IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are private parcels that abut the evaluation area along the west/southwest boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The proximity of the area to the Summit Road, a main through road provides ease of access to less timbered ridges in the area. OHV and motorized use would be difficult to stop.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. The area would be very difficult to manage to preserve the wilderness characteristics due to its proximity to the Summit Road. The Summit Road is a main, heavily traveled and popular road and provides bases for camps mainly during hunting season.

Evaluation ID: 4006

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

No

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

No

Size

6866 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has such plant and/or animal communities? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific plant and/or animal communities (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): Non-native, invasive plant species including medusahead, common St. Johnswort, and North Africa Grass are prevalent on the hillsides spreading from the railroad right of way along the western boundary. The naturalness of the grasslands is degraded.

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? Yes

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?	
Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	Yes
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): This area experiences frequent fires from the railroad along the western boundary and the non-native invasives that have come in as a result. There are dozer lines on ridgetops. There are several closed roads within the evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes WITHIN the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? No

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No

Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)

Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There is an active railroad along the western boundary of the evaluation area. Approximately 15-20 trains run per day and are loud and pervasive. Their horns can be heard throughout the evaluation area. There is unauthorized motorized travel within the area that is difficult to manage. These things diminish opportunities for solitude.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: This area is within a desirable and

limited issue hunt unit. The railroad and proximity to private lands and limited public access affects the opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? No

SIZE

Acres: 6866

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Although there are no designated motorized routes within the area, there is known unauthorized motorized use that is difficult to manage. The area permits many outfitter/guides for hunting.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%
What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Hellhole Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Hellhole IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are private lands and lands that belong to the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) along the western boundary. There is no public access along the western edge and snow often limits access from the east side of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4007

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

12364 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	Yes

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes?

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

There are some small, documented occurrences of non-native invasive plant species growing unchecked on slopes within the evaluation area (Canada thistle and diffuse knapweed). Access and topography make management of these species difficult, and the natural vegetative communities are declining.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" Yes

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for

solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”): There is a motorized single-track trail within the evaluation area, but it is not maintained and is seldomly used. The area is surrounded by roads. The shape of the evaluation area creates short distances to roads outside and the sights and sounds from them is pervasive even with limited topographic screening, thereby affecting solitude.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is primarily used during hunting season. The road system provides access along 3 sides.

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

SIZE

Acres: 12364

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Critical steelhead habitat was identified within the evaluation area. There is a 197-acre botanical area in Shimmiehorn Canyon along Shimmiehorn Creek. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have specifically been researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Unknown/Other

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Goodman grazing allotment, but it is not currently active. There is a motorized single-track trail within the area that is not currently maintained and is seldomly used. It is a permitted area for several outfitter/guides and the primary use is during hunting season.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Hellhole Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294. The North Fork Umatilla wilderness area is separated from the evaluation polygon by the FS Road 32.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Hellhole IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are private lands along the western and northwestern boundaries of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? Although the area could be managed to preserve the wilderness characteristics of the area, it is at risk of losing its

naturalness from declining vegetative communities from non-native invasive species growing unchecked. Access and topography prevent the ability for treatment.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4009

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

26892 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

There is a historic cabin, Bear Creek Cabin that is no longer used for administrative purposes.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There is a historic cabin, Bear Creek Cabin that is no longer used for administrative purposes.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN** the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There is an extensive, very popular motorized trail system (30+ miles) within the evaluation area. Most of the trails are single track with one 2-track trail and there are several constructed trail bridges on the system. The forest is in the planning phase of rebuilding some of the trails to increase access to the area.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or

permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area is popular for hiking, backpacking, horseback riding and hunting.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 26892

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is known to contain some sensitive plant communities and has been determined critical habitat for bull trout, steelhead and chinook salmon. The watershed and integrity of it is important to the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) for their new fish hatchery. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge, Tribal Input/Indigenous Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Walla Walla grazing allotment that is not currently active. There is an extensive motorized trail system within the area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Walla Walla River Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No

National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Walla Walla River IRA boundary extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are private lands along the entire western boundary and more small private parcels along the southern boundary. There are parcels of BLM-managed lands along the western boundary as well.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? There is a BLM designated Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) in the BLM-managed parcel along the western boundary. There are no outfitter/guides permitted in this area, but they may go in if they are guiding within the Walla Walla hunt unit. It would be difficult to prevent motorized use of the area based on the trail system and historical use.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4010

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

1798 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): Although there are no activities or improvements within the evaluation area, the narrow configuration of the polygon sandwiched between private lands on both sides diminishes the opportunities for solitude.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular and provides opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation. There is no motorized access to the area, so activities include fishing accessible by foot and horseback only.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 1798

If the area is LESS than 5,000 acres, is its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition practicable? No. Managing for preservation and use in an unimpaired condition is not practicable because of the private lands along the northeast, southeast and southwest boundaries. Livestock is actively grazed on the adjacent private lands.

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Several sensitive/protected species were identified in the area including bull trout, salmon and steelhead. Habitat was determined critical for these species. Potential threatened and endangered plant species were assumed to be present, but none have been documented. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present. The scenic portion of the Wenaha Tucannon Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor overlaps with most of the evaluation polygon.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands **WITHIN** the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?	
Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Wenaha Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor is within and overlaps with nearly all of the evaluation polygon. The evaluation area is within the Wenaha-Tucannon Three Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area is adjacent to the Weneha-Tucannon wilderness area. The Weneha Wild and Scenic River extends beyond the evaluation boundaries. There are adjacent BLM-managed lands along the northeast and southeastern boundaries. There are privately owned lands along the entirety of both the eastern and western boundaries

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4011

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

11148 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	Yes

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): The evaluation area is within the active Asotin grazing allotment. Associated range improvements including drift fences, and a spring development are present, but none would cause obvious ecological changes. Some documented non-native invasive plant species (Dalmation toadflax, gypsyflower, diffuse knapweed and Scotch cottonthistle) have been documented in and around the evaluation area but are mostly unnoticeable. The area recently burned in a low intensity wildfire. There are some older timber harvest plots in the southern end but are not obvious.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? One Cluster

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Old timber harvest plots in the southern end but are not substantially noticeable.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.): Old timber harvest plots in the southern end but are not substantially noticeable.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There is one closed road within the evaluation area that is maintained for administrative use. The entire evaluation area is surrounded by a road system and private lands that have roads. One may find solitude in the drainage bottoms; sights and sounds of others would be pervasive from any ridgetop. There is a main travel corridor (ML3) FS Road 4304 that borders the northern boundary. This road sees the heaviest amount of traffic on the Pomeroy Ranger District.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area offers opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation including hiking and horseback riding on the 25+ miles of developed non-motorized trails found within the evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 11148

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Wenatchee Creek and West Wenatchee Creek drainages were identified as critical habitat for bull trout and salmon and steelhead. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Prevalent Throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Asotin grazing allotment.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The area overlaps with the Wenatchee Creek Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Wenatchee Creek IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. There are private and state managed lands to the south. State lands managed by the Washington Fish and Wildlife Service are popular for big game hunting. The Weneha-Tucannon wilderness area is nearby but separated from the evaluation area by a ML2 FS Road.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? This is a popular area for permitted outfitter/guides for hunting.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes. The area is rugged and remote and could reasonably be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics.

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 4012

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

12241 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There is active grazing in a small portion of the NW corner of the evaluation area.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): The Diamond Peak radio repeater and towers are just outside the evaluation area to the south. The area has burned multiple times in past wildfires.

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): The evaluation area used to have a motorized trail system that has since been changed to a non-motorized trail system. There is very limited unauthorized cross-country motorized use due to the rugged and remote terrain.

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?

Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is popular for hunting. The bulk of use is during the months of September-November, and minimal use the rest of the year. Non-motorized trail system and hunting opportunities are in this area.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 12241

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes

Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There is identified critical habitat for bull trout in the Tucannon River. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No

Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: There are several outfitter/guides permitted to operate in this area.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No

Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics

No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Tucannon River is identified as eligible for inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The evaluation area overlaps with the Upper Tucannon Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a

short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The evaluation area borders the Weneha-Tucannon wilderness area along the south and west boundaries. The Upper Tucannon IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? There is a small area that was excluded from evaluation in the northwest corner. That should be added back into the evaluated area.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

Evaluation ID: 4013

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

23613 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make? The area is in the final planning stages with expected implementation in early 2025 for large scale vegetation management that would be obvious. Project activities include fuels reduction, commercial harvest activities and prescribed burning.

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice:

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make? The area is within planned project boundaries for the Tiger Mill project. Timber harvests will be noticeable. The area is within the Mill Creek municipal watershed and there are associated improvements that could be noticed but are not substantial.

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public?** Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN the evaluation area?**

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	No
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short

rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating “screening?”):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes. The area offers opportunities for solitude because of the lack of motorized access and limited entry restrictions. The area is closed to human entry aside from a tightly controlled hunt.

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Over half of the evaluation area is within the Mill Creek Municipal Watershed that supplies over 90% of the water needs to the city of Walla Walla, Washington. Entry into the watershed is limited to permit holders to conduct management activities to that benefit the watershed only, and one tightly controlled hunt. About 30% of the evaluation area outside of the watershed is a Research Natural Area and could provide opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation due to the limited access to the area.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 23613

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	Yes
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: About 30% of the evaluation area overlaps with a Research Natural Area. Over half of the evaluation area is within the Mill Creek municipal watershed, an important resource for the city of Walla Walla, Washington. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	No
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Mill Creek Watershed Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following **ADJACENT TO** the evaluation area?

Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Mill Creek Watershed IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundary. There is an adjacent BLM-managed parcel along the western boundary that have been determined to possess wilderness character. There are privately owned lands along the southern, western and northern boundaries of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? This area would be difficult to manage to preserve its wilderness characteristics being a municipal watershed, the planned projects to be implemented in the area and the adjacency to private lands.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. Although the area could be managed to preserve its natural characteristics, it would not be manageable as a wilderness area due to the municipal watershed.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 4014

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

No

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

6061 acres

Other Features of Value

No

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):
There are some post-harvest/post fire planted units within the evaluation area but would not be substantially noticeable to the public. Evaluation area is within the Wall and Swale Creek grazing allotments and there are some associated fences.

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names,

locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.): There is a lookout tower just outside the evaluation area along the western boundary (Madison Butte Lookout Tower).

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude **WITHIN the evaluation area?**

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	No
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	Yes

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"): There are some closed roads that enter the evaluation area that still experience unauthorized use. Non-motorized trail systems within the area are authorized for snowmobile use in the winter months. Motorized and electric bikes are known to use the non-motorized trail system and is hard to manage that type of unauthorized use.

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating “screening”) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does “screening” mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?):

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? No

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor’s ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area offers opportunities for horseback riding, hiking and bicycle riding on the non-motorized trail system. It is one of few trail systems on the Heppner Ranger District. There is little unauthorized motorized cross-country use due to vegetation (dead and downed).

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 6061

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	No
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have been specifically researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	Yes
Access to private lands	No
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the Wall and Swale Creek grazing allotments and likely within a permitted area for outfitters/guides.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The evaluation area overlaps with the Texas Butte Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No

National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	No
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Texas Butte IRA extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. The entire northern boundary is adjacent to privately owned lands.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? There is strong partnership interest in treating the area to reduce fuels because of the adjacency to private lands.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area? The evaluation area is within planned project boundaries including fuel reduction activities to reduce fuel buildup around Skookum and Alder Creek Trails and Texas Butte Trails. It is also adjacent to the larger Parkers Mill and Wildcat 2 Project areas.

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No. Managing to preserve wilderness characteristics would be difficult because of the current uses and desire to retain current uses of the area and public interest in fuels management due to adjacency to private land boundaries.

DRAFT

Evaluation ID: 5012

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

24163 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

No

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found **NOT** to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.): The evaluation area experienced high intensity fire in 2022 in the Crockett's Knob fire. Planting for rehabilitation is planned to occur in 2025.

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	Yes
Livestock grazing and range management	Yes
Minerals or energy developments	Yes

Non-native invasive species	No
Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	Yes

How much of the evaluation area has human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific human interventions that are causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Evaluation area is within the active North Middle Fork grazing allotment with water developments limited to existing springs. There are active mining load claims in the southeast portion of the area.

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):
Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? Yes

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	Yes
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	Yes
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

How much of the evaluation area has improvements that an average member of the public would notice? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of improvements within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies those specific improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) that an average member of the public would notice: Fire rehabilitation activities are ongoing from high intensity fire in the 2022 Crockett's Knob fire. Planting planned to occur in 2025. Active mining land claims in southeast portion of evaluation area.

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would NOT notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements WITHIN the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?" No

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that DO NOT have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): There is a non-motorized trail from the southeast corner to the northwest corner (Princess Trail). The trail has been identified for pack and saddle use but there is known motorized (ATV) use on the trail. The area experiences heavier use during hunting season, otherwise use is light. Terrain and vegetation provide screening from the sights and sounds of others overall.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Visitors are known to use the non-motorized Princess Trail. The area is known to see heavier use during hunting season.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are **NOT** primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Scattered Throughout

SIZE

Acres: 24163

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	No
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of

cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area includes a Whitebark Pine (threatened) treatment emphasis area. The area contains several precontact lithic scatter sites and a couple of historic archaeological sites, none of which have been evaluated for their eligibility to the NRHP.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make? None.

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 0% - 24%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? Yes

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?

Tribal treaty rights or uses	No
Grazing allotments	Yes
Mining claims	Yes
Infrastructure Rights-of-way	No
Motorized routes or areas	Yes
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations	No
Access to private lands	
Private water rights	No
Any other legally established rights or uses	No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within an active grazing allotment. There are active placer mining claims within the evaluation area. The area is known for heavy winter motorized use (snowmobile). Eastern Oregon Trail Alliance has expressed interest in working with the Forest Service to establish authorized use of non-motorized trails for bicycle trails.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found NOT to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the	Yes

ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

The area overlaps with the Greenhorn Mountain Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Unknown/Other

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found NOT to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following ADJACENT TO the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	No
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	No
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	Yes
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	No
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The

evaluation area crosses forest boundaries (Umatilla National Forest and Malheur National Forest). There are some small private land parcels on the northern end of the evaluation area.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area?

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? No.

Evaluation ID: 6030

SUMMARY

Apparent Naturalness

Yes

Solitude

Yes

Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Yes

Size

6196 acres

Other Features of Value

Yes

Manageability

Yes

APPARENT NATURALNESS

PLANT AND ANIMAL COMMUNITIES

Are there plant and/or animal communities within the evaluation area that appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

Provide information that identifies any plant and/or animal communities evaluated that were found NOT to appear substantially unnatural (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, acreages, etc.):

Plant and animal communities reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the plant and animal communities above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Plant & Animal Communities

Given responses to the question above, do the plant and animal communities within the evaluation area appear substantially unnatural to an average member of the public? No

HUMAN INTERVENTION & OBVIOUS ECOLOGICAL CHANGES

Are any of the following human interventions causing ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area that would be obvious to an average member of the public?

Restoration and/or fuel treatments (e.g., wildland urban interface/fire-related management activities)	No
Livestock grazing and range management	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Non-native invasive species	No

Other human interventions (other vegetation management or watershed treatments, water resource management, fire suppression, wildlife or fisheries management, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any human interventions evaluated that are **NOT** causing obvious ecological changes (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

Human interventions and ecological changes reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the human interventions and ecological changes above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Human Interventions & Ecological Changes

Given responses to the question above, are human interventions and ecological changes **WITHIN** the evaluation area obvious to an average member of the public? No

IMPROVEMENTS

Which of the following improvements exist WITHIN the evaluation area that an average member of the public would notice?	
Timber harvest areas or other vegetation treatments or watershed treatments (e.g., contouring diking, channeling)	No
Dams/Reservoirs or other water resource management-related improvements	No
Minerals or energy developments	No
Communication sites, permanently installed vertical structures, or utility corridors	No
Other improvements (e.g., range improvements, historic structures, airstrips or heliports, recreation improvements, ski areas, etc.)	No

Provide information that identifies any improvements evaluated that exist within the evaluation area that an average member of the public would **NOT** notice (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acres, etc.):

Improvements reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Improvements

Given responses to the questions above, are improvements **WITHIN** the evaluation area substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

Overall Apparent Naturalness

Given responses to the questions above, does the area generally appear to be affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprints of man's work substantially unnoticeable to an average member of the public? Yes

SOLITUDE

Which of the following activities/improvements attract crowds of people and/or are visible or generate loud noises that may impact a visitor's opportunities for solitude WITHIN the evaluation area?

Motorized recreation (e.g., roads, OHV routes/areas, motorcycle trails, e-bikes, motorized watercraft, over-snow vehicle routes/areas, etc.)	Yes
Popular/crowded visitor destinations or trails	Yes
Recreation improvements (e.g., developed recreation sites/facilities, etc.)	No
Airstrips/Heliports	No
Utility infrastructure	No
Other (competitive events, administrative activities, fire management activities, special use permit or commercial permit activities, etc.)	No

Does topography, vegetation, and/or other factors provide "screening" that at least partially mitigates impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvement selected above? Yes

Are some (or all) of the impacts on opportunities for solitude from the activities and/or improvements selected above pervasive and/or permanent, even after evaluating "screening?"

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) with pervasive and/or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How are some or all impacts on opportunities for solitude permanent and/or pervasive after evaluating "screening?"):

Provide information that identifies those specific activities/improvements (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) evaluated that **DO NOT** have pervasive or permanent impacts on opportunities for solitude (after evaluating "screening") and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (How does "screening" mitigate impacts on opportunities for solitude such that the impacts are not permanent or pervasive?): The use of the existing road system outside the evaluation area is low. Solitude on the Grande Ronde River is marginal during high use floating season. Topography allows for screening from the sights and sounds of others outside of peak use seasons.

Solitude reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to the improvements above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Solitude

Given responses to the questions above, are there any portions of the evaluation area that have opportunities for solitude? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for solitude? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for solitude within the evaluation area?
Prevalent Throughout

PRIMITIVE AND UNCONFINED RECREATION

Are there opportunities to engage in primitive and unconfined recreation activities that lead to a visitor's ability to feel a part of nature within the evaluation area? Yes, opportunities exist, and visitors are known to recreate in this area

Provide information that identifies specific opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: Floating the Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River is a recreational opportunity in this area.

Provide information that identifies specific recreation opportunities evaluated that are NOT primitive and unconfined (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Primitive and unconfined recreation reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to primitive and unconfined recreation above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Primitive and Unconfined Recreation

Given responses to the questions above, does the area have opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation? Yes

How much of the evaluation area has opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation?
50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of opportunities for primitive and unconfined recreation within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

SIZE

Acres: 6196

OTHER FEATURES OF VALUE

Which of the following ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value exist within the evaluation area?

Plant or animal communities that are rare locally, regionally, nationally, or within the system of protected designations	Yes
Outstanding landscape features such as waterfalls, mountains, viewpoints, waterbodies, or geologic features	No
Historic and cultural resource sites	Yes
Research Natural Areas	No
High quality water resources or important watershed features	Yes
Other features of value	No

Provide information that identifies those specific features of value (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is identified as critical habitat for threatened fish species and as big game winter range. The area contains a combination of prehistoric and historic cultural resources (some of which are historic properties). None of the cultural resources have specifically been researched for Historic Properties of Religious or Cultural Significance to Indian Tribes (HPRCSITs) or Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) but they are expected to be present.

Other features of value reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to other features of value above and what assumptions did you need to make?

Overall Other Features of Value

Given responses to the questions above, does the area contain other features of value? Yes

How much of the area has other features of value? 25% - 49%

What is the spatial distribution of other features of value within the evaluation area?

Multiple Areas, but not throughout

MANAGEABILITY

NON-FEDERAL LAND

Are there any non-Federal lands WITHIN the evaluation area? No

Non-Federal lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to non-Federal lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

LEGALLY ESTABLISHED RIGHTS OR USES

Do any of the following legally established rights and uses, created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, exist WITHIN the evaluation area that may affect preservation of the area's wilderness characteristics?		
Tribal treaty rights or uses		No
Grazing allotments		Yes
Mining claims		No
Infrastructure Rights-of-way		No
Motorized routes or areas		No
Special use permits and/or commercial use authorizations		Yes
Access to private lands		No
Private water rights		No
Any other legally established rights or uses		No

Provide information that identifies those specific legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, that may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The area is within the active Eden grazing allotment.

How much of the evaluation area has such legally established rights or uses? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of such legally established rights and uses within the evaluation area? One Occurrence

Provide information that identifies any rights or uses evaluated that were found **NOT** to be legally established rights or uses created through a binding treaty, conveyance, lease, deed, contract, or law, and/or were found **NOT** to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc. while respecting confidentiality requirements of cultural sites) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Rights and uses reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to legally established rights or uses above and what assumptions did you need to make?

SPECIFIC FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS THAT MAY BE RELEVANT TO AVAILABILITY OF THE AREA FOR WILDERNESS OR THE ABILITY TO MANAGE THE AREA TO PROTECT WILDERNESS CHARACTERISTICS

Do any of the following Federal or state legal circumstances exist WITHIN the evaluation area?	
Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	No
Any other federal or state laws or regulation that are relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics	No

Provide information that identifies those specific Federal or state legal circumstances that may be relevant to the availability of the evaluation area for wilderness or the ability to manage the evaluation area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion: The Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River and associated corridor lies within the evaluation area boundaries. The area also overlaps with the Grande Ronde Inventoried Roadless Area regulated by the 2001 Roadless Rule, 36 CFR 294.

How much of the evaluation area is affected by such legal circumstances? 75% - 100%

What is the spatial distribution of lands affected by such legal circumstances within the evaluation area? Prevalent Throughout

Provide information that identifies any legal circumstances evaluated that were found **NOT** to be relevant to availability of the area for wilderness or the ability to manage the area to protect wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Federal and state law reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to Federal or State laws above and what assumptions did you need to make?

MANAGEMENT OF ADJACENT LANDS

Are any of the following **ADJACENT TO** the evaluation area?

Congressionally designated areas (including National Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Scenic or Historic trails, etc.)	Yes
National Historic Landmarks or sites on National Register of Historic Places	No
Administratively designated areas (e.g., Research Natural Areas, Special Interest Areas, etc.)	Yes
Forest Service Lands administered by a different unit	Yes
Other Federal Lands (e.g., NPS, BLM, FWS, DOD, etc.)	Yes
Non-Federal Lands (e.g., state, county, private, etc.)	Yes
State designated areas	Yes
Private conservation lands	No
Lands considered 'wildland urban interface'	No

Provide information that identifies those specific adjacent lands where management may affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics, positively and/or negatively, (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion (i.e., how such adjacent lands are managed): The Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River extends beyond the evaluation area boundaries. The polygon is split between the Umatilla National Forest and the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. There are BLM-managed lands along the northeast boundary and privately owned and state-managed lands along the eastern/southeastern edge. The Weneha State Wildlife Area lies to the east of the evaluation area and poses no management challenges.

How much of the evaluation area's boundary may be affected by management of adjacent lands? 50% - 74%

What is the spatial distribution of areas that may be affected by management of adjacent lands within the evaluation area? Multiple Areas, but not throughout

Provide information that identifies any adjacent lands evaluated where management was found NOT to affect preservation of the evaluation area's wilderness characteristics (e.g., names, locations, brief descriptions, lengths/acreages, etc.) and provide a short rationale to support your conclusion:

Adjacent lands reference data source(s): GIS Data, Expert/Local Knowledge

What information gaps did you encounter related to management of adjacent lands above and what assumptions did you need to make?

OTHER

What else have you learned from public participation and collaboration, intergovernmental coordination, and/or Tribal consultation specific to this evaluation area? Use of chainsaws on the river would be difficult to mitigate/manage.

What else is important to know about this evaluation area?

Overall Manageability, including the shape and configuration of the area

Given responses to the questions above, may the area be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? Yes

How much of the area may be managed to preserve its wilderness characteristics? 75% - 100%

DRAFT