Appendix 4: Hansen lotic wetland assessment of BDNF lands.

Stream name	Polygon[1]	Trend	Vegetative %	Soil and Hydrological %	Total %	Rating	Invasive plant total score (9 possible)[2]	Grazing impact total score (15 possible)[2]	Sediment impact total score (18 possible)[2]	Length (miles)
Burnt Hollow (Peterson tributary)	BH E	degrading	56	83	70	functional at risk	4	3	16	0.00
Burnt Hollow (Peterson tributary)	BH F	degrading	52	70	61	functional at risk	4	3	12	0.64
Cottonwood Crk	D	degrading	56	87	72	functional at risk	6	8	14	0.42
Cottonwood Crk Middle Fork	F	static	70	87	79	functional at risk	6	11	14	0.25
Cottonwood Crk Middle Fork	H	static	78	80	79	functional at risk	6	13	12	0.25
Cottonwood Crk North Fork	E	static	81	100	91	PFC	6	12	18	0.25
Cottonwood Crk S Southeast Fork	I	static	85	93	89	PFC	6	13	16	0.25
Cottonwood Crk S Southeast Fork	J	static	81	93	88	PFC	6	12	16	0.25
Cottonwood Crk South Fork	G	degrading	74	87	81	PFC	6	12	14	0.25
Dry Cottonwood Creek	R	status unknown	37	43	40	nonfunctional	1	11	4	0.16
Dry Cottonwood Creek	S	status unknown	74	100	88	PFC	2	12	18	0.17
Dry Cottonwood Creek	T	status unknown	56	57	56	nonfunctional	6	5	8	0.20
Dry Cottonwood Creek	U	status unknown	56	87	72	functional at risk	4	8	14	0.08
Dry Cottonwood Creek	V	status unknown	67	100	84	PFC	5	8	18	0.50
Dry Cottonwood Creek	W	static	63	60	61	functional at risk	4	10	6	0.05
Dry Cottonwood Creek	X	status unknown	85	67	75	functional at risk	4	13	8	0.06
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF A	static	81	100	91	PFC	6	11	18	0.04
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF B	static	52	93	74	functional at risk	4	6	16	0.18
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF C	status unknown	63	93	79	functional at risk	4	7	16	0.31
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF D	status unknown	63	87	75	functional at risk	6	7	14	0.09
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF E	degrading	33	57	46	nonfunctional	4	2	8	0.67
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF F	degrading	52	67	60	functional at risk	6	3	10	0.06
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF G	status unknown	59	50	54	nonfunctional	6	3	6	0.36
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF H	degrading	52	50	51	nonfunctional	4	4	6	0.69
Dry Cottonwood North Fork	NF I	status unknown	74	70	72	functional at risk	6	6	12	0.23
Girard Gulch	D	degrading	37	83	61	functional at risk	2	2	16	0.08
Girard Gulch	E	degrading	48	90	70	functional at risk	1	6	18	0.33
Girard Gulch	F	degrading	48	90	70	functional at risk	1	6	18	0.18
Girard Gulch	G	degrading	41	90	67	functional at risk	1	2	18	0.01
Jack Crk (Peterson tributary)	JC D	status unknown	67	50	58	nonfunctional	6	11	4	0.13
Jack Crk (Peterson tributary)	JC E	status unknown	44	37	40	nonfunctional	6	3	2	0.13
Jack Crk (Peterson tributary)	JC F	degrading	56	57	56	nonfunctional	6	4	12	0.38
Jack Crk (Peterson tributary)	JC G	static	59	87	74	functional at risk	4	5	16	0.49
Jack Crk (Peterson tributary)	JC H	status unknown	74	93	84	PFC	6	10	16	0.12

Appendix 4: Hansen lotic wetland assessment of BDNF lands.

Stream name	Polygon[1]	Trend	Vegetative %	Soil and Hydrological %	Total %	Rating	Invasive plant total score (9 possible)[2]	Grazing impact total score (15 possible)[2]	Sediment impact total score (18 possible)[2]	Length (miles)
Orofino Crk	J	status unknown	41	37	39	nonfunctional	4	2	2	0.26
Orofino Crk	K	status unknown	56	77	67	functional at risk	4	8	12	0.15
Orofino Crk	L	status unknown	67	67	67	functional at risk	6	5	10	0.28
Orofino Crk	M	status unknown	63	67	65	functional at risk	4	5	11	0.44
Orofino Crk	N	status unknown	63	83	74	functional at risk	4	5	16	0.63
Perkins Gulch	K	status unknown	33	43	39	nonfunctional	2	2	4	0.01
Perkins Gulch	L	status unknown	44	53	49	nonfunctional	4	8	10	0.16
Perkins Gulch	M	status unknown	59	67	63	functional at risk	6	11	14	0.29
Perkins Gulch	N	status unknown	70	100	86	PFC	6	8	18	0.21
Perkins Gulch	O	status unknown	67	87	77	functional at risk	4	7	16	0.41
Perkins Gulch	Q	status unknown	59	93	77	functional at risk	1	9	18	0.02
Perkins Gulch	R	status unknown	93	90	91	PFC	6	10	18	0.35
Perkins Gulch	S	status unknown	78	83	81	PFC	4	10	18	0.24
Perkins Gulch North Fork	NF1 A	status unknown	48	20	33	nonfunctional	1	3	6	0.16
Perkins Gulch North Fork	NF2 A	status unknown	67	73	70	functional at risk	4	5	16	0.16
Perkins Gulch South Fork	SF A	status unknown	67	70	68	functional at risk	6	4	12	0.12
Perkins Gulch South Fork	SF B	static	74	83	79	functional at risk	6	5	16	0.13
Peterson Crk	V	static	59	57	58	nonfunctional	3	5	8	0.07
Peterson Crk	W	degrading	44	33	39	nonfunctional	4	4	6	0.01
Peterson Crk East Fork	EF A	degrading	63	70	67	functional at risk	6	4	12	0.20
Peterson Crk East Fork	EF B	degrading	52	57	54	nonfunctional	6	2	8	0.80
Peterson Crk East Fork	EF C	status unknown	73	63	67	functional at risk	6	12	8	0.08
Peterson Crk Northeast Fork	NEF A	degrading	59	70	65	functional at risk	6	5	12	0.62
Peterson Crk Northeast Fork	NEF B	degrading	37	0	18	nonfunctional	4	3	0	0.20
Spring Crk (Peterson tributary)	SC C	static	63	90	77	functional at risk	4	5	18	0.02
Spring Crk (Peterson tributary)	SC D	degrading	56	70	63	functional at risk	4	5	12	0.53
Spring Crk (Peterson tributary)	SC E	static	85	100	93	PFC	6	12	18	0.28

1- Polygon locations can be identified by GIS file or by spreadsheet available from the WRC.
2- A score of 33% or less in this column indicates a specific cause of impairment shown in figures IIB-4, IIB-4, IIB-6.