


**Table 4.3-1
Road Characteristics in the Bridger Bowl Study Area**

Parameter	Alternative 1 Existing Conditions	Alternative 2 Proposed Impacts	Alternative 3 Proposed Impacts	Alternative 4 Proposed Impacts
Number of Road Stream Crossings				
Perennial	5	+1	0	+1
Intermittent	24	0	0	0
Total Road Stream Crossings	29	+1	0	+1
Length of Roads in Study Area				
Roads on NFS Lands (miles)	8.6	+1.4	+0.8	+0.9
Roads on Private Lands (miles)	7.3	+0.4	+0.2	+0.3
Total Roads in the Study Area (mi.)	15.9	+1.8	+1.0	+1.1
Road Density in Study Area (mile/mile ²)	4.0	+0.4	+0.3	+0.3

Induced sedimentation from the proposed developments and disturbances in the watersheds draining the Study Area was evaluated using the R1R4 model (Cline et al., 1981). In order to run the R1R4 model for SF Brackett Creek, Upper Bridger Creek, Maynard Creek, and Slushman Creek, all existing watershed disturbances were factored by date for all of the different land cover types (roads, timber harvest units, ski trails, ski area facilities, parking lots, etc.). The results of the analyses are presented in the Geology and Soil Resources section and summarized in Table 4.2-3. The sediment model results indicate that under Alternative 2, a total of 9.1 tons per year more sediment would be delivered to the aforementioned streams, which is a 2.2 percent increase over existing conditions.

Wetlands



Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, calls for the identification, assessment, and protection of wetlands by requiring Federal agencies to avoid, if possible and practicable, adverse impacts to wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. As shown in Table 4.3-2, there would be no grading impacts to wetlands under Alternative 2 and there would be a total of 0.48 acres of clearing in wetlands within the Study Area. For any vegetation removal that is done in wetlands, the clearing prescription in Chapter 2 states that trees would be cut flush to the ground, the stumps would not be removed, and trees would be moved by dragging them out over the snow. In addition mitigation measures VM-3, VM-4, and VM-6 have been developed to avoid and/or minimize direct and incidental indirect impacts to wetlands (see Table 2.6-1). Due to the location of wetlands within the Study Area, the clearing prescriptions, and proposed mitigation measures, there would be no significant adverse impacts to wetlands under Alternative 2. All Army COE wetland regulatory requirements will be met. This will consist of a COE determination prior to construction if the alder trimmings are considered a "fill" and if so whether nationwide permit #33 (temporary construction) or #42 (recreational facilities) is appropriate.