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INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

This Decision Notice (DN) documents my decision and rationale for approving the proposed projects on the Dillon Ranger District, White River National Forest (WRNF). My decision is based on and supported by the November 2020 Keystone Bergman Bowl Enhancement Projects Environmental Assessment (EA). The project area is located within the Keystone Resort (Keystone) special use permit (SUP) and existing operational boundary in Summit County, Colorado.

The WRNF Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) provides general standards and guidelines for the operation of Keystone regarding its activities and operations on National Forest System (NFS) lands. The SUP and associated summer and winter operating plans, as well as other resource management documents, provide more specific guidance for annual winter and summer ski area operations and projects.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

The purpose of the proposed action is to better meet the demands of destination visitors while appealing to the needs and desires of Keystone's day-use clientele.

The proposed action is needed to:

- Better utilize the existing terrain within Keystone's operational boundary and SUP area;
- Reduce overcrowding by redistributing skiers from the front side of the mountain;
- Improve circulation between key terrain pods; and
- Increase terrain variety for a range of ability levels, while providing an above tree line skiing experience that does not currently exist for lower ability level guests.

DECISION AND REASONS FOR THE DECISION

After thoroughly considering the purpose and need for action, issues, range of alternatives, and analyses presented in the EA, as well as public comments received, I am approving alternative 3, which includes the project specific design criteria (PDC) and lynx conservation measures (identified in Table 2-1 of the EA and Appendix A in this DN) and the WRNF Mountain Sports Program – Ski Area General Design Criteria (GDC) posted on the project webpage. The selected alternative will include the installation of one chairlift in Bergman Bowl combined with trail development, timber removal, and terrain modifications that will provide enhanced access to Bergman Bowl and Erickson Bowl.

Subsequent to the combined scoping and opportunity to comment period, the proposed action was modified and alternative 3 was created to respond to resource concerns raised internally by an Interdisciplinary Team (ID Team) comprised of Forest Service resource specialists and externally by the public. In a collaborative effort between the WRNF and Keystone, the planning and design of the action alternatives reduced the disturbance footprint of the project compared to that proposed in the notice of proposed action (NOPA). Ultimately, the analysis showed that these efforts reduced environmental impacts to wetland, wildlife, and soil and watershed resources while still addressing the purpose and need. Refer to Section 1.4 of the EA for a discussion of relevant changes to the proposed action that occurred since the publication of the NOPA.
Rationale for My Decision

In reaching my decision I relied heavily upon ID Team resource specialists who analyzed the effects of the selected alternative as documented in the EA. I considered the following issues and concerns: effects to wildlife/fish, vegetation, wetland, soils, watershed, scenery, recreation, and traffic and parking resources. I recognize that certain resources were not carried forward in detailed analysis for the EA; however, those resources were considered by the ID Team and eliminated from detailed analysis with supporting rationale. These resources and their rationale for elimination is included in the Issues and Resources Considered but Not Carried Forward document available on the project webpage. I also reviewed the PDC included in the EA as well as public comments received during the 30-day scoping/comment period and considered how the selected alternative will respond to the stated purpose and need.

In the context of the existing developed conditions at Keystone and the potential benefits to visitors of the WRNF and to local communities, I believe the long-term benefits of the project outweigh the potential costs. Overall, I feel my decision will improve the experience of guests to the National Forest within the Keystone SUP area.

The following paragraphs describe some of the most important resource issues that were considered in reaching my decision.

Wetlands

Commenters expressed concern over impacts to wetlands in proximity to permanent infrastructure (e.g., Bergman Bowl lift, skier bridge, permanent construction and maintenance access road). In response to these concerns and in accordance with Executive Order 11990, the selected alternative was developed to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands wherever possible. This includes revisions to the project proposed in the NOPA reconfiguring the proposed lift towers and bottom terminal, skier bridge, and construction and maintenance access road outside of wetlands identified in the project area. Through a two-year planning process and in coordination with Keystone, the project avoids all direct impacts to wetlands, including impacts to wetland fens or wetlands directly adjacent to fens. This precludes the need for an individual wetland permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers or any in-kind wetland mitigation or replacement. In addition, the selected alternative reduces indirect impacts to wetlands by eliminating tree removal over wetlands in several locations. With implementation of the various PDC and GDC, I anticipate indirect impacts to wetlands due to tree removal to be minimal.

Canada Lynx

Commenters expressed concern over impacts to wildlife in the project area, particularly Canada lynx (Lynx canadensis). In response to these concerns, numerous revisions were incorporated into the selected alternative to reduce the amount of tree removal and glading in Canada lynx habitat. As compared to the project proposed in the NOPA, the selected alternative will reduce glading by approximately 19 acres and tree clearing by approximately 10 acres. The selected alternative will maintain habitat connectivity within the South Summit Lynx Analysis Unit (LAU) and between this and other LAUs and is consistent with the ALL S1 Standard as described in the Southern Rockies Lynx Amendment (SRLA). The selected alternative is also consistent with all other relevant guidelines of the SRLA. Further, implementation of an Independence Bowl Operations and Ski Patrol Management Plan and lynx monitoring, detailed in Table 2-1 of the EA and Appendix A, will ensure that additional skier traffic does not occur into...
Jones Gulch and the Management Area 5.5 – Forested Landscape Linkages adjacent to the operational boundary. Collectively, the selected alternative will have minimal effects on lynx and will not compromise the ability of the South Summit Lynx Analysis Unit (LAU) to support traveling lynx. As a result, it has been determined that the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect Canada lynx. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has been engaged in informal consultation and will provide a letter of concurrence for this determination prior to the WRNF issuing a final decision document.

**Soils and Watershed**

I recognize that internal and external comments have expressed concern over impacts to soil and watershed resources in the project area. In response to these concerns, numerous revisions were incorporated into the selected alternative to reduce the amount of grading and tree clearing. As compared to the project proposed in the NOPA, the selected alternative will reduce grading by approximately 6.6 acres and tree clearing by approximately 10 acres. Revisions include changes to the proposed lift terminals, realignment of proposed ski trails, relocation of the proposed skier bridge, and realignment of the proposed construction and maintenance access road. Ground disturbing activities associated with the selected alternative would result in impacts to soil and watershed resources related to sedimentation and erosion; however, I believe that implementation of GDC and PDC described in Table 2-1 of the EA and Appendix A would reduce and minimize any potential impacts. PDC include the development and implementation of a drainage management plan and a revegetation plan, which will further reduce impacts to watershed and soil resources and ensure that the project area is restored to a suitable condition following project implementation.

**Recreation**

The selected alternative will benefit winter recreation resources at Keystone and on the WRNF. It will improve access to the eastern extent of Keystone’s SUP area by providing additional lift-served ski terrain, snowmaking, and guest support facilities in Bergman and Erickson bowls. Dercum Mountain currently offers most of the intermediate terrain and all the beginner terrain at Keystone, as well as serves as a transition area for all guests moving to and from North Peak and the Outback. As the current configuration results in congestion issues, a lift serving the high alpine terrain in Bergman Bowl will distribute skiers across an increased amount of beginner and intermediate terrain. The Bergman Bowl lift will supplement the existing lift network by providing guests more options for circulating among Dercum Mountain, North Peak, and the Outback. Guests of lower ability levels will have the opportunity to ski in new settings with "big mountain" views and experiences when compared to Dercum Mountain. The selected alternative is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Keystone’s accepted 2009 Master Development Plan (MDP), which largely focused on addressing constraints associated with skier circulation and the underutilization of high alpine terrain. Furthermore, the theme identified for Management Area 8.25 in the Forest Plan states, “ski areas are developed and operated by the private sector to provide opportunities for intensively managed outdoor recreation activities during all seasons of the year.” Development of Keystone for these recreational opportunities is in line with this theme and, therefore, the selected alternative is in accordance with the Forest Plan.
Selected Alternative Description

A detailed description of the individual project components follows. All components of the selected alternative will occur within Keystone’s existing operating boundary and SUP area and are depicted on the attached DN Figure 1: Selected Alternative, DN Figure 2: Selected Alternative – Snowmaking, and DN Figure 3: Selected Alternative – Construction Plan. The selected alternative would require approximately 16.6 acres of grading, approximately 60 acres of tree clearing, and approximately 21 acres of glading.

Bergman Bowl Lift

The Bergman Bowl lift is approved to access terrain in Bergman and Erickson bowls, which are currently skied regularly and accessed by hiking or snowcat. The approved lift will be a detachable chairlift with a capacity of approximately 2,400 people per hour. It will be located in the center of Bergman Bowl, with the top terminal situated above tree line, at an elevation of approximately 12,300 feet. The bottom terminal will be located below tree line, at an elevation of approximately 11,300 feet. In addition to the top and bottom terminals, there will be approximately 20 to 25 lift towers required for this project.

The Bergman Bowl lift will serve approximately 555 acres of terrain including the existing undeveloped natural features that are currently accessible, and the traditional developed ski trails and gladed ski trails that will be incorporated into the enhanced Bergman Bowl terrain network under the selected alternative. From the top of the approved Bergman Bowl lift, guests will be able to reach the Outpost Restaurant and existing terrain on North Peak. Guests of lower ability levels will be encouraged to return to Dercum Mountain primarily via the Outpost gondola; however, the Ruby Express could be used for those guests capable of

skiing intermediate terrain to the bottom of the North Peak terrain network. Guests with expert skiing ability will also have the option to access Erickson Bowl and ski down to the Outback Express or Wayback lift.

Power and telecommunication lines for the bottom terminal of Bergman Bowl lift will be sourced from existing infrastructure at Labonte’s Restaurant and installed within the approved construction and maintenance access road. In order to provide adequate power, the existing powerline, which extends from Labonte’s Restaurant, up Starfire trail to the Outpost Restaurant, will be replaced in the same alignment. There will be no permanent road or trenched in utilities implemented for the top terminal of Bergman Bowl lift.

Bergman Bowl and Erickson Bowl Terrain Enhancements

The approved Bergman Bowl terrain network will include 13 ski trails in Bergman Bowl and 3 ski trails in Erickson Bowl. The approved terrain will consist of undeveloped terrain above tree line, gladed terrain, and traditional developed runs. In addition to the 13 developed trails in Bergman Bowl, approximately 4 acres of glading will occur within two 100- to 150-foot corridors along the northern extent of the approved terrain network to add to the variety of terrain types in the area. A skier bridge or large culvert will be installed to allow skiers utilizing the northern extent of the approved network to cross a drainage and return to the bottom terminal of the approved Bergman Bowl lift.

Within Erickson Bowl, trees will be removed to create 3 expert ski trails below tree line, enabling direct egress and circulation back to the Outback Express or Wayback lift. Five 100- to 150-foot gladed corridors are approved to be implemented adjacent to the developed trails totaling approximately 10 acres. An additional 7-acre gladed area is also approved to be implemented adjacent to
approved trail 16-15U for a total of approximately 17 acres of gladed terrain in Erickson Bowl. Existing vegetation in these areas will be reduced by no more than 15 percent.

The existing snowcat guided skiing and shuttle programs will continue to operate in Bergman, Erickson, and Independence bowls until project completion and this program will continue in Independence Bowl after project completion. Aside from eventually being phased out of Bergman and Erickson bowls, there are no approved modifications to existing snowcat operations associated with this project.

**Snowmaking**

The selected alternative includes the implementation of approximately 20 acres of snowmaking coverage, which will increase Keystone’s average annual water withdrawals by approximately 33 acre-feet of water. The approved snowmaking coverage will occur on approved beginner and intermediate ski trails in Bergman Bowl. The approved snowmaking coverage will be located on approved trails 16-08 and 16-09, which include the beginner ski trail connecting the Outpost Restaurant with the approved bottom terminal of Bergman Bowl lift and the intermediate trail extending from the approved bottom terminal to Prospector trail. Additional coverage will be applied to approved trail 16-10, which follows the ridgeline between the approved top terminal of Bergman Bowl lift and the Outpost Restaurant. This portion of approved coverage will begin just above tree line and end at the Outpost Restaurant.

Approximately 8,100 feet of snowmaking pipe will be trenched into approved ski trails with snowmaking coverage, resulting in approximately 8.5 acres of temporary ground disturbance. To accommodate the additional approved snowmaking in Bergman Bowl, Keystone will need to replace an existing snowmaking line located within the Anticipation ski trail to increase its capacity. Additional upgrades to existing snowmaking infrastructure may be required to accommodate the proposed snowmaking increase including pump and valve replacements and a pump booster station located within the disturbance footprint of the Outpost Restaurant expansion. Disturbed areas will be restored and revegetated immediately following implementation.

**Construction and Maintenance Access Road**

Included in the selected alternative is an approximately 2,140-foot permanent construction and maintenance access road to provide access to the bottom terminal of the approved Bergman Bowl lift. The approved construction and maintenance access road will start on the north side of the Outpost Restaurant and follow approved trail 16-08 to the bottom terminal of the Bergman Bowl lift. Construction of the road will require approximately 2 acres of grading and tree clearing. The road will be designed with rolling grades and waterbars for drainage.

**Ski Patrol Facility**

Included in the selected alternative is a small ski patrol facility located adjacent to the top terminal of the approved Bergman Bowl lift. The approved facility will be approximately 1,000 square feet in size. Construction of the facility and the top terminal of the approved Bergman Bowl lift will require approximately 1 acre of grading. The facility will be designed to be constructed and operated off the grid, without an access road or trenched in utilities. The architectural style of the facility will be designed to blend with the surrounding landscape and will be reviewed and approved by the Forest Service to ensure consistency with Forest Plan guidelines.
Outpost Restaurant Expansion

In order to accommodate a greater percentage of guests circulating through the project area, the selected alternative includes the expansion of the Outpost Restaurant and deck. The approved expansion will increase the seating capacity of the facility by 300 interior seats and 75 exterior seats, consistent with the 2009 MDP.

The approved expansion project will occur on the south side of the Outpost Restaurant and provide approximately 6,000 square feet of space for guest services including restaurant seating and restrooms. The area around the building will be regraded to accommodate skier egress out of Bergman Bowl and the existing Fox Trot road will be relocated to the north side of the restaurant. In total, the project will require just over an acre of grading. Construction access will be facilitated by the existing Fox Trot road. Architectural styles of the restaurant expansion will be designed to match the existing facade of the current structure and will be reviewed by the Forest Service to ensure consistency with Forest Plan guidelines.

General Construction Plans

General construction plans including construction access and staging, and timber removal are depicted in DN Figure 3. While timber removal and construction methodologies are subject to change based on field conditions discovered during project implementation, the locations of disturbance for staging and construction access routes, as well as the types of routes, are specifically approved in this document. Low impact timber removal and construction methodologies would be utilized as much as possible.

Access

The approved construction and maintenance access road will provide construction access to the bottom terminal of the approved Bergman Bowl lift. Temporary construction routes will facilitate the construction of project components uphill of the bottom terminal (e.g., lift towers, skier bridge, and timber removal for ski terrain). The temporary construction routes will be located within the disturbance footprint of approved ski trails and will not require earthwork, with the exception of one approximately 1,830-foot route segment which will cross Bergman Bowl uphill of the approved bottom lift terminal. This segment will require spot grading and incidental tree removal, resulting in approximately 0.5 acre of temporary ground disturbance. A minimal construction route will not require grading. During construction, materials and machinery will be staged in designated construction staging areas located within the disturbance footprint of the top lift terminal, the permanent construction and maintenance access road, the temporary construction access routes, and approved ski trails. The temporary construction access routes, minimal construction route, and construction staging areas will be restored and revegetated immediately following implementation of the selected alternative. Construction of the lift, skier bridge, and ski patrol facility will be facilitated by low impact equipment such as a helicopter and spider hoe to the greatest extent possible.

Tree Removal

Tree removal methods are subject to change based on conditions discovered in the field during project implementation. Tree removal methods will include over-snow skidding, traditional over-ground skidding, and helicopter removal/piling and burning. DN Figure 3 identifies areas in which different tree removal methods would be appropriate.
based on access limitations such as slope steepness or wetlands. Over-snow skidding will be utilized in areas that are inappropriate for skidding due to the presence of wetlands. Traditional over-ground skidding will be utilized in areas that are flat and dry. Helicopter removal/piling and burning will be utilized for the approved ski trails and glades in Erickson Bowl, the approved glades in Bergman Bowl and for any area that is too steep for traditional over-ground/snow skidding. Helicopter landing zones will be located at the Outpost Restaurant, Labonte’s Restaurant, and other pre-established locations in and adjacent to the project area. Low impact machinery, such as spider hoes, will be utilized as much as possible. Piling and burning may be used as a secondary approach to vegetation removal. Protocols for piling and burning would follow established Forest Service and State requirements.

Timber will be transported to log decks established along the construction access road and the approved ski trails and will be transported out of the project area using logging trucks. Road improvements will be required on the existing Fox Trot road for logging trucks to access the project area.

In addition to timber removed specifically for this project, hazard trees would likely be removed following project implementation to facilitate safe operation of the proposed terrain, particularly in Erickson Bowl which has a high number of dead trees. Typical ski area practices for operating lift-served terrain, including the removal of hazard trees for the safety of the skiing public, would be authorized through the resort operating plan or summer construction plan. As this terrain is already with Keystone’s operating boundary, hazard tree removal is currently permissible, but would likely be increased to accommodate developed ski trails and a greater number of users in the area.

**Design Criteria and Lynx Conservation Measures**

GDC and PDC have been applied to avoid and minimize potential resource impacts from construction and operation of the selected alternative. PDC and lynx conservation measures are identified in Table 2-1 of the EA and Appendix A of this document; GDC apply to all ski area projects on the WRNF and are available on the project webpage.

**OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires that a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed action be developed and analyzed. Alternatives must meet the purpose and need of the project while responding to issues identified during scoping. In response to internal and external comments received during the combined scoping and opportunity to comment period, numerous alternatives were considered by the WRNF early in the NEPA process. Ultimately only one alternative to the proposed action, alternative 3, was analyzed alongside the proposed action in the EA. Alternatives considered but dismissed from detailed analysis in the EA are discussed in Section 2.2 of the EA and in the Response to Comments document available on the project webpage. In accordance with Forest Service Handbook 1909.15, Chapter 40, Section 41.22, and 36 CFR § 220.7(b)(2)(i), the EA did not include an analysis of the no action alternative.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Formal public scoping began in May 2020. A NOPA was shared with 91 community residents, interested individuals, public agencies, tribal governments, and other organizations, and was also made available on the project webpage. The NOPA was
specifically designed to summarize the proposed action, and elicit comments, concerns, and issues pertaining to the proposed action. A legal notice was published on May 1, 2020 in the Glenwood Springs Post Independent, the newspaper of record for the WRNF, announcing the opportunity to comment on the proposed action and initiating a combined scoping and opportunity to comment period for the project. The combined scoping and opportunity to comment period closed on May 30, 2020.

Prior to the combined scoping and opportunity to comment period, the Forest Service assembled and engaged with focus groups on key issues (traffic and parking, wildlife, soils and watershed) that were comprised of external stakeholders. The goal of the focus group meetings was to establish a baseline understanding of resource concerns within the project area and refine project components to address these resource concerns. The analysis and the design of the project itself were in part tailored to some of the specific concerns that came out of these meetings. Many of the focus group attendees participated in the comment period and remained engaged throughout the process.

Twenty-six comment letters were received during the combined scoping and opportunity to comment period, and were then utilized by the ID Team to identify substantive issues and consider potential alternatives to the selected alternative. I considered these comments and the ID Team provided a response to them and in the Response to Comments document available on the project webpage. After reviewing public comments, as well as internal concerns raised by Forest Service specialists, a final list of issues assembled to help guide the subsequent analysis in the EA. Issues are identified in Chapter 1 of the EA.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

After considering the environmental effects described in the EA, I determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (according to 40 CFR §1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared. Refer to Appendix B of the EA for the explanation of the Finding of No Significant Impact.

FINDINGS REQUIREMENT BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

This decision is consistent with the Forest Plan as required by the National Forest Management Act of 1976 and all other laws, regulations, and policies that govern Forest Service actions. Site-specific PDC and Forest Plan standards and guidelines will be applied, as appropriate, to meet Forest Plan goals and desired conditions. While the Forest Service assumes no responsibility or enforcing laws, regulations, or ordinances under the jurisdiction of other governmental agencies, Forest Service regulations require permittees to abide by applicable laws and conditions imposed by other jurisdictions. The project was designed to conform to the Forest Plan and all other laws, regulations, and policies, including:

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife’s Endangered Species Act Informal Section 7 Consultation;
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Clean Water Act 404 Permit;
- State of Colorado’s Burn Permit;
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands; and
- Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management.
OPPORTUNITY TO OBJECT TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This decision is subject to the objection processes pursuant to 36 CFR § 218.8 (project-level components objection), subparts A and B. Objections will only be accepted from those who have previously submitted specific written or substantive formal comments regarding the approved project during a comment period in accordance with 36 CFR § 218.5(a). Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted, timely, and specific written or substantive formal comments regarding the approved project, unless based on additional information arising after the designated comment opportunities.

Incorporation of documents by reference is not allowed, except for the following items that may be referenced by including date, page, and section of the cited document, along with a description of its content and applicability to the objection: 1) All or any part of a federal law or regulation; 2) Forest Service directives and land management plans; 3) Documents referenced by the Forest Service in the approved project environmental analysis document that is subject to objection. All other documents must be included with the objection.

Objections, including attachments, should be filed electronically or via mail as the Dillon Ranger District office is closed to the public due to the pandemic. Electronic objections may be submitted online at SM.FS.r02admin-rev@usda.gov. Electronic objections must be submitted in a format such as an e-mail message, plain text (.txt), portable document format (.pdf), rich text format (.rtf), or MS Word (.doc). In cases where no identifiable name is attached to an electronic message, a verification of identity will be required. A scanned signature is one way to provide verification.

To file objections via mail, send to:
Lisa Stoeffler, Acting Forest Supervisor
c/o Sam Massman, Project Leader
Dillon Ranger District
PO Box 620
Silverthorne, CO 80498

At a minimum, an objection must include the following: objector’s name and physical mailing address; signature or other verification of authorship upon request; identification of the lead objector when multiple names are listed; name of the approved project; name and title of responsible official; and name of national forest unit(s) on which the project will be implemented (36 CFR § 218.8(d)).

Objections must be submitted within 45 calendar days following the publication of a legal notice in the Glenwood Springs Post Independent. The publication date in the newspaper of record is the exclusive means for calculating the time to file an objection. Those wishing to object should not rely upon dates or timeframe information provided by any other source. The regulations prohibit extending the time to file an objection.

It is the objector’s responsibility to ensure timely filing of a written objection with the reviewing officer pursuant to 36 CFR § 218.9, which includes: date of U.S. Postal Service postmark or shipping date for delivery by private carrier for an objection received before the close of the fifth business day after the objection filing period; agency’s electronically generated date and time for email and facsimiles; or official agency date stamp showing receipt of hand delivery. All objections are available for public inspection during and after the objection process.
IMPLEMENTATION DATE

Implementation of this decision may occur on, but not before, five (5) business days from the close of the objection filing period.

CONTACT

For additional information concerning this decision, contact:

Sam Massman
Mountain Sports Administrator
Dillon Ranger District
White River National Forest
samuel.massman@usda.gov
(970) 309-3268

To remain unsigned until final Decision

LISA STOEFFLER
Acting Forest Supervisor
White River National Forest

Date
APPENDIX A. PROJECT-SPECIFIC DESIGN CRITERIA

Project-Specific Design Criteria and Lynx Conservation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT PHASE</th>
<th>PROJECT-SPECIFIC DESIGN CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on resource analysis, and building off of GDC, it has been determined that the following plans will be prepared prior to project implementation and reviewed by the Forest Service. At this point it is anticipated that plans will be finalized between draft and final decision. These plans may encompass additional design measures; however, the findings presented in the analysis is not hinged on any measure not currently presented in this table or the action alternatives themselves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Construction Implementation Plan: All proposed construction methodologies and practices would be reviewed for compliance with the decision and resource management direction. This plan shall include project timelines, project contracts, disturbance boundaries and any required survey information. Detailed grading and site plans have been prepared and staging and parking areas and construction access are identified on Figure 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Timber Management: Any refinement of planned logging deck areas, access, and skid paths, and protocol for timber removal as preliminarily identified on Figure 5 would occur in this plan. This plan would also define pile burning areas and any contracting needed to remove timber and other forest products from NFS lands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Drainage Management Plan (DMP): Keystone, the Forest Service, and the consultant team have started developing a plan that would specify the design, construction and maintenance of features such as ski trail terrain enhancements, waterbars, drainage ditches, and erosion and sediment control BMPs. A monitoring plan would be detailed to ensure stream health is maintained and that the implemented drainage features and associated BMPs are performing as designed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Revegetation and Restoration Plan: Keystone, the Forest Service, and the consultant team have started developing a post-construction revegetation, restoration and monitoring plan that would be in effect until the project area is restored to applicable Forest Service standards. The plan would address turf salvage, storage, preservation, and replacement for all proposed grading areas in the alpine containing turf. The plan would include methodology, locations, vegetative mixes, and soil amendments. Weed control methodologies including equipment cleaning, pretreatment, and post-construction monitoring and treatment would be disclosed in this plan as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to prevent the proposed snowmaking and drainage pipelines from dewatering wetlands, an impermeable construction technique (e.g., PVC liner, clay cutoff wall) would be installed if the excavated pipeline trench encounters high groundwater adjacent to wetland(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a three-year wetland monitoring plan for those wetlands indirectly impacted by forest overstory removal. Monitoring should include a concise qualitative assessment of wetland health and plant species composition as well as year-to-year photographic record. If adverse impacts to wetlands are observed, then the Forest Service shall be notified and remedial measures to correct the adverse impact would be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Lynx Conservation Measures

### During Construction

Take a phased approach to vegetation removal in areas identified for glading, removing the minimum amount of trees necessary to create the desired skiing condition. Conduct tree removal in iterations until adequate tree density is reached.

### Post Construction

1. Keystone would develop an Independence Bowl Operations and Ski Patrol Management Plan to ensure that additional skier traffic does not occur into Jones Gulch adjacent the operational boundary. This plan should describe both physical closures and operational measures to be taken. Prior to implementation of any activities authorized by this decision, this plan would be reviewed by the Forest Service. A copy of this draft plan is included in Appendix C of the Wildlife BA. This plan will be finalized and incorporated into the operating plan prior to operation of lift-served terrain in Bergman Bowl.

2. To ensure continued consistency with Southern Rockies Lynx Amendment (SRLA) ALL S1 monitoring within the Jones Gulch corridor will occur following implementation of the Bergman Bowl lift. Should problematic levels of skier use in Jones Gulch be documented, then the Forest Service will contact USFWS and assess the need for reinitiating consultation. Details of Jones Gulch monitoring are included in the Independence Bowl Operations and Ski Patrol Management Plan referenced in the measure above.

3. Although summer uses are not included in this proposal, authorization of this project precludes future summer projects from being proposed within the project area. Existing summer uses such as hiking and weddings at the Outback would continue.

4. Operation of the Bergman Bowl lift would conclude by May 1st annually.
Bergman Bowl Enhancement Projects
ON Figure 3: Selected Alternative Construction Plan
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Note: Timber removal and construction methodologies are subject to change based on field conditions discovered during project implementation.
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