

# BURNED AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13, Report FS-2500-A)

Date of Report

Sept. 21, 1987

## PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

## 1. Type of Report

A. ☒ Funding (Request for estimated FFF funds)B. ☐ Accomplishment Report

## 2. Type of Action

A. ☒ Initial (estimated funding is first requested)B. ☐ Interima. ☐ Updating the initial funding requestb. ☐ Supplying information for accomplishments to date on emergency work underwayC. ☐ Finala. ☐ Best estimate for funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measureb. ☐ Following completion of funded work

## PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire Name (From Form FS-5100-29)

Cove Creek

2. Forest Supervisor's Fire No. (From FS-5100-29)

129

3. State

Idaho

4. County

Idaho

5. Region

1

6. Forest

Nez Perce

7. Ranger District

Red River

8. Date Fire Started

Sept. 12, 87

9. Date Fire Controlled

Sept. 19, 1987

10. Estimated Suppression

\$ 650,000

11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds

a. 5.5 miles (firelines waterbarred)

b. 0 acres (firelines seeded)

c. Other (identify)

12. Fire Intensity

a. 80 % (low)

b. 10 % (medium)

c. 10 % (high)

## PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed No.

See \*

2. NFS Acres Burned

5300

3. Water Repellant Soil

43

% of NFS acres burned compared to 25% on unburned area.

4. Vegetation Types

40% Ponderosa pine/Idaho fescue h.t.  
 20% Douglas fir/mallow ninebark h.t.  
 40% Idaho fescue/bluebunch wheatgrass h.t.

5. Geologic Types

Granitics and gneiss

6. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating

a. 0 % (low)

b. 87 % (medium)

c. 13 % (high)

7. Erosion Potential

90 cu. yds/sq. miles

8. Miles of Stream Channels By Regional Order or Classes

1st order - 5.2 miles 7th order - 3.9 miles

9. Miles of Forest Service Trails

1

10. Miles of Forest Service Roads By Maintenance Levels

a. miles (Level I)

b. 4.7 miles (Level II)

c. miles (Levels III, IV, V)

## PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period (Years)

2

2. Chance of Success Desired By Management (Percent)

90

3. Equivalent Design Recurrence Period (Years)

100

----Intense Convective Storm----

1/2

4. Related Design Storm Magnitude (Inches)

Precipitation - Frequency Atlas

0.90 for Idaho

6. Related Design Flow (cfsm)

Water Supply Paper #1688--100 Year Return  
 Interval 55

7. Estimated Reduction In Infiltration (Percent)

50 (Initial only)

8. Adjusted Related Design Flow (cfsm)

83

# PART V - SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills Represented on Burned Area Survey Team (x appropriate boxes)

- a. ☐ Hydrology    b. ☒ Soils    c. ☐ Geology    d. ☐ Range    e. ☒ Timber    f. ☐ Wildlife  
g. ☐ Fire Mgmt.    h. ☐ Engineering    i. ☐ Contracting    j. ☐ Local Mgmt.    k. ☐ Research    l. ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_  
(Identify)

2. Describe Emergency

No emergency exists.  
Management objectives (See #3-will be met through natural recovery processes.)

3. Emergency Rehabilitation Objective

- Maintain soil productivity at existing or near existing level.
- Maintain the stability and integrity of Cove Creek.
- Maintain the water quality in Cove Creek for fishery and other beneficial uses.

4. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage Producing Storm

a. 80 % (land)    b. NA % (channel)    c. 90 % (roads)    d. NA % (other) \_\_\_\_\_  
(Identify)

5. Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index

- a. ☐ Significant    b. ☒ Not Significant

6. Net Social Well Being Benefit Index

- a. ☐ Significant    b. ☐ Not Significant

7. Benefit/Cost Ratio

8. Net Benefits

9. Cost Effectiveness Index

- a. ☐ I    b. ☐ II    c. ☐ III    d. ☐ IV

## PART VI - ELIGIBLE EMERGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS & SOURCE OF FUNDS

Note: Emergency rehabilitation is work done promptly following a wildfire and is not to solve watershed problems that existed prior to the wildfire.

Line Items (1)	Units (2)	Unit Cost (3)	NFS Lands			Other Lands			All Lands Total \$ (10)
			No. of Units (4)	FFF 092 \$ (5)	Other \$ (Identify) (6)	No. of Units (7)	Federal \$ (Identify) (8)	Non-Federal \$ (Identify) (9)	
A. LAND	a. Seeding	Acres							
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
B. CHANNELS	a. Opening water courses	Miles							
	b. Stabilizing Streambanks	Miles							
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
C. ROADS & TRAILS	a.								
	b.								
	c.								
	d.								
	e.								
D. MAJOR STRUCTURES									
a. Preplanned - from Forest Plans									
E. TOTAL									

## PART VII - APPROVALS

1. Forest Supervisor (Signature)

2. Date

3. Regional Forester (Signature)

2. Date

Table 1.--Environmental quality benefit index

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Environmental	Weighting	Without treatment	Weighted	With treatment	Weighted	Net difference	
quality	factor	Adverse	value	Adverse	value	Benefit index	Weighted
criteria	1-10	effect		effect		(0-2)	value
		index		index			
		(0-2)		(0-2)			

Erosion and sediment	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Asthetic land quality	5	1	5	1	5	0	0
Water quality	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Site productivity	5	1	5	1	5	0	0
Fish Habitat	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Wildlife Habitat	10	1	10	1	10	0	0

Other

Total 50 50 50

Average Weighted Index 1

Net Environmental Quality Index = 0

Significance Index

0.7 or higher = Significant Benefits (S)  
Less than 0.7=No Significant Benefit (NS)

Adverse Effect Index (with and without treatment)

0 = No or little expected damage  
1 = Moderate potential damage  
2 = High potential damage