United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Nez Perce NF

REPLY TO: 2520 Date: November 29, 1988

SUBJECT: Burned Area Report - Upper Bear Fire

TO: Regional Forester

Enclosed for your records is the Burned Area Report for the Upper Bear Fire.

No emergency exists and we are not requesting any funds for emergency rehabilitation.

/s/ Joe Bednorz (for)

TOM KOVALICKY
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Moose Creek RD
P. Green

BURNED AREA REPORT DATE: Nov. 21, 1988

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. A. Funding Request
2. A. Initial

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: UPPER BEAR
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 042
3. State: IDAHO (AND MONTANA)
4. County: IDAHO (AND RAVALLI)
5. Region: 01
6. Forest: NEZ PERCE (AND BITTERROOT)
7. Ranger District: MOOSE CREEK (06) (AND DARBY (02))
8. Date Started: AUGUST 13, 1988
9. Date Controlled: NOVEMBER 3, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: COSTS ARE INCLUDED IN TOTAL OF $1,120,000 FOR MOOSE CREEK INCIDENT: INCLUDES BURNED AREA REPORTS FOR FREEMAN TRAIL, FOOTSTOOL, GARDINER AND UPPER BEAR.
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
    a. . 0 . miles of firelines waterbarred
    b. . 0 . acres of firelines seeded
    c. . . . other (identify)_____
12. Fire intensity 65 % low 40 % medium 5 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060301-03-02, -04 (AND 1701020505D ON BITTERROOT)
2. NFS acres burned: 5180 (ABOUT 3280 ACRES ON NEZ PERCE AND 1900 ON BITTERROOT)
3. Water repellant soil: 60 % NFS acres burned BASED ON SIMILAR FIRES IN SIMILAR VEGETATIVE TYPES.
4. Vegetation types: WHITEBARK PINE, SUBALPINE FIR, DOUGLAS-FIR
5. Geologic types: GRANITE
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 55 % low 40 % medium 5 % high
7. Erosion potential: 72.8 cu.yd./sq.mi.
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: (1) 9.8 (2) 2.8
9. Miles FS trails: .5
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level:
    a. (level I) b. 2.5 ON BITTERROOT (level II)
    c. (level III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 3 years
2. Chance of success desired by management: 90 %
3. Equivalent design recurrence: 100 years
4. Related design storm duration: 1/2 hours
5. Related design storm magnitude: .75 inches
5. Related design flow: 73 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 20 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 88 cfsm

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills represented on burned area survey team (list as appropriate):
   SOILS, HYDROLOGY, FIRE

2. Describe emergency: NO EMERGENCY EXISTS. MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES IN (3) CAN BE MET THROUGH NATURAL RECOVERY PROCESSES.

3. Emergency rehabilitation objective:
   A. MAINTAIN SOIL PRODUCTIVITY AT EXISTING OR NEAR EXISTING LEVELS.
   B. MAINTAIN STABILITY AND INTREGITY OF GRANITE CREEK, BEAR CREEK, LOST HORSE CREEK AND THEIR TRIBUTARIES.
   C. MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY IN THE ABOVE STREAMS FOR FISHERIES HABITAT AND OTHER BENEFICIAL USES.
4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
   Land % Channel % Roads % Other %

5. Net Environmental-quality benefit index: NOT SIGNIFICANT

6. Net Social-well-being benefit:

7. Benefit/cost ratio:

8. Net benefits: $

9. Cost effectiveness index (choose one): a. I b. II c. III d. IV

PART IV
ELIGIBLE EMERGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS

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

			NFS LANDS			OTHER LAND			
	Units	Unit cost	units #	FFF $	092 other $	units #	federal $	non-fed $	total $
A. LAND									
SEEDING	Acres								
B. CHANNELS									
opening water courses	Miles								
stabilizing streambanks	Miles								
C. ROADS & TRAILS	Miles								
MAJOR STRUCTURES	Each								
E TOTAL									

PART VII - APPROVALS

Forest Supervisor approval and date: /s/ .....

Regional Forester approval and date: /s/ .....

Table 1. Environmental Quality Benefit Index

1 Environmental Quality Criteria	2 Weighting Factor 1-10	3 Without Treatment Adverse Effect Index (0-2)	4 Without Treatment Weighted Value	5 With Treatment Adverse Effect Index (0-2)	6 With Treatment Weighted Value	7 Net Difference Benefit Index (0-2)	8 Net Difference Weight. Value
Erosion and Sediment	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Aesthetic Land Quality	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Water Qaulity	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Site Productivity	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fish Habitat	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Wildlife Habitat	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	53	X	40	X	40	X	0
Average Weighted Index		X	.8	X	.8		0

Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index = 0

Significance Index:
0.7 or higher = Significant Benefit (S)
Less than 0.7 = No Significant Benefit (NS)

Adverse Effect Index (with and without treatment):
0 = Little or no expected damage
1 = Moderate potential damage
2 = High potential damage