

Forest Service **Nez Perce National Forest**

Route 2, Box 475 Grangeville, ID 83530 208 983-1950

Date: September 20, 2001

File Code: 2520-3 **Route To:**

Subject: Burned Area Report - Earthquake

To: Regional Forester

Enclosed is the initial Earthquake Fire Burned Area Report Funding request for estimated WFSU-SULT funds. This requests funds to treat noxious weeds. There is no other emergency.

Please contact Pat Green, Forest Ecologist, at 208-983-1950 if you have any questions or concerns regarding this matter. She will gladly assist you.

/s/ Bruce E. Bernhardt

BRUCE E. BERNHARDT Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

Cc:

Bruce Sims, Northern Regional Office Pat Green, Nez Perce National Forest



BURNED-AREA REPORT

Dateof Report: Sept. 17, 2001

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

| A. Type of Report | |
|--|--|
| [X] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSI[] 2. Accomplishment Report[] 3. No Treatment Recommendation | U-SULT funds |
| B. Type of Action | |
| [X] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of measures) | funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation |
| [] 2. Interim Report[] Updating the initial funding requesionanalysis[] Status of accomplishments to date | est based on more accurate site data or design |
| [] 3. Final Report (Following completion of | f work) |
| PART II - BURNED | AREA DESCRIPTION |
| A. Fire Name: Earthquake | B. Fire Number: ID-NPF-050_ |
| C. State: Idaho | D. County: Idaho |
| E. Region: Northern (01) | F. Forest: <u>Nez Perce</u> |
| G. District: Clearwater | H. Date Fire Started: August 9, 2001 |
| I. Date Fire Controlled: estimated_late Sept, 200 | <u>1</u> |
| J. Suppression Cost: \$1,500,000 current estimate | <u>red</u> |
| 2. Fireline seeded (miles): 8.2 to b | miles hand line, 5.1 miles dozer line |
| L. Watershed Number: 1706030507-13,14,15, a | and 99 |
| M. Total Acres Burned: 1260 estimated NFS Acres (1260) Other Federal () Sta | ate() Private() |
| N. Vegetation Types: Annual grasses and weed | s. native grasses, ponderosa pine. Douglas-fir |

| Ο. | Dominant Soils: Ultic haploxerolls, with mixed volcanic ash surf | ace | layers | | | | | |
|----|--|-----------|------------------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | P. Geologic Types: <u>quartzite and granite</u> | | | | | | | |
| Q. | Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: 3.1 miles 1st order | | | | | | | |
| R. | Transportation System | | | | | | | |
| | Trails: .8 miles Roads: 1.1 | | | | | | | |
| | PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION | <u>N</u> | | | | | | |
| A. | Burn Severity (acres): <u>1250 (99%)</u> (low) <u>10 (1</u> %) (modera | te) | (0%) (high) | | | | | |
| В. | Water-Repellent Soil (acres): <30 acres with moderate or higareas exhibit as much or more water repellency than burned are | | ater repellency. | Unburned | | | | |
| C. | Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): 0 (low) 1023 (moderate) 237 (high | <u>1)</u> | | | | | | |
| D. | Erosion Potential: .12 tons/acre delivered sediment | | | | | | | |
| E. | Sediment Potential: .12 tons/acre routed to the mouths of the cr | eeks | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FAC | TOR | <u>ks</u> | | | | | |
| A. | Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): | 1_ | | | | | | |
| В. | Design Chance of Success, (percent): | <u>30</u> | | | | | | |
| C. | Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): | <u>10</u> | | | | | | |
| D. | Design Storm Duration, (hours): | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| E. | Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): | <u>.3</u> | | | | | | |
| F. | Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): | 13_ | | | | | | |
| G. | Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): | 0_ | | | | | | |
| Н. | Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): | <u>30</u> | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

- A. Describe Watershed Emergency:
 - 1. Threats to long-term soil productivity and ecosystem integrity: The burned area includes extensive infestations of Idaho noxious weeds including spotted knapweed and sulfur cinquefoil. These species result in decreased soil stability, higher erosion risk, degraded wildlife habitat, and loss of native species and community integrity. An estimated 80 percent of the burned area is habitat highly susceptible to invasion by one or more of these species. The burned areas provide seedbeds, and the trails, roads, and firelines provide vectors for spread.
 - 2. Threats to water quality,TES aquatic species, and heritage resources: The burned area is in very steep canyons with high potential for debris torrents under both natural and burned conditions. The resources potentially at risk include listed fish species in the South Fork Clearwater River, and a developed campsite at the mouth of Castle Creek. However, the low burn severity and low water repellency indicate no watershed emergency exists: the watershed condition is very little different from natural conditions.
- B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:
 - 1. Control spread of noxious weeds within the fire perimeter, and along roads, trails, and campsites that border the fire perimeter.

| C. Probability of Completing | ng Treatment Prio | r to First Major | Damage-Pro | ducing Storm: |
|------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Land % | Channel % | Roads % | Other <u>70</u> | . % |

D. Probability of Treatment Success

| | Yea | Years after Treatment | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----|-----------------------|----|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 1 | 3 | 5 | | | | | |
| Land | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Channel | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Roads | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Other (weeds) | | | | | | | | |
| (weeds) | 70 | 80 | 80 | | | | | |

- E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): \$131,000 to control expanded weed populations_
- F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss):\$25,000 includes cost of treatment and cost to treat weeds in areas not proposed for treatment.

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

| [] Hydrology | [x] Soils | [] Geology | [] Range | [] |
|----------------|-------------|-------------------|----------------|----|
| [] Forestry | [] Wildlife | [] Fire Mgmt. | [] Engineering | [] |
| [] Contracting | [x] Ecology | [x] Botany | [] Archaeology | [] |
| [x] Fisheries | [] Research | [] Landscape Arch | []GIS | |

Team Leader:_Pat Green

Email: pgreen@fs.fed.us Phone: 208 983-1950 FAX: 208 983-4099

H. Treatment Narrative:

(Describe the emergency treatments, where and how they will be applied, and what they are intended to do. This information helps to determine qualifying treatments for the appropriate funding authorities. For seeding treatments, include species, application rates and species selection rationale.)

<u>Land Treatments</u>: Spot herbicide treatments of 30 acres along leading edge of current infestations, new infestations, and South Fork Clearwater highway, in fall of 2001 and spring of 2002. A total of 60 acres would be treated over the two years. Weed management strategy for the Clearwater River Basin Weed Management Area is currently in place. Concurrence with a BA for noxious weed control has been received from Fish and Wildlife Service and is pending from National Marine Fisheries Service. Weed treatment will follow the requirements and mitigation outlined in the Biological Assessment. An approved EA for weed control is in place.

Channel Treatments: None at this time

Roads and Trail Treatments: None at this time

Structures: None at this time

I. Monitoring Narrative:

(Describe the monitoring needs, what treatments will be monitored, how they will be monitored, and when monitoring will occur. A detailed monitoring plan must be submitted as a separate document to the Regional BAER coordinator.)

5-10 monitoring transects with replicated microplots will be established immediately after the fire and in the two years following the fire, in burned areas as well as controls. This follows the protocols established for the Three Bears, Pinchot, and Taco fires, so that replication occurs across fires and across burn severities and pre-fire conditions. Monitoring will determine densities of weeds by species present before and following the fire, and relate this to pre burn weed populations, site characteristics, and burn severity. This information can be used to predict risk and rates of spread in similar settings.

Part VI – Emergency Rehabilitation Treatments and Source of Funds by Land Ownership

| | | | NFS Lar | nds | | X | | Other L | ands | | All |
|--------------------------|-------|---------|---------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|-------|---------|------------|
| | | Unit | # of | WFSU | Other | Š | # of | Fed | # of | Non Fed | Total |
| Line Items | Units | Cost | Units | SULT \$ | \$ | 8 8 | units | \$ | Units | \$ | \$ |
| | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| A. Land Treatments | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| weeds | acres | \$262 | 60 | \$15,720 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$15,720 |
| | | | | \$0 | | Š | | \$0 | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Land Treatments | | | | \$15,720 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$15,720 |
| B. Channel Treatmen | ts | | | | | 8 | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | Š | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Channel Treat. | | | | \$ 0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| C. Road and Trails | | | | | | 8 | | | , | | |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Road & Trails | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| D. Structures | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Structures | | | | \$0 | | | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| E. BAER Evaluation | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Salary | days | \$250 | 4 | \$1,000 | | X | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$1,000 |
| | | | | \$0 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | | | 8 | | | | | |
| G. Monitoring Cost | years | \$1,500 | 3 | \$4,500 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$4,500 |
| weeds | | | | | | 8 | | | | | |
| H. Totals | | | | \$21,220 | | 8 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$21,220 |
| | | | | | | Š | | | | | |

PART VII - APPROVALS