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: FREEMAN TRAIL
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 036
3. State: IDAHO
4. County: IDAHO
5. Region: 01
6. Forest: NEZ PERCE
7. Ranger District: MOOSE CREEK (06)
8. Date Started: AUGUST 11, 1988
9. Date Controlled: NOV. 3, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: COSTS INCLUDED IN $1,120,000 FOR MOOSE CREEK INCIDENT WHICH INCLUDES FIRES REPORTED AS FREEMAN TRAIL, GARDINER, FOOTSTOOL, 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 30 % medium 5 % high

## PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060302-05-08, -09, -10 AND 17060301-02-01, -03, -16
2. NFS acres burned: 23,220
3. Water repellant soil: 60 % NFS acres burned BASED ON SIMILAR FIRES IN SIMILAR VEGETATIVE TYPES
4. Vegetation types: SUBALPINE FIR, DOUGLAS-FIR, GRAND FIR HABITAT TYPES
5. Geologic types: GRANITE, GNEISS
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 1 % low 59 % medium 40 % high
7. Erosion potential: 144 cu.yd./sq.mi.
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: (1) 28.5 (2)14.4 (3) 3.8
9. Miles FS trails: 32
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level:
    a. 0 (level I) b. 0 (level II) c. 0 (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: .80 inches
5. Related design flow: 71 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 20 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 85 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 (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 INTEGRITY OF DOG, PETTIBONE, MONUMENT, TROUT, AND SQUAW CREEKS.
   C. MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY OF THE ABOVE STREAMS FOR FISHERIES HABITAT AND OTHER BENEFICIAL USES.
4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
   Land 80 % Channel NA % Roads NA % 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 = | | | .75 | X | .75 | | 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