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

Rcd SEP 27 1988 RP BK WK

REPLY TO: 2520 Date: September 22, 1988

SUBJECT: Burned Area Report - McMeekin Fire

TO: Regional Forester

Enclosed for your records is the Burned Area Report for the McMeekin Fire.

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

for TOM KOVALICKY
Forest Surpervisor

Enclosure

cc: B.Abbott
P.Green

FS-6200-28(7-82)

BURNED AREA REPORT DATE: 20 Sept. 1988

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. A. Funding Request
2. A. Initial

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: McMeekin
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 717043
3. State: Idaho
4. County: Idaho
5. Region: Northern R01
6. Forest: Nez Perce F17
7. Ranger District: Salmon River D01
8. Date Started: Sept. 16, 1988
9. Date Controlled: Sept 19, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: $600,000
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
    a. . . . miles of firelines waterbarred 3.4 handline and about 2 dozer line
    b. . . . acres of firelines seeded 4.4
    c. . . . other (identify)_____
12. Fire intensity 92 % low 8 % medium 0 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060207-01-19 17060207-01-24
2. NFS acres burned: 850
3. Water repellant soil: 46 % NFS acres burned (versus 32 % on unburned area)
4. Vegetation types: Bluebunch wheatgrass; Ponderosa pine/bluebunch wheatgrass; Douglas-fir/snowberry
5. Geologic types: granite
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 0 % low 37 % medium 63 % high
7. Erosion potential: 124.9 cu.yd./sq.mi. for the first two years
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: Order 1 - 2.6 miles
   Order 4 - 1.1 miles
9. Miles FS trails: 3.6
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level: None
    a. (level I) b. (level II) c. (level III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 1 year
2. Chance of success desired by management: 90 %
3. Equivalent design recurrence: 100 years
4. Related design storm duration: 1/2 hour
5. Related design storm magnitude: .90 inches (Precipitation Frequency Atlas for Idaho)
5. Related design flow: 55 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 15 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 63 cfsm

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills represented on burned area survey team (list as appropriate):
   Soils

2. Describe emergency: No emergency exists. This was a patchy ground fire of light to moderate intensity.

3. Emergency rehabilitation objective:
   Maintain soil productivity at or near existing levels.
   Maintain stability and integrity of Wind River, Hall's Gulch, Forest Gulch, and Lovell Gulch.
   Maintain water quality in these streams for downstream beneficial uses.

4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
   Land 80 % Channel N/A % Roads N/A % 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	4	1	4	1	4	0	0
Fish Habitat Wildlife Habitat	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Other	NA						
Total	44		44		44		0

Average Weighted Index = 1

Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index = 0 (NS)

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

BURNED AREA REPORT DATE: 20 Sept. 1988

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. A. Funding Request
2. A. Initial

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: McMeekin
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 717043
3. State: Idaho
4. County: Idaho
5. Region: Northern R01
6. Forest: Nez Perce F17
7. Ranger District: Salmon River D01
8. Date Started: Sept. 16, 1988
9. Date Controlled: Sept 19, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: $600,000
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
    a. . . . miles of firelines waterbarred 3.4 handline and about 2 dozer line
    b. . . . acres of firelines seeded 4.4
    c. . . . other (identify)_____
12. Fire intensity 92 % low 8 % medium 0 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060207-01-19 17060207-01-24
2. NFS acres burned: 850
3. Water repellant soil: 46 % NFS acres burned (versus 32 % on unburned area)
4. Vegetation types: Bluebunch wheatgrass; Ponderosa pine/bluebunch wheatgrass; Douglas-fir/snowberry
5. Geologic types: granite
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 0 % low 37 % medium 63 % high
7. Erosion potential: 124.9 cu.yd./sq.mi. for the first two years
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: Order 1 - 2.6 miles
   Order 4 - 1.1 miles
9. Miles FS trails: 3.6
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level: None
    a. (level I) b. (level II) c. (level III, IV, V)

No Funds Requested

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 1 year
2. Chance of success desired by management: 90 %
3. Equivalent design recurrence: 100 years
4. Related design storm duration: 1/2 hour
5. Related design storm magnitude: .90 inches (Precipitation Frequency Atlas for Idaho)
5. Related design flow: 55 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 15 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 63 cfsm

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills represented on burned area survey team (list as appropriate):
   Soils

2. Describe emergency: No emergency exists. This was a patchy ground fire of light to moderate intensity.

3. Emergency rehabilitation objective:
   Maintain soil productivity at or near existing levels.
   Maintain stability and integrity of Wind River, Hall's Gulch, Forest Gulch, and Lovell Gulch.
   Maintain water quality in these streams for downstream beneficial uses.

4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
   Land 80 % Channel N/A % Roads N/A % 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	#	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	4	1	4	1	4	0	0
Fish Habitat Wildlife Habitat	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Other	NA						
Total	44		44		44		0

Average Weighted Index = 1

Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index = 0 (NS)

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