

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Nez Perce NF

REPLY TO: 2520

DATE: August 29, 1988

SUBJECT: Lauer Fire Burned Area Report

TO: Regional Forester

Enclosed is the Burned Area Report for the Lauer Fire. Because no significant economic or social benefits can be demonstrated, no emergency rehabilitation funds will be requested.

Appropriated funds may be allocated to do some seeding or erosion barrier construction as a restoration project in the intensely burned portion. This also may be a good opportunity to do some monitoring of fish habitat in Meadow Creek and the tributary above and below the fire.

/s/ Tom Kovalicky

TOM KOVALICKY
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: S. Williams
P. Green
F. Haas

BURNED AREA REPORT

DATE: 8/29/88

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. A. Funding Request
2. A. Initial

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: LAUER
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 097
3. State: IDAHO
4. County: IDAHO
5. Region: NORTHERN R01
6. Forest: NEZ PERCE
7. Ranger District: RED RIVER D05
8. Date Started: 18 AUGUST, 1988
9. Date Controlled: 26 AUGUST, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: \$700,000
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
 - a. .2.25 miles of firelines waterbarred
 - b. .2.25 acres of firelines seeded
 - c. . . . other (identify)
12. Fire intensity % low 75 % medium 25 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060302-02-14 TOP MEADOW CREEK
2. NFS acres burned: 380
3. Water repellant soil: 47% OF NFS ACRES THAT BURNED AT HIGH INTENSITY
4. Vegetation types:

SUBALPINE FIR/BEARGRASS	90%
SUBALPINE FIR/BLUEJOINT	5%
SUBALPINE FIR/MENZIESIA	5%
5. Geologic types: GRANITE
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 5 % low 95 % medium 0 % high
7. Erosion potential: 170.68 cu.yd./sq.mi.OVER THE FIRST 2 YEARS
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: .8 FIRST ORDER
9. Miles FS trails: 0
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level: 0
 - a. (level I)
 - b. (level II)
 - c. (level III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 4 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: .90 inches
5. Related design flow: 36 cfs
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 20 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 42 cfs

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills represented on burned area survey team:
1) SOILS 2) HYDROLOGY 3) TIMBER
2. Describe emergency: 90 ACRES BURNED AT HIGH INTENSITY THROUGH A FIRST ORDER TRIBUTARY OF MEADOW CREEK, AN IMPORTANT FISHERIES STREAM. SLOPES ADJACENT TO THE STREAM ARE STEEP: 40-60%, AND LITTLE ORGANIC MATTER REMAINS TO BUFFER THE SOILS FROM EROSION.
3. Emergency rehabilitation objective: 1) PROTECTION OF WATER QUALITY AND FISHERIES HABITAT.
4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
Land 70 % Channel NA % Roads NA % Other %
5. Net Environmental-quality benefit index: SIGNIFICANT (.9)
6. Net Social-well-being benefit: NOT SIGNIFICANT
7. Benefit/cost ratio: RESIDENT FISHERIES IS THE ONLY RESOURCE VALUE AT RISK. A 7% LOSS IN WINTER REARING CAPACITY OF CUTTHROAT TROUT IS PROJECTED, BUT THE ECONOMIC VALUE IS PROJECTED TO BE LESS THAN \$200. U
8. Net benefits: \$-1800.
9. Cost effectiveness index (choose one): d. IV

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**Environmental Quality Benefit Index**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Environmental	Weighting	Without Treatment	Treatment	With Treatment		Net Difference	
Quality	Factor	Adverse	Weighted	Adverse	Weighted	Benefit	Weight.
Criteria	1-10	Effect	Value	Effect	Value	Index	Value
		Index		Index		(0-2)	
		(0-2)		(0-2)			
Erosion and Sediment	10	1	10	0	0	1	10
Water Quality	10	1	10	0	0	1	10
Site Productivity	4	1	4	0	0	1	4
Fish Habitat	10	1	10	0	0	1	10
Wildlife Habitat	3	2	6	2	6	0	0
Total	37		40		6		34
Average Weighted Index =			1.1		.2		.9

Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index = .9 (significant)

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

SOCIAL WELL-BEING

The following social well-being criteria will not be affected by the rehabilitation measures proposed:

Security of life, health, and safety - No homes could potentially be affected by flood or debris flows if proposed measures are not implemented.

Employment - the effect on local employment will be insignificant

Recreational opportunity - there are no developed recreational facilities in the burn area.

Economic stability - there will be no disruption of normal business patterns.

Income distribution - the proposed measures would not affect any lower average income families if not implemented.

Preservation of special uses - there are no cultural, historical, or scientific sites that will be affected by implementation of the proposed measures.

Social Well-Being Benefit Index

The social well-being index is not significant.