

Date of Report: August 16, 1994BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

- ☒ 1. Funding request for estimated EFFS-FW22 funds
☐ 2. Accomplishment Report
☐ 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

- ☒ 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)

☐ 2. Interim Report
 ☐ Updating the initial funding request based on more accurate site data and design analysis
 ☐ Status of accomplishments to date

☐ 3. Final report - following completion of work

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION

- A. Fire Name: Sam Group-Hidden Fix B. Fire Number: P12627
C. State: Idaho D. County: Clearwater
E. Region: One F. Forest: Clearwater N.F.
G. District: North Fork
H. Date Fire Started: 8 - 3 - 94 I. Date Fire Controlled: Est. 8-17-94
J. Suppression Cost: \$2,000,000.
K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with EFFS-PF12 Funds:
 1. Fireline waterbarred (miles) 3.6
 2. Fireline seeded (miles) _____
 3. Other (identify) Rip and Seed Fire Camp
L. Watershed Number: 1706030718
M. NFS Acres Burned: 475(275 Hidden) Total Acres Burned: 475
 Ownership type:
 () State () BLM () PVT () _____
N. Vegetation Types: THPL/CLUN; TSME/MEFE
O. Dominant Soils: Typic Vitrandepts and Entic Cryandepts
P. Geologic Types: Quartzite and Coherent Schist
Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:
 1ST-.8 MI 4TH-.5 MI.
R. Transportation System:
 Trails: 1 miles Roads: .3 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

- A. Fire Intensity (acres): 38 (low) 120 (moderate) 117 (high)
- B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 102
- C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
24 (low) 151 (moderate) _____ (high)
- D. Erosion Potential: _____ tons/acre
- E. Sediment Potential: _____ cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

- A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: _____ years
- B. Design Chance of Success: _____ percent
- C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval: _____ years
- D. Design Storm Duration: _____ hours
- E. Design Storm Magnitude: _____ inches
- F. Design Flow: _____ cubic feet per second per square mile
- G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: _____ percent
- H. Adjusted Design Flow: _____ cubic feet per second per square mile

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

- A. Describe Watershed Emergency: The BAER Team determined that no emergency condition exists on this fire. No funding is requested.

- B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

- C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage-Producing Storm:

Land _____ % Channel _____ % Roads _____ % Other _____ %

- D. Probability of Treatment Success

	<----Years after treatment----->		
	1	3	5
Land			
Channel			
Roads			
Other			

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): \$ _____

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): \$ _____

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

<input type="checkbox"/> X Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology	<input type="checkbox"/> Range
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timber	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/> Fire Mgmt.	<input type="checkbox"/> Engineering
<input type="checkbox"/> Contracting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ecology	<input type="checkbox"/> Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Archaeology
<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

Team Leader: Jerry Niehoff

Phone: (208)-765-7445 Electronic Address: R01F04A

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.

PART VI - EMERGENCY REHABILITATION TREATMENTS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS BY LAND OWNERSHIP

Line Items	Units	Unit Cost \$	NFS Lands			Other Lands			All Total \$
			Number of Units	EFFS- FW22 \$	Other \$ ident.	Number of Units	Fed \$ ident.	Non-Fed \$ ident.	
A. LAND TREATMENTS									
B. CHANNEL TREATMENTS									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
D. STRUCTURES									
E. BAER EVALUATION/ ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT									
F. TOTALS									

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. _____ Date _____
 Forest Supervisor

2. _____ Date _____
 Regional Forester

United States Forest Idaho Panhandle 1201 Ironwood Drive
Department of Service National Forests Coeur d'Alene, ID 83814
Agriculture

Reply to: 2550 Soil Survey

Date: August 16, 1994

Subject: Burned-Area Report for Sam Group Fire

To: Forest Supervisor, Clearwater National Forest

The Sam Group fire consisted of three separate fires: Sam, 130 acres; Minnesaka, 70 acres; and Hidden Fix, 275 acres.

A Burned-Area Emergency Rehabilitation Team consisting of Jerry Niehoff - team leader and soil scientist; Ken Heffner - hydrologist; Kent Wellner - silviculturalist and Jim Mital - ecologist, conducted a burned-area ground survey on all three fires to determine if a flooding, erosion, or life and property emergency existed.

Our finding was that No Emergency Existed and emergency funding was not requested.

The Hidden Fix fire has the highest potential for watershed problems. Four helicopter clearcut units containing unburned red slash ignited and burned very hot creating hydrophobic conditions over approximately 85% of these units.

The Hidden Creek drainage contains suitable habitat for the summer rearing of west slope cutthroat trout and bull trout. This was the major resource concern along with the loss of soil productivity.

The Hidden Creek watershed is approximately 3900 acres. The Hidden Fix fire burned 275 acres, 140 of which are within the Hidden Creek drainage, and of the 140 acres only 34 acres had hydrophobic conditions. Based on the fact that less than 1% of the Hidden Creek drainage was detrimentally burned, we determined that damage from peak flows is not a concern and would not qualify as an emergency.

The remaining portion of the Hidden Fix fire burned on the face of the North Fork of the Clearwater and again a flood emergency does not exist.

The majority of the hydrophobic conditions occur within the clearcut units. On Sunday, we applied a continuous spray of water on a 4ft X 4ft hydrophobic area for 2 hours, simulating a rainfall event. The result was that we had absolutely no infiltration of the water into the soil, but we also did not have any erosion of the surface mineral soil. We did find that about 1/4 to 1/2 of the burn ash eroded off the sprayed site.

When we get fall rains, we can expect that a portion of the burn ash will become sediment in both Hidden Creek and the North Fork of the

Clearwater. Ned Horner, fisheries biologist with the State, Fish and Game, along with Dave Cross, fisheries biologist on the IPNF were contacted, and asked about the effect of ash on trout. They both indicated that the ash would quickly flush through and would have no effect.

The winter snowpack will break down the majority of the existing hydrophobic condition within the surface mineral soil. So surface erosion of mineral soil and the loss of soil productivity should not be a problem.

A burned-area report was submitted to the Regional Office on the Sam fire. If problems should occur this fall or next spring, which create an emergency, we would then qualify for emergency dollars to correct the problem.

A plan addressing the correction of suppression damage was submitted to Bill Cowin, Incident Commander.

If we can provide any further assistance, feel free to call.

Jerry Niehoff
Team Leader - Soil Scientist, IPNF
R01F04A 208 - 765-7445