United States Department of Agriculture | Forest Service | Nezperce NF

REPLY TO: 2520 Watershed Protect & Management Date: JUL 17 1985

SUBJECT: Burned Area Report for Arlington Creek Fire

TO: Regional Forester

Enclosed for your records is the Burned Area Report for the Arlington Creek fire. We sent a copy of this report by electronic mail on July 16 to Dick Cline who is coordinating these reports in your office.

As you can see, we don't feel an emergency exists and are not requesting any funds for emergency rehabilitation.

TOM KOVALICKY
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Gary Kellogg
Mike Johnson
Jerry Dombrovske

USDA Forest Service

BURNED AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13, Report FS-2500-A)

Date of Report: July 16, 1985

PART I – TYPE OF REQUEST

1. Type of Report

A. [X] Funding (Request for estimated FFF funds) B. [ ] Accomplishment Report

2. Type of Action

A. [X] Initial (estimated funding is first requested)

B. [ ] Interim

a. [ ] Updating the initial funding request

b. [ ] Supplying information for accomplishments to date on emergency work underway

C. [ ] Final

a. [ ] Best estimate for funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measure

b. [ ] Following completion of funded work

PART II – FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire Name (From Form FS-5100-29)	2. Forest Supervisor's Fire No. (From FS-5100-29)	3. State	4. County
Arlington	009	Idaho	Idaho

5. Region	6. Forest	7. Ranger District	8. Date Fire Started	9. Date Fire Controlled	10. Estimated Suppression
One	Nezperce	Red River	7/7/85	7/14/85	$ 600,000

11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds

a. 5 miles (firelines waterbarred) b. 0 acres (firelines seeded) c. Other (identify) waterbarred firelines

12. Fire Intensity

a. 45 % (low) b. 30 % (medium) c. 25 % (high)

PART III – NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed No.	2. NFS Acres Burned	3. Water Repellant Soil
17060207-02-15	635	91 % of NFS acres burned

73% of nonburned areas within firelines have water repellant soil

4. Vegetation Types

Ponderosa pine/Idaho fescue H.T.
Douglas fir/Ninebark H.T.
Idaho fescue/bluebunch wheatgrass

5. Geologic Types

Batholith granite

6. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating

a. 10 % (low) b. 30 % (medium) c. 60 % (high)

7. Erosion Potential: 150 cu. yds/sq. miles

8. Miles of Stream Channels By Regional Order or Classes

1st Order-7.7 2nd Order-3.0 3rd Order-1.7

9. Miles of Forest Service Trails: 1.4

10. Miles of Forest Service Roads By Maintenance Levels

a. 0 miles (Level I) b. 0 miles (Level II) c. 0 miles (Levels III, IV, V)

PART IV – CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period (Years)	2. Chance of Success Desired By Management (Percent)
5	90
3. Equivalent Design Recurrence Period (Years)	**4. Related Design Storm Duration (Hours)**
100 --Intense Convective Storm ---	1/2
5. Related Design Storm Magnitude (Inches)	**6. Related Design Flow (cfsm)**
0.90 Precipitation - Frequency Atlas for Idaho	55 Water Supply Paper #1688--100 Yr. Return Internal
7. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration (Percent)	**8. Adjusted Related Design Flow (cfsm)**
50 (initial only)	83

Previous edition of this form is obsolete.

FS-2500-8 (11/82)

(OVER)

PART V – SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills Represented on Burned Area Survey Team (x appropriate boxes)

a. [X] Hydrology b. [X] Soils c. [ ] Geology d. [ ] Range e. [ ] Timber f. [ ] Wildlife
g. [ ] Fire Mgmt. h. [ ] Engineering i. [ ] Contracting j. [ ] Local Mgmt. k. [ ] Research l. [ ] Other _____ (Identify)

2. Describe Emergency

No emergency exists; we feel that management objectives as stated in number 3 will be met through natural processes.

3. Emergency Rehabilitation Objective

1. Maintain soil productivity at existing or near existing levels.
2. Maintain the stability and integrity or Arlington and Crooked Creeks.
3. Maintain the water quality in Arlington and Crooked Creeks for fishery and other beneficial uses.

4. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage Producing Storm

a. 80 % (land) b. NA % (channel) c. NA % (roads) d. NA % (other) _____ (Identify)

5. Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index

a. [ ] Significant b. [X] Not Significant

6. Net Social Well Being Benefit Index

a. [ ] Significant b. [ ] Not Significant

7. Benefit/Cost Ratio

8. Net Benefits

9. Cost Effectiveness Index

a. [ ] I b. [ ] II c. [ ] III d. [ ] IV

PART VI – ELIGIBLE EMERGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS & SOURCE OF FUNDS

Note: Emergency rehabilitation is work done promptly following a wildfire and is not to solve watershed problems that existed prior to the wildfire.

	Line Items (1)	Units (2)	Unit Cost (3)	NFS Lands: No. of Units (4)	NFS Lands: FFF 092 $ (5)	NFS Lands: Other $ (Identify) (6)	Other Lands: No. of Units (7)	Other Lands: Federal $ (Identify) (8)	Other Lands: Non-Federal $ (Identify) (9)	All Lands: Total $ (10)
A. LAND	a. Seeding	Acres								
	b.									
	c.									
	d.									
	e.									
B. CHANNELS	a. Opening water courses	Miles								
	b. Stabilizing Streambanks	Miles								
	c.									
	d.									
	e.									
C. ROADS & TRAILS	a.									
	b.									
	c.									
	d.									
	e.									
D. MAJOR STRUCTURES										
	a. Preplanned – from Forest Plans									
E. TOTAL										

PART VII – APPROVALS

1. Forest Supervisor (Signature)	2. Date	3. Regional Forester (Signature)	2. Date
Tom Kovalchik	7/16/95		