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

REPLY TO: 2520 Date: November 29, 1988

SUBJECT: Burned Area Report - Ladder/Boston Lake Fire Complex

TO: Regional Forester

Enclosed for your records is the Burned Area Report for the Ladder/Boston Lake fire complex.

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

/s/ Joe Bednorz (for)

TOM KOVALICKY
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Red River RD
P. Green

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: LADDER/BOSTON LAKE
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 024, 121
3. State: IDAHO
4. County: IDAHO
5. Region: 1 (AND 4)
6. Forest: NEZ PERCE (AND PAYETTE)
7. Ranger District: RED RIVER (05) (06 ON PAYETTE)
8. Date Started: AUGUST 13, 1988 (DISCOVERED)
9. Date Controlled: OCTOBER 24, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: $5,500,000
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
    a. . . . miles of firelines waterbarred 22 MILES TRACTOR; 20 MILES HANDLINE
    b. . . . acres of firelines seeded 100
    c. . . . other (identify)_____
12. Fire intensity 80 % low 10 % medium 10 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060207-04, 17060207-03, (17060207-020: PAYETTE N.F.)
2. NFS acres burned: 57,040 (29,520 ON NEZ PERCE AND 7040 ON PAYETTE)
3. Water repellant soil: 50 % NFS acres burned BASED ON PAST RECORDS OF SIMILAR INTENSITY FIRES IN SIMILAR PLANT COMMUNITIES.
4. Vegetation types: SUBALPINE FIR, GRAND FIR, DOUGLAS-FIR, PONDEROSA PINE, GRASSLAND HABITAT TYPES
5. Geologic types: GRANITE, GNEISS
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 4 % low 61 % medium 35 % high
7. Erosion potential: 78.4 cu.yd./sq.mi.FOR THE FIRST 2 YEARS.
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: ORDER (1) 24.1 (2) 19.2 (3) 5.2 (4) 8.2 (5) 2.4 (7) 16.9
9. Miles FS trails: 64.5
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level:
    a. 0 (level I) b. 64.5 (level II) c. 0 (level III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 1 YEAR GRASSLANDS, PONDEROSA PINE, AND DOUGLAS-FIR COMMUNITIES; 3-5 YEARS GRAND FIR AND SUBALPINE FIR COMMUNITIES.
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: .67 inches
5. Related design flow: 40 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 20 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 48 cfsm

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills represented on burned area survey team (list as appropriate):
   SOILS, HYDROLOGY, WILDLIFE

2. Describe emergency:
   NO EMERGENCY EXISTS; MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES CAN BE MET THROUGH NATURAL RECOVERY PROCESSES.

3. Emergency rehabilitation objective:
   MAINTAIN SOIL PRODUCTIVITY AT EXISTING OR NEAR EXISTING LEVELS.
   MAINTAIN STABILITY AND INTEGRITY OF AFFECTED STREAM CHANNELS.
   MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY FOR DOWNSTREAM BENEFICIAL USES.
4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
   Land 80 % Channel NA % Roads 70 % Other NA %

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	6	1	6	1	6	1	0
Aesthetic Land Quality	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Water Qaulity	10	1	10	1	10	1	0
Site Productivity	5	1	5	1	5	0	0
Fish Habitat	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Wildlife Habitat	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	49		31		31		0
Average Weighted Index =		X	.6	X	.6	X	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