BURNED AREA REPORT

DATE: July 7, 1986

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. A. Funding Request B. Accomplishment report
2. A. Initial B. Interim C. Final

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: Cherry Creek
2. Supervisors Fire Number: NPF-016
3. State: Idaho
4. County: Idaho
5. Region: R-1
6. Forest: Nezperce NF
7. Ranger District: Slate Creek RD
8. Date Started: 6/30/86
9. Date Controlled: 7/06/86
10. Estimated suppression costs: $473,365
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
    a. 6 . miles of firelines waterbarred
    b. 0. . . acres of firelines seeded
    c. . . . other (identify)_____
12. Fire intensity 70 % low 20 % medium 10 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060207-01-16,15
2. NFS acres burned: 720
3. Water repellant soil: 10 % NFS acres burned
4. North Idaho Habitat Types: Pipo/Agsp Agsp
   Pipo/Feid Feid/Agsp
5. Geologic types: Gneiss, Quartzite
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 25 % low 65 % medium 10% (Med.-High)
7. Erosion potential: 192 cu.yd./sq.mi.
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: 1st order - 1.4
   7th order - 1.1
9. Miles FS trails: 0
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level:
    a. 0 (level I) b. 0 (level II) c. 0 (level III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 2 years
2. Chance of success desired by management: 90%
3. Equivalent design recurrence: 100 years Intense Convective Storm
4. Related design storm duration: 1/2 hours
5. Related design storm magnitude: 0.90 inches Precipitation-Frequency Atlas for Idaho
5. Related design flow: 55 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 20 % (initial only)
8. Adjusted related design flow: 83 cfsm

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

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

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 of Cherry Cr., Chittam Cr., Salmon River, and unnamed drainages.
   3. Maintain water quality for fisheries and other beneficial uses in the streams mentioned under #2.
   4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm.

   Land 80 % Channel N/A % Roads N/A % Other N/A %

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

USDA Forest Service

BURNED AREA REPORT

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

Date of Report: July 7, 1986

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
Cherry Creek	NPF-016	Idaho	Idaho

5. Region	6. Forest	7. Ranger District	8. Date Fire Started	9. Date Fire Controlled	10. Estimated Suppression
R-1	Nez Perce NF	Slate Creek	June 30, 1986	July 6	$ 473,365

11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds
   - a. 6 miles (firelines waterbarred)
   - b. 0 acres (firelines seeded)
   - c. Other (identify)

12. Fire Intensity
   - a. 70 % (low)
   - b. 20 % (medium)
   - c. 10 % (high)

PART III – NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed No.	2. NFS Acres Burned	3. Water Repellant Soil
17060207-01-16, 15	720	10 % of NFS acres burned

4. Vegetation Types
North Idaho Habitat Types:
Pipo/feid Pipo/Agsp
Agsp Feid/Agsp

5. Geologic Types
Gneiss
Quartzite

6. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating
   - a. 25 % (low)
   - b. 65 % (medium)
   - c. 10 % (high)

7. Erosion Potential: 192 cu. yds/sq. miles

8. Miles of Stream Channels By Regional Order or Classes
1st order 1.4 miles
7th order 1.1 miles

9. Miles of Forest Service Trails: 0

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)
2	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
7. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration (Percent)	**8. Adjusted Related Design Flow (cfsm)**
20	83

FS 2600-8 (11/82)

Previous edition of this form is obsolete.

(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 & integrity of Cherry Cr., Chittam Cr., Salmon R., & unnamed drainages
3. Maintain water quality for fisheries & other beneficial uses in the streams mentioned in 2.

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) for Dave Drachman

2. Date 7/7/80

3. Regional Forester (Signature)

2. Date

GPO 893-6