

United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Nez Perce  
National  
Forest

Rt. 2, Box 475  
Grangeville, ID 83530

File Code: 2520  
Route To: \*

Date: October 17, 1996

Subject: Burned Area Report for Swet Creek Fire

To: Regional Forester

Enclosed for your records is the Burned Area Report for the Swet Creek Fire.

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

/s/Ihor Mereszczak, for

COY G. JEMMETT  
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: E.Woods  
N.Rasure  
P.Green

BURNED AREA REPORT

October 17, 1996

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. (List as appropriate) A. Funding Request B. Accomplishment report C. No Treatment Recommendation X

2. A. Initial X B. Interim C. Final

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: Sweet Creek
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 15
3. State: Idaho
4. County: Idaho
5. Region: Northern (01)
6. Forest: Nez Perce (17), Betterroot (03)
7. Ranger District: Red River (05), West Fork (04)
8. Date Started: July 9, 1996
9. Date Controlled: Contained October 1, 1996
10. Estimated suppression costs: \$1,015,000 (most of these expenditures were for suppression on the ~~associated Warrior Fire~~)
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
  - a. 0 . . miles of firelines waterbarred
  - b. 0 . . acres of firelines seeded
  - c. . . . other (identify) Using minimum impact suppression techniques, fireline construction was minimal. About 1/4 mile of line on the Bitterroot portion was obliterated.
12. Fire intensity 33 % low 34 % medium 31 % high (12 % was unburned within the fire perimeter)

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 1706030118 Epper Selway River basin
2. NFS acres burned: approximately 40,085 acres were within the perimeter, and about 39,000 actually burned.
3. Water repellent soil: 50 % of NFS acres burned (80% of high intensity, and about 70% of the moderate intensity showed weak to moderate repellency at 1/2 to 1 inch depth)
4. Vegetation types: Douglas-fir/ponderosa pine 25 %, lodgepole/Douglas-fir 50%, subalpine fir/spruce 25%, nonforest openings 5%
5. Geologic types: granite
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 8 % low 27 % medium 65 % high
7. Erosion potential: 200 cu.yd./sq.mi. yr 1 and 41 du.yd/sq.mi yr 2
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: 31 miles order 1, 21 miles order 2, 11 miles order 3, 13 miles order 4
9. Miles FS trails: 75
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level: None
  - a. (level I)
  - b. (level II)
  - c. (level III, IV, V)

# BURNED AREA REPORT

## PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 5 years
2. Chance of success desired by management: NA
3. Equivalent design recurrence: 10 years
4. Related design storm duration: 6 hours
5. Related design storm magnitude: 1.6 inches
5. Related design flow: 11 cfs
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 27 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 294 cfs

## PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills represented on burned area survey team (list as appropriate):  
 Hydrology  
 Fisheries biology  
 Wilderness  
 Trails  
 Botany/weeds  
 Soil/ecology
2. Describe emergency:  
 No emergency exists. It is expected that significant erosion, sedimentation and channel scour may occur within the Wilkerson, Storm, and Line Creek drainages. However, burn extent and severity were within presettlement range, and appropriate for wilderness prescribed fire. Bull trout and cutthroat trout refugia occur within the upper Selway to provide for refounding of fish populations. Impacts on trails are likely to be significant, as snag fall and erosion occur. However, the probability of completing this work before the first damaging storm is slight. Trail stabilization will need funding through watershed improvement and trail maintenance funding sources.
3. Emergency rehabilitation objective:
4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:  

Land	%	Channel	%	Roads	%	Other	%
------	---	---------	---	-------	---	-------	---
5. Net Environmental-quality benefit index:
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

## BURNED AREA REPORT

## 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.)

	<u>NFS LANDS</u>				<u>OTHER LAND</u>				total \$
	Units	Unit cost	units #	FFF \$	092 \$	other #	federal \$	non-fed \$	
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	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Environmental	Weighting	<u>Without Treatment</u>	<u>With Treatment</u>	<u>Without Treatment</u>	<u>With Treatment</u>	<u>Net Difference</u>	
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

Aesthetic  
Land  
Quality

Water Quality

Site  
Productivity

Fish Habitat

Wildlife Habitat

Other

Total

Average Weighted Index =

Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index =

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