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

REPLY TO: 2520

Date: November 29, 1988

SUBJECT: Burned Area Report - Footstool Fire

TO: Regional Forester

Enclosed is the Burned Area Report for the Footstool Fire.

No emergency exists and we are requesting no funds for emergency rehabilitation. Plots to monitor erosion, changes in channel cross section and changes in fisheries habitat over time were installed in October, 1988.

/s/ Joe Bednorz (for)

TOM KOVALICKY
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Moose Creek RD
P. Green

DATE: NOV. 21, 1988

BURNED AREA REPORT

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. A. Funding Request
2. A. Initial

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire name: FOOTSTOOL
2. Supervisors Fire Number: 035
3. State: IDAHO
4. County: IDAHO
5. Region: 01
6. Forest: NEZ PERCE
7. Ranger District: MOOSE CREEK (06)
8. Date Started: AUGUST 13, 1988
9. Date Controlled: NOV. 3, 1988
10. Estimated suppression costs: COSTS ARE INCLUDED WITH TOTAL OF $1,120,000 FOR MOOSE CREEK INCIDENT WHICH INCLUDES FIRES REPORTED AS FREEMAN TRAIL, UPPER BEAR, GARDINER AND FOOTSTOOL.
11. Fire suppression damage repaired with FFF 102 funds:
    a. . 0 . miles of firelines waterbarred
    b. . 0 . acres of firelines seeded
    c. . . . other (identify)_____
12. Fire intensity 30 % low 25 % medium 45 % high

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed Number: 17060302-05-02, -03, 04, -05, -16
2. NFS acres burned: 13,900
3. Water repellant soil: 60 % NFS acres burned BASED ON FIRES OF SIMILAR INTENSITY IN SIMILAR PLANT COMMUNITIES.
4. Vegetation types: SUBALPINE FIR, GRAND FIR HABITAT TYPES
5. Geologic types: GRANITE
6. Soil erosion hazard rating: 10 % low 20 % medium 70 % high
7. Erosion potential: 152.3 cu.yd./sq.mi.THE FIRST TWO YEARS.
8. Miles stream channel by regional order or class: (1): 21.9; (2): 6.5; (3): 2.3; (4): 4.8
9. Miles FS trails: 15
10. Miles FS roads by maintenance level:
    a. 0 (level I) b. 0 (level II) c. 0 (level III, IV, V)

BURNED AREA REPORT

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Est. veg. recovery period: 3 years
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: .90 inches
5. Related design flow: 83 cfsm
7. Estimated reduction in infiltration: 20 %
8. Adjusted related design flow: 100 cfsm

PART V SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

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

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 EAST FORK MOOSE CREEK AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.
   MAINTAIN WATER QUALITY IN EAST FORK MOOSE CREEK FOR FISHERIES HABITAT.

4. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage producing storm:
   Land 80 % Channel NA % Roads NA % Other %

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	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Aesthetic Land Quality	10	1	10	1	10	0	0
Water Qaulity	10	2	20	1	10	1	10
Site Productivity	5	1	5	1	5	0	0
Fish Habitat	10	2	20	1	10	1	10
Wildlife Habitat	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	53		55		45		20
Average Weighted Index =			1.0	X	.8	X	.4

Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index = .4

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