USDA-FOREST SERVICE FS-2500-8 (7/00)

Date of Report: 02-03-03

BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

[ ] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSU-SULT funds
[ ] 2. Accomplishment Report
[x] 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

[] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)

[ ] 2. Interim Report
[ ] Updating the initial funding request based on more accurate site data or design analysis
[ ] Status of accomplishments to date

[X] 3. Final Report (Following completion of work)

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION

A. Fire Name: Trampas

B. Fire Number: NM-SNF-104

C. State: NM

D. County: San Miguel

E. Region: 3

F. Forest: Santa Fe

G. District: Pecos

H. Date Fire Started: 06-13-2002

I. Date Fire Contained: (estimated) 07-01-2002

J. Suppression Cost: $3.9 million

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds
1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): unknown; >10 miles
2. Fireline seeded (miles): unknown; > 10 miles
3. Other (identify):

L. Watershed Number: 1306000101 (Upper Pecos); 1108000403 (Manuelitas)

M. Total Acres Burned: 4,680
NFS Acres(4,680) Other Federal ( ) State ( ) Private ( )

N. Vegetation Types: subalpine fir, spruce, aspen, 69%; lower mixed conifer 30%; willow, alder 1%

O. Dominant Soils: Mollic and Typic Cryoboralfs; deep, very cobbly, loamy-skeletal, mixed,

P. Geologic Types: Permian and Jurassic sediments: limestone, sandstone, shale; outcrops of Cretaceous intrusive unit: granite, quartz monzonite and diorite, gneiss

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: ~3 miles perennial, ~10 miles ephemeral/intermittent

R. Transportation System

Trails: 11 miles Roads: 0 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 3030 (low) 1400 (moderate) 250 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): light-scattered repellancy; negligible effect was seen with rainfall

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
0 (low) 0 (moderate) 4680 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: (not modeled) tons/acre

E. Sediment Potential: (not modeled) cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): 5-10

B. Design Chance of Success, (percent): (no treatment recommended)

C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): 25

D. Design Storm Duration, (hours): 1

E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): 2.2

F. Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): (not modeled)

G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): (not modeled)

H. Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): (not modeled)

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:
A lightning strike in the Pecos Wilderness ignited a fire that made several crowning runs through heavily-timbered spruce-fir and aspen-mixed conifer stands. The loss of live canopy was nearly all above 10,000 feet elevation and mostly along shallow-gradient ridge tops, with the exception of small spotfires and a section of Esteros Canyon that was backfired. About 30 percent of the burned area was affected by crown fire, which looked like high-severity burn from the air.

In walking through a large portion of the crown-fire area, the assessment team determined that little damage had been sustained by the soil. Charred litter remained in place, and beneath it was a mat of unburned fibric material insulating the A-Horizon. Water repellancy was light and scattered, mostly on north-facing slopes where it had probably existed before the fire. Several afternoon hail-and-rainstorms had produced limited,

shallow, discontinuous rills on the steeper slopes, but no widespread erosion. A tangle of downed trees that were not consumed by the fire, augmented by post-fire blowdown, provided ample slope-delimiting roughness to mitigate water and soil movement. In many places there were new grass shoots growing root clumps.

Because the soil resource seemed capable of recovery without treatment, the crown-fire area was reclassed overall as a moderate-severity burn, with an estimate of about 5% that would qualify as high severity scattered throughout. The majority of the area within the fire perimeter was unburned or received a beneficial low-severity burn. As this was a wilderness fire with high potential for recovery, and the downstream values (Mora Creek, Maestas Creek, and the town of Rociada) were deemed to have minimal risk of significant damage from post-fire floods, the assessment team recommended no BAER treatment.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage-Producing Storm:

Land __ % Channel __ % Roads __ % Other __ %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment		
	1	3	5
Land			
Channel			
Roads			
Other			

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): $60,000

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): $60,000

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

[x] Hydrology [x] Soils [ ] Geology [x] Range [x] District Ranger
[x] Forestry [ ] Wildlife [ ] Fire Mgmt. [ ] Engineering [ ]
[ ] Contracting [ ] Ecology [ ] Botany [ ] Archaeology [ ]
[x] Fisheries [ ] Research [ ] Landscape Arch [ ] GIS

Tom Malecek, District Ranger and forestry
Bill Britton, range
Charlie Jankiewicz, range
Alison Dean, soils and hydrology
Chris Gatton, fisheries

Team Leader: Alison Dean

Email: adean@fs.fed.us Phone: 505-638-5526 FAX: 505-638-5351

H. **Treatment Narrative:**

(Describe the emergency treatments, where and how they will be applied, and what they are intended to do. This information helps to determine qualifying treatments for the appropriate funding authorities. For seeding treatments, include species, application rates and species selection rationale.)

Land Treatments:

Channel Treatments:

Roads and Trail Treatments:

Structures:

I. **Monitoring Narrative:**

(Describe the monitoring needs, what treatments will be monitored, how they will be monitored, and when monitoring will occur. A detailed monitoring plan must be submitted as a separate document to the Regional BAER coordinator.)

Part VI – Emergency Rehabilitation Treatments and Source of Funds by Land Ownership

			NFS Lands				Other Lands			All
		Unit	# of	WFSU	Other	# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT $	$	units	$	Units	$	$
A. Land Treatments										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0			
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Land Treatments				$0			$0		$0	$0
B. Channel Treatments										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Channel Treat.				$0			$0		$0	$0
C. Road and Trails										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Road & Trails				$0			$0		$0	$0
D. Structures										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Structures				$0			$0		$0	$0
E. BAER Evaluation										
Assessment Team				$7,217			$0		$0	$7,217
				$0			$0		$0	$0
F. Monitoring				$0			$0		$0	$0
G. Totals				**$7,217**			**$0**		**$0**	**$7,217**

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. _____ _____
Forest Supervisor (signature) Date

2. _____ _____
Regional Forester (signature) Date