

Date of Report: 5/9/01

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
☐ 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
☐ 3. Final Report (Following completion of work)

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTIONA. Fire Name: M-9B. Fire Number: P53670C. State: CAD. County: TehamaE. Region: 5F. Forest: MendocinoG. District: Grindstone (53)H. Date Fire Started: May 2, 2001I. Date Fire Controlled: May 5, 2001J. Suppression Cost: \$320,000.00

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds

1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 6.9
2. Fireline seeded (miles): 0 miles
3. Other (identify): Cleaned fireline stream crossings with an excavator (starting 5/7).
Covered exposed soil at crossings with brush.

L. Watershed Number: 1802011502M. Total Acres Burned: 860

NFS Acres (750) Other Federal () State () Private (110)

N. Vegetation Types: Chaparral, knobcone, Ponderosa pineO. Dominant Soils: Maymen, Sheetiron, Los GatosP. Geologic Types: Grindstone Creek formation - mudstones/sandstones

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:

Order 1 streams = 6.4 miles

Order 2 streams = 0.9 miles

R. Transportation System

Trails: 0.6 miles

Roads: 3.4 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 170 (low) 150 (moderate) 540 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 40

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
 ___ (low) ___ (moderate) 860 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: 6.0 tons/acre

E. Sediment Potential: 880 cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): 8-10

B. Design Chance of Success, (percent): NA – no treatment prescribed

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

D. Design Storm Duration, (hours): NA

E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):

F. Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): NA

G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): 5%

H. Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): NA

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

The M-9 fire was located in the Grindstone Creek watershed of the Stony Creek basin. The Grindstone Ranger District was the responsible administrative unit.

The (escaped) fire started from an old burned slash pile on private land when a 40 mph North wind event hit the area. Slash piles on both sides of road M-9 ignited. Embers were blown onto NFS harvested timber land and eventually into a NFS brush field.

The fire was wind driven, resulting in a narrow and linear burn pattern. When the wind ceased, the rate of fire spread greatly diminished and dozers, with the aid of handcrews and engines, were able to flank the downslope side of the fire. Other engines and handcrews held the upper flank along an existing road (23N08).

Burn severity mapping revealed that the harvested timbered areas were burned at a low to moderate intensity. A Forest Service plantation burned mostly at low intensity with a minor amount (5%) of mortality. The brushfield burned at high intensity leaving tall "skeletons", indicating a short duration fire. Testing for hydrophobic soils in the brushfield revealed that a small portion of the area had moderate hydrophobicity. However, the soil, about ¼" under the surface, was very moist. With this amount of remaining soil moisture it is expected that the chamise will readily sprout. By winter, there should be adequate revegetation to protect the site. Since the fire was narrow and along a ridge top, it emulated a prescribed burn. No mini-watersheds were over impacted by the fire.

Various resource specialists were contacted for their concerns. Wildlife concerns about spotted owls were distant from the fire area, fisheries concerns were for trout and yellow legged frog in Grindstone Creek, range concerns were that the permittee be notified that a fire was in the grazing allotment, engineering concerns were adequate waterbarring of roads used as fire control lines, timber concerns were about loss of plantation trees, soils concerns were about the severe EHR soils, hydrology concerns were about clean out of streams crossed by the dozer lines, archeology concerns were for a spring area that was damaged during suppression activities and botany concerns were about spread of noxious weeds.

Since the burn was similar to a prescribed burn and no resource concerns, except noxious weeds, were identified, no emergency watershed treatment exists with this fire. However, the noxious weed concern is important and requires BAER funding for monitoring and eradication.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

None

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):_ NA

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss):

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Range	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forestry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/> Fire Mgmt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Contracting	<input type="checkbox"/> Ecology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Botany	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeology	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fisheries	<input type="checkbox"/> Research	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Arch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS	

Team Leader: Robert Faust

Email: rfaust@fs.fed.us

Phone: (530) 934-1152

FAX: (530) 934-7384

H. Treatment Narrative:

Land Treatments:

None

Channel Treatments:

None

Roads and Trail Treatments:

None

Structures:

None

H. Monitoring Narrative:

Monitoring needs:

Noxious weed introduction:

There were seven dozers with lowboys, 12 engines, handcrews and aircraft assigned to the fire. The dozers and engines originated from valley low elevation areas and Modoc County where yellowstar thistle and other noxious weeds are prevalent. No equipment was washed prior to entering the fire area. The staging area at fire camp contained yellowstar thistle.

Average elevation at the fire area is about 4500 feet. No yellowstar thistle is known exist or was seen on Daves Ridge or the lowboy staging areas (M-9 near the center of section 36).

The Forest has a concern that the dozers, engines and lowboys may have spread yellowstar thistle or other noxious weeds into a previously uninfested area. About 3.3 miles of dozer line were constructed. Dozers were off loaded about ¼ mile from the fire. Engines were used on road 23N55 and 23N08.

Monitoring Plan:

At this elevation noxious weeds become identifiable by late spring and early summer. Trained observers will need to walk the dozer lines, roads and road M-9 staging area at two time periods each year for the next two years. If weeds are found in either year, a third year of survey will be necessary. Also, upon discovery of an infestation, eradication must be done. The Forest noxious weed coordinator will do the plant identification training, assure monitoring is completed according to protocol and write a findings report by the end of each fiscal year. A detailed monitoring plan is submitted separately 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
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
B. Channel Treatments											
				\$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
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
D. Structures											
				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Structures				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
E. BAER Evaluation											
Salary	days	\$250	3	\$750				\$0		\$0	\$750
				\$0				\$0		\$0	\$0
F. Monitoring Cost				\$7,500				\$0		\$0	\$7,500
Noxious weed											
Monitoring	days	\$250	10	\$2,500							\$2,800
Eradication	project	\$5,000	1	\$5,000							\$5,000
G. Totals				\$8,250				\$0		\$0	\$8,250

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. /s/ James Fenwood
Forest Supervisor (signature)

5/8/01
Date

2. /s/ C. Wayne Simonson (for)
Regional Forester (signature)

5/15/01
Date