outcrop complex, 30 to 60 percent slopes.

Date of Report:

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report	
[X] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSL[] 2. Accomplishment Report[X] 3. No Treatment Recommendation	J-SULT funds
B. Type of Action	
[X] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of fund	s needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)
[] 2. Interim Report[] Updating the initial funding request I[] Status of accomplishments to date	pased on more accurate site data or design analysis
[] 3. Final Report (Following completion of	work)
DADTII DIID	NED AREA DESCRIPTION
PARTII - BUR	NED-AREA DESCRIPTION
A. Fire Name: Source	B. Fire Number: P5A41F
C. State: CA	D. County: Madera
E. Region: Pacific Southwest (R-5)	F. Forest: Sierra NF
G. District: Bass Lake	
H. Date Fire Started: June 16, 2004	I. Date Fire Contained: June 20, 2004
J. Suppression Cost:	
 K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Sup 1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 1.0 2. Fireline seeded (miles): 3. Other (identify): 	pression Funds
L. Watershed Number: 1804000607 Mammoth F	Pool Reservoir (5 th field)
M. Total Acres Burned: 385 NFS Acres(385) Other Federal () State () Private ()
N. Vegetation Types: Ponderosa pine, California and Mariposa manzanita	Incense cedar, Black oak with an under story of Bear clover

O. Dominant Soils: Holland - Chawanakee family complex, 35 to 65% slopes and Tollhouse family - Rock

	Geologic Types. Granitic bedrock including a large tales slope
Q.	Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: 1.25 miles - Order 1 channels
R.	Transportation System
	Trails: 0 miles Roads: 0 miles
	PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION
Α.	Burn Severity (acres): <u>345</u> (low) <u>18</u> (moderate) <u>22</u> (high)
В.	Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 10
C.	Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): 363 (low) (moderate) _22 (high)
D.	Erosion Potential: 65 tons/acre
E.	Sediment Potential: 8,960 cubic yards / square mile
	PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS
A.	Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years):
	Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): Design Chance of Success, (percent):
В.	
В. С.	Design Chance of Success, (percent):
В. С. D.	Design Chance of Success, (percent): Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years):
B. C. D. E.	Design Chance of Success, (percent): Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): Design Storm Duration, (hours):
B. C. D. E.	Design Chance of Success, (percent): Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): Design Storm Duration, (hours): Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):
B. C. D. E. G.	Design Chance of Success, (percent): Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): Design Storm Duration, (hours): Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile):
B. C. D. E. G.	Design Chance of Success, (percent): Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): Design Storm Duration, (hours): Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent):

P. Goologic Types: Granitic hodrock including a large talus slope

A. Describe Watershed Emergency: No watershed emergency was found during the field survey of the burned area on 6/20/2004. Burn severity was predominately low with only a small area of high burn severity present. The high burn severity coincided with the steep, rock exposure near Source Point. The low burn severity and the widespread presence of a bear clover understory with high re-sprouting potential greatly limits the potential increase in soil erosion. The small affected area, limited vegetative change and multiple first order channels draining from the burn make the prospect of increased runoff or debris flow unlikely.

The potential does exist for a short-term increase in rockfall within and downslope from the high burn severity area. Very large rocks have already been observed falling from this area. While there are no

values-at-risk from this increased geologic hazard, it is recommended that administrative action in the form of closing the area and notifying employees (whose jobs might lead them to be in this area after fire suppression is completed) be done.

В.	Emergency	Treatment	Objectives:	None	identifi	ed
----	-----------	-----------	-------------	------	----------	----

C.	Probability	v of (Completina	Treatment	Prior to	First Mai	or Dama	ge-Producing	a Storm:
_		, -	1 3						9

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

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Ye	Years after Treatment						
	1	3	5					
Land								
Channel								
Roads								
Other								

- E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss):
- F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss):
- G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

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

Team Leader: Jerome V. DeGraff

Email: jdegraff@fs.fed.us Phone: 559-297-0706 x4932 FAX: 559-294-4809

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: None recommended

<u>Channel Treatments</u>: None recommended

Roads and Trail Treatments: None recommended

Structures: None recommended

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.)

None recommended – dozers were from local area and clean prior to starting fireline work. Therefore, no noxious weed survey is necessary.

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

		Unit	# of	WFSU	Other	X	# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT \$	\$	X	units	\$	Units	\$	\$
						8					
A. Land Treatments						8					
				\$0	\$0	X		\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0	Š		\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	Š		\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
B. Channel Treatmen	ts					8					
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Channel Treat.				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
C. Road and Trails				* -		8		* -			
				\$0	\$0	δ		\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
D. Structures				4-5	**	X		+-	!	**	**
2.0				\$0	\$0	X		\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Structures				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
E. BAER Evaluation				Ψο	ΨΟ	X		Ψ		Ψ	Ψ
				\$1,800	\$0	X		\$0		\$0	\$1,800
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Evaluation				\$1,800	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$1,800
F. Monitoring				ψ.,σσσ	ΨΟ	8		90		\$0	ψ.,500
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Monitoring				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Cabicial Monitoring				ψυ	ΨΟ	8		ΨΟ		ΨΟ	ΨΟ
G. Totals				\$1,800	\$ 0	8		\$0		\$0	\$1,800
J. Totals				Ψ1,000	\$0	8		ΨΟ		Ψυ	ψ1,000

PART VII - APPROVALS

1.	_/s/ Edward C. Cole Forest Supervisor (signature)	<u>06/23/04</u> Date
2.	Regional Forester (signature)	

