Date of Report:

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

GENERALLY THIS SHORT FORM CAN BE USED FOR SMALL FIRES (300-500 ACRES OR LESS) AND THERE IS A NO TREATMENT DECISION AND/OR THE ONLY PROPOSED TREATMENT IS NOXIOUS WEED DETECTION SURVEY- as a minimum fill out the yellow highlighted sections

NOTE: IF THERE IS A FUNDING REQUEST FOR NOXIOUS WEED DETECTION SURVEY, THEN THIS SHORT FORM 2500-8 MUST BE SIGNED BY FOREST SUPERVISOR and a funding request made through the correspondence database.

IF THERE IS NO FUNDING REQUEST, THEN THE TEAM LEADER OR FOREST BAER COORDINATOR MAY SIGN and send directly to the Regional Coordinator.

CALL THE REGIONAL COORDINATOR IF THERE IS A QUESTIONS IF THIS FORM IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE PARTICULAR FIRE August 25, 2009 BR

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

I.	Type of F	Report

- [] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSU-SULT funds
- [] 2. Accomplishment Report
- [X] 3. No Treatment Recommendation
- I. Type of Action
 - [X] 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 DESCRIPTION

- A. Fire Name: Silver Fire B. Fire Number: PNF-961
- C. State: CA D. County: Plumas
- E. Region: 5 F. Forest: Plumas
- G. District: Mount Hough
- H. Date Fire Started: September 19, 2009 I. Date Fire Contained: September 22, 2009
- J. Suppression Cost:
- K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds

	 Fireline waterbarred (miles): Fireline seeded (miles): Other (identify):
L.	Watershed Number:
M.	Total Acres Burned: 307 NFS Acres (307) Other Federal () State () Private ()
<mark>N.</mark>	Vegetation Types: mixed conifer
<mark>0.</mark>	Dominant Soils: Typic Haploxerults, Mollic Haploxeralfs
P.	Geologic Types: Peridotite, Serpentine, rock outcrops and rubble land (10-15%)
Q.	Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:
	I. Transportation System
	Trails:_ miles Roads:_ miles
	PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION
Δ	Burn Severity (acres): 132 (low) 95 (moderate) 80 (high)
	Water-Repellent Soil (acres):
	Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): (low) (moderate) (high)
D.	Erosion Potential: tons/acre
E.	Sediment Potential: cubic yards / square mile
	PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS
A.	Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years):2_
В.	Design Chance of Success, (percent):
C.	Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years):
D.	Design Storm Duration, (hours):
Ε.	Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):
F.	Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile):
G.	Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent):
	I. Adjusted Design Flow. (cfs per square mile):

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency: State whether or not Values At Risk were identified and the degree or level of threats to them. Two potential values at risk were identified: the Forest Service's property investment in the 24N30A road (along the eastern perimeter of the fire) and a Special Use Permittee's domestic water diversion structure and pipeline along Silver Creek at the southern tip of the burned area. Risk to the road would be increased post-fire runoff and erosion that could result in bedload and debris disrupting road drainage, potentially resulting in washouts of the road prism, particularly at the 8 small culverts that cross the road on ephemeral drainages. Risk to the water diversion and pipeline would be increased risk of debris flows or rock fall that would damage the structure or crush the pipeline.

Provide justification why NO TREATMENT was chosen.

Effects of the fire do not appear to be sufficient to result in significant alteration of runoff or erosion rates in the watersheds located above the two potential values at risk. Only 80 acres appear to have burned at high severity, as indicated by significant consumption of organics on the forest floor. However, indications of hydrophobicity were infrequent and, where present, were of low intensity. Further, the high severity acres were not concentrated spatially but were spread out over nearly a dozen small ephemeral drainages. Therefore, runoff intensity is expected to be similar to pre-fire runoff and would not be altered significantly enough to place the culvert crossings on 24N30A at a higher risk of failure. Only a very small portion of the burned area is located in the Silver Creek watershed and soil burn severity on that portion was generally low. Some ground cover was consumed but the burned slopes have high rock content and appear resistant to mass wasting events. Assessment indicated little or no increase in the risk that a debris flow or rock slide that could damage the water works would occur on those slope above the risk that was present pre-fire. The Special Use Permittee has been advised of the BAER team's findings.

В.	Emergency Treatmen	t Objectives:		
C.	Probability of Complet	ing Treatment Pric	or 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):
- F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss):
 - I. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

[x] Hydrology [] Forestry [] Contracting [] Fisheries		[] Geology [] Fire Mgmt. [] Botany [] Landscape Arch	[] Engineering [] Archaeology	[] []	
Team Leader: Joe Ho	offman				
Email: jahoffman@fs	s.fed.us_	Phone	e: <u>(530) 283-7868</u>		FAX <u>:</u>
(Describe the e do. This inform seeding treatments	nation helps to dents, include spe	determine qualifying ecies, application ra	treatments for the tes and species sel	appropriate lection ratior	hat they are intended to funding authorities. For nale.)
Channel Treatm	nents:				
Roads and Trai	I 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 L	ands		All
		Unit	# of	WFSU	Other		# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT \$	\$		units	\$	Units	\$	\$
A. Land Treatments			_								
noxious weed survey	season	500	2	\$1,000	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$1,00
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
nsert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$1,000	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$1,00
B. Channel Treatmen	ts										
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$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	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$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	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Structures				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$(
E. BAER Evaluation				4-5	4.			**		1 72	<u> </u>
	team	1200	1	\$1,200	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$1,20
			i i	\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
Subtotal Evaluation				\$1,200	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$1,20
F. Monitoring				ψ., <u>-</u> 50	Ψ0			+ 0		"	ψ·,=0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
nsert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$
Subtotal Monitoring				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	<u>Ψ</u>
Dantotal Monitoring				ΨΟ	ΨΟ			Ψ0		Ψ3	Ψ
G. Totals				\$2,200	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$2,20

f NO TREATMENT AND NO FUNDING REQUEST-	<mark>- then</mark>
Forest Coordinator or Team Leader (signature) _	Date
F NO TREATMENT EXCEPT FUNDING REQUEST	FOR NOXIOUS WEED DETECTION SURVEY, ther
Forest Supervisor (signature)	Date
Regional Forester (signature)	Date