

USDA-FOREST SERVICE

Date of Report: December 15, 1988

BURNED AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13, Report FS-2500-A)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. Type of Report

☒ A. Funding (Request for estimated FFF funds)☐ B. Accomplishment Report

2. Type of Action

☐ A. Initial (estimated funding is first requested)☒ B. Interim☒ Updating the initial funding request.☐ Supplying information for accomplishments to date on emergency work underway.☐ C. Final☐ Best estimate for funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measure.☐ Following completion of funded work.☐ Negative report.

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire Name: Texas 2. Forest Supervisor's Fire No.: 38733. State: CA 4. County: San Bernardino 5. Region: 56. Forest: San Bernardino 7. Ranger District: Cajon8. Date Fire Started: 9/28/88 9. Date Fire Controlled: 10/6/8810. Estimated Suppression Costs: \$2,750,000

11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds:

Firelines waterbarred: 9 miles Firelines seeded: 72 acres

Other (identify):

12. Fire Intensity - Low: 5% Medium: 10% High: 85%

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed No.: 38, 39, 40, & 41 2. NFS Acres Burned: 5,1603. Water Repellant Soil: 95% of NFS acres burned

4. Vegetation Types: Chaparral 90%, Oak/conifer woodland 9%, Riparian 1%

5. Geologic Types: Metamorphic, 4319 acres; Granitic, 865 acres

6. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating: Low 0% Medium 0% High 100%

7. Erosion Potential: 106,780 average cu. yds/sq. mile

8. Miles of Stream Channels by Regional Order or Classes:

PWI	I	II	III
38	0.82	0.68	0.00
39	2.27	0.95	0.00
40	5.00	0.00	0.00
41	4.92	2.16	0.64
TOTAL	13.01	3.79	0.64

9. Miles of Forest Service Trails: 0.00

10. Miles of Forest Service Roads by Maintenance Levels:

I	II	III, IV, V
0.1 miles	7.15 miles	10.8 miles

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION	
1. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: 3 years for 80% ground cover 2. Chance of Success Desired by Management: 85% 3. Equivalent Design Recurrence Period: 100 years 4. Related Design Storm Duration: 3 hours 5. Related Design Storm Magnitude: 2.45 inches 6. Related Design Flow: ---- cfsm 7. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: 50% 8. Adjusted Related Design Flow: ---- cfsm	
PART V - SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS	
1. Skills Represented on Burned Area Survey Team ("x" appropriate boxes): <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Range <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timber <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife <input type="checkbox"/> Fire <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering <input type="checkbox"/> Contracting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Mgmt <input type="checkbox"/> Research <input type="checkbox"/> Other (identify)	
2. Describe Emergency: The extreme intensity of the burn has caused pervasive hydrophobicity of the soil. This effect has raised the run-off coefficient over soils that have high to extreme erosion hazard ratings. It is likely that soil and debris in excess of one million cubic yards could be produced from the burned area.	
3. Emergency Rehabilitation Objective: To reduce the amount of soil that will erode and to reduce the volume of sediment that will be delivered down-slope and downstream.	
4. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage-Producing Storm: Land 95% Channel 70% Roads 95% Other	
5. Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant <input type="checkbox"/> Not Significant	
6. Net Social Well Being Benefit Index: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant <input type="checkbox"/> Not Significant	
7. Benefit/Cost Ratio:	8. Net Benefits: \$
9. Cost Effectiveness Index: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I. <input type="checkbox"/> II. <input type="checkbox"/> III. <input type="checkbox"/> IV.	
10. The following is a listing of some of the values to be protected by the proposed reseedling and road drainage improvement projects: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Wild trout in East Etiwanda Creek. Residences located along Lytle Creek Road which lack flood protection structures between them and the burned area. Scattered residences along the southern boundary of the National Forest. Large chicken ranch below Duncan Canyon. Water supplies for adjacent residences and for the Cucamonga Water Company. Downstream cities of Fontana and Rancho Cucamonga. 	

**PART VI - ELIGIBLE EMERGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS
AND SOURCE OF FUNDS**

NOTE: 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 Lands			All Lands
Line Items	Units	Unit	No. of	FFP 092	Other \$	No. of	Federal \$	Non-Federal	Total
		Cost	Units	\$		Units		\$	\$
								SCS/CDF/SBC	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
A. LAND									
** a. Seeding **	Acres	55	1,300	71,500		400		20,000	91,500
b. (see below)									
c.									
d.									
e.									
B. CHANNELS									
a. Open water course	Miles	3650	0.6	2,190		0.9	1,710	1,710	5,610
b. Streambank stabil	Miles								
c.									
d.									
e.									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
a. Drainage Struct	Each	1/	18	35,100					35,100
b.									
c.									
d.									
D. MAJOR STRUCTURES									
a. Preplanned									
E. TOTAL				108,790			1,710	21,710	132,210

PART VII - APPROVALS

/s/ Richard L. Stauber

12/15/88

Forest Supervisor (Signature)

Date

Andrew G. Lauer

1-9-89

for Regional Forester (Signature)

Date

1/ Costs of structures vary by size.