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

Date of Report: July 12, 2008

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

NO TREATMENT DECISION- as a minimum fill out the yellow highlighted sections

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report	
[] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSU[] 2. Accomplishment Report[x] 3. No Treatment Recommendation	-SULT funds
B. Type of Action	
[] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds	s needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)
[] 2. Interim Report [] Updating the initial funding request [] Status of accomplishments to date	based on more accurate site data or design analysis
[] 3. Final Report (Following completion of	f work)
DADT II . BIII	RNED-AREA DESCRIPTION
FARTII - BOI	MED-AREA DESCRIPTION
A. Fire Name: Peterson Complex	B. Fire Number: CA LNF 00275
C. State: California	D. County: Shasta County / Lassen County
E. Region: 5	F. Forest: Lassen National Forest
G. District: Hat Creek	
H. Date Fire Started: June 22, 2008	I. Date Fire Contained July 1, 2008:
J. Suppression Cost \$1,853,454 K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Su 1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 2. Fireline seeded (miles): 3. Other (identify):	ppression Funds
L. Watershed Number:	
M. Total Acres Burned: 7.821 NFS Acres(2,755) Other Federal (4,118)	State (517) Private (430)
N. Vegetation Types: Eastside Pine, Juniper Wo	oodland, Big Sagebrush

O. Dominant Soils Soil Map units only cover NFS lands: Bobbit-Brownlee-Alicel families complex (0-35); Bobbit family, moderately deep-Gwin families (0-35%); Bobbitt family

silt, and clay deposited in lakebeds or lo Pliocene volcanic-basalt	w areas, alluvium; stream to basin fill deposits (undifferentiated),
Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or C	Class:
Transportation System	
Trails: miles Roads: miles	
<u>PART I</u>	II - WATERSHED CONDITION
A. Burn Severity (acres): 3,896 (low)	3,138 (moderate) 183 (high)
NFS: <u>1,132</u> (low) <u>1,230</u> (moderat (BARC imagery; no changes were made; wB. Water-Repellent Soil (acres):	
C. 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): <u>2</u>
B. Design Chance of Success, (percent):	
C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval,	(years):
D. Design Storm Duration, (hours):	
E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):	
F. Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square	re mile):
G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (per	cent):
Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square r	nile):
PART Y	V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS
A. Describe Watershed Emergency: ST AND IF SO, WHAT THEY ARE.	ATE WHETHER OR NOT VALUES AT RISK WERE IDENTIFIED

P. Geologic Types: Pleistocene volcanic basalt, Recent volcanic basalt, lake deposits: unconsolidated sand,

 OHV incursions and erosion of archeologic sites within fire perimeter (Brenda Reed, Hat Creek District Archeologist)

Values at risk were identified through person to person conversations with specialists at the Supervisor's Office and phone conversations with District specialists on the Hat Creek Ranger District. Initial values at risk are

listed below:

The potential values at risk, in relation to engineering, involve the forest transportation system.
 Along with the Pittville Highway (Lassen County Road 111), there were approximately 110

- miles of National Forest System roads (NFSRs) in or affected by the fire. Drainage crossings are the primary concern when assessing potential effects of increased runoff due to wildfire on the forest transportation system.
- Spread of invasive noxious weeds throughout the fire area (Allison Sanger, Forest Botanist).
- B. Emergency Treatment Objectives: Even if Values at Risk were identified, the actual threat to them may be quite low due to the fire size or other circumstances. Provide further description and why NO TREATMENT was chosen. Otherwise, we may need to go further in our assessment and consideration of possible treatments.

Field visits found that an emergency only exists for the spread of invasive noxious weeds.

Invasive noxious weeds

There is an emergency for the spread of invasive noxious weeds within the Peterson Fire. Dispersal of weeds from fire equipment movement poses a significant risk to the native plant post-fire regeneration. Roadsides and dozer lines will be most impacted by this threat. Due to the extreme fire behavior during initial attack, there was not adequate time to set up a washing station to prevent the transport of weed seed into the burned area during suppression activities. Equipment such as engines, dozers, and excavators were not washed or inspected or cleaned for dirt/plant parts on the way into the fire during suppression and rehabilitation efforts. Because of this, we have no way of knowing if invasive noxious weed seeds were introduced to roadsides and dozer lines within the fire area. If any weeds were introduced, they could take advantage of the disturbance associated with the fire and displace native vegetation, degrade habitat function, lower ecosystem stability. Assessing the establishment of weeds and treating small outlying populations before they expand, will prevent the weeds from becoming serious threats to the recovery of native plants. Monitoring for invasive noxious weeds has been requested and is required under the Sierra Nevada Framework FSEIS ROD following wildfire (page 55 (refer to monitoring plan).

Archeology

There is no emergency for the protection of archeolgical sites. Potential archeological sites risk are located in areas of low burn severity and areas with slopes less than 5%. Vegetation has already begun to re-sprout in areas with a low burn severity. Consequently, there is a low risk of accelerated erosion in and around the archeologic sites. From the survey, it was also determined that archeological sites were at a risk of OHV incursion prior to the Peterson Fire. Vegetative and physical barriers were not present prior to the fire and unauthozed routes traverse the perimeter of one of the sites. There is no emergency for the protection of archeolgical sites.

Transporation-NFS roads

There is no emergency for road-related drainage problems on NFS roads. Some pre-existing and suppression-related problems were discovered. No BAER treatments are recommended at this time. A field and office review was conducted on July 9 2008. Drainage crossings were the primary concern when assessing potential effects of increased runoff due to wildfire on the forest transportation system. Focus was aimed at road segments below or within areas of high burn severity. In general, the review observed NFS roads west of the Pittville Highway and north of Forest Distinctive Route 22. Collector routes NFSR 35N11, NFSR 35N42Y, and NFSR 35N18 were included in the assessment, along with various local roads.

C. Probability	of Com	pletin	g Treatme	ent Prio	r to First	Major	Damag	e-Producing	Storm:
	Land	%	Channel	%	Roads	%	Other	%	

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment							
	1	1 3						
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:

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

Team Leader: Andrew Breibart:

Email:abreibart@fs.fed.us Phone:530-252-6456 FAX: 530-252-6428:

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.)

No treatments have been proposed.

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.)

Monitoring for the presence and threat of invasive noxious weeds has been proposed:

A. Treatment Type

The treatment is noxious weed detection surveys of all roads, dozer lines, staging area, and drop points affected by the Peterson Fire. These areas will be surveyed for evidence of introduction or spread of noxious weeds. If any new or outlying populations are found in these surveys, a supplementary request for noxious weed treatment will be submitted.

B. Treatment Objective

To determine if the fire and associated ground disturbing activities have promoted the establishment and spread of noxious weeds to the extent that eradication efforts are necessary. Early detection dramatically increases the likelihood of successful treatment. If weeds are detected, a supplemental request for BAER funds will be made for eradication.

C. Treatment Description

Surveys will begin in 2009 during the flowering periods of weed species. Completion of surveys along dozer lines, staging areas, and known invasive plant populations will be the first priority. The second survey priorities will be along roads, handlines, and drop points. Surveys of general habitats in the burned area will be the lowest priority. All locations of weed species will be documented and mapped using GPS equipment. Surveys will be completed using the NRIS protocol available at the national website: http://fsweb.ftcol.wo.fs.fed.us/frs/rangelands/index.shtml. Results will be entered into the NRIS database.

D. Reporting

A Weed Detection Survey Report will be submitted to the regional BAER coordinator. If weed introduction and spread has occurred, an interim BAER report will be completed to request eradication funding.

E. Treatment Cost:

L. Heatinent Cost.		
GS - 9 Botanist	\$235/day x 5 days =	\$1,175
GS - 5 Bio Tech	\$130/day x 1 pay periods (10 days) =	\$1,600
GS – 5 Bio Tech	\$130/day x 1 pay periods (10 days) =	\$1,600
Mileage:	500 @ 0.46/mile = Total Cost Estimate for FY 2009 = \$	\$225 \$4,600

Part VI – Emergency Rehabilitation Treatments and Source of Funds by Land Ownership									
						X			
A. Land Treatments						X			
				\$0	\$0	X	\$0	\$0	\$0
				0.9	0.9	X	0.2	0.2	0.9

						83			
A. Land Treatments						X X			
				\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0	X	\$0	\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0	X	\$0	\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	X	\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$0	\$0	X	\$0	\$0	\$0
B. Channel Treatment	ts					X		•	,
				\$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	
Subtotal Channel Treat.				\$0	\$0	8	\$0	\$0	
C. Road and Trails				·		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	
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
D. Structures				,	·	X		!	
				\$0	\$0	X	\$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	\$0
E. BAER Evaluation					·	X			
BAER Team	assessr	2718	1	\$2,718	\$0	8	\$0	\$0	\$2,718
				\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal Evaluation				\$2,718	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$2,718
F. Monitoring				. ,	·	8			. ,
Invasive noxious wed	plan	4,600	1	\$4,600	\$0	8	\$0	\$0	\$4,600
Insert new items above this line!	•	, -		\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0
Subtotal Monitoring				\$4,600	\$0		\$0	\$0	\$4,600
Ŭ				. ,		8			. ,
G. Totals				\$7,318	\$0	8	\$0	\$0	\$7,318
				, , ,	, ,	8	**	1	. ,

PART VII - APPROVALS

1.	<u>/s/ Kathleen Morse</u>	<u>_8/5/08</u> _
	Forest Supervisor (signature)	Date
2.	/s/ James M. Peña (for) Regional Forester (signature)	<u>8/7/08</u> Date