

USDA Forest Service

## BURNED AREA REPORT

Page 1

Detailed instructions for use of this form are in the Burned-Area Emergency Rehabilitation Handbook (FSH 2509.13), Section 41.

1. Fire name WRIGHTS		2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Initial <input type="checkbox"/> Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Accomplishment report <input type="checkbox"/> FFF <input type="checkbox"/> Other		3. Date of report August 17, 1981	
4. State California	5. County El Dorado	6. Congressional District 14	7. Region 5	8. Forest Eldorado	9. Ranger District Placerville
10. Supervisor 051 fire no.	11. Date fire started August 8, 1981	12. Date controlled August 13, 1981	13. Estimated suppression cost \$2,000,000		
14. Fire suppression damages repaired with FFF 102 funds 12 mi. firelines waterbarred 5 acres firelines seeded					
15. Fire intensity 15 % low 25 % medium 60 % high					

## NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

16. Watershed no. 18 02 01 29 01	17. NFS acres burned 3,500	18. Water repellent soil 15 % of NFS area burned
19. Vegetation types 15% brush, 5% rock outcrop & meadows, 10% Red fir, 70% mixed conifer		
20. Geologic types 90% granitic 5% glacial 5% volcanic		
21. Soil erosion hazard rating 5 % low 20 % med. 75 % high	22. Erosion potential 170,000 cu. yds./sq. mi.	23. Flood peak potential 165 cu. ft./sec./sq. mi.
24. Miles of stream channels by Regional order or classes 5 miles Class III 2.5 Class II		
25. Miles of Forest Service roads and trails by maintenance levels non-system 10 mi. 0.5 mi. level I rds. mi. level II rds. 3.5 mi. levels III, IV, V rds. 4 mi. trails		

## CLIMATIC DATA

26. Annual precipitation 55 - 65 inches	27. Design storm rainfall during 6 hour period 2.2 inches 2 yr. frequency 2.8 inches 10 yr. frequency
28. Annual runoff 35 inches	29. Maximum 30 minute intensity storm .5 inches 2 yr. frequency .8 inches 10 yr. frequency

## SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

30. Skills represented on burned area survey team (check) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils <input type="checkbox"/> Geology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Range <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Timber <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife <input type="checkbox"/> Fire Management <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering <input type="checkbox"/> Contracting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Management <input type="checkbox"/> Research <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
31. Describe emergency High potential for onsite sheet, rill, and gully erosion and the associated reduction in site productivity. Onsite and offsite sedimentation, rockfalls and the associated damage to roads, recreation, non-community water system, fisheries, water storage facilities and historic sites.	
32. Emergency rehabilitation objective Stabilize the soils with grasses and forbs thereby protecting site productivity & reducing damages to downstream beneficial uses. Stabilizing the soils will also reduce the potential for rockfalls and debris torrents damaging U.S. Highway #50 & impacting water projects under FERC licenses #184 & #2101.	
33. Personnel needs for rehabilitation project on NFS lands 0.5 man-years reassigned for \$11,000 no man-years new hires for \$ --	
34. Probability of completing treatment prior to first major damage-producing storm Land 95 % Channel % Roads 95 % Other %	
35. Net environmental quality benefit index <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant <input type="checkbox"/> Not Significant	
36. Net social wellbeing benefit index <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant <input type="checkbox"/> Not Significant	
37. Benefit/cost ratio 20.2 to 1	38. Cost effectiveness index (check one) #782,929 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I <input type="checkbox"/> II <input type="checkbox"/> III <input type="checkbox"/> IV
39. Forest Supervisor approval & date ROBERT R. LUSK <i>[Signature]</i> Aug -18-81	
Regional Forester approval & date <i>[Signature]</i> 8/21/81	
Date funding approved in WO	

T2500-3 (7/78)

ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE DEVELOPMENTS SUBJECT TO HAZARDS FROM FLOODS, FLOATING DEBRIS, EROSION, OR SEDIMENT BECAUSE A WATERSHED IS IMPAIRED BY WILDFIRE. (Do not include value of resources damaged or destroyed by the fire as reported on Form 5100-29.)

	No. of units	Estimated value (dollars)
40. Community and urban development	people cabins 12	600,000
41. Municipal and domestic water supply	people served 385	100,000
42. Transportation systems	miles 9	600,000
43. Water distribution systems (irrigation)	miles -	-
44. Agricultural development (crops, facilities)	acres -	-
45. Industrial development (dams, power, manufacturing)	number 2	10,000
46. Power and communication lines	miles -	-
47. Recreation development	PAOT 20	-2,100
48. Fish habitat	miles 9	7,500
49. Other (specify) Wildlife habitat	hunter-days	23,000
TOTAL HAZARD POTENTIAL (Indicates values threatened by design storm. Does not enter into the R/C.)		1,342,600

NARRATIVE (Optional. May be left out or expanded on additional sheets as needed.)

## BURNED AREA REPORT

Fire Name Wrights

Date of Report August 17, 1981

Page 3

## SUMMARY OF EMERGENCY REHABILITATION NEEDS BY LAND OWNERSHIP

Land ownership	50.  Acres burned	51. Emergency rehabilitation needs				Source of emergency rehabilitation funds for needed work (dollars)							
		Land (acres)	Channel (miles)	Road and Trail (miles)	Other	52.		53.  216	54.  FR&T	55.  Other Federal (name)	56.  Non- Federal (name)	57.  Total	
						092	FFF						
								102					
FEDERAL NFS	3,500	2,610	0	2	-	38,800	9,000	0				47,800	
Other (name)	N/A												
Subtotal Federal													
NON-FEDERAL State & county	N/A												
Indian reservation	N/A												
Private	100												
Subtotal Non-Federal	N/A												
TOTAL	3,600	2,610	0	2	-	38,800	9,000	0				47,800	

T 2500-8 (7/78)

ELIGIBLE EMERGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS

(Emergency rehabilitation is work done promptly following a wildfire and is not to solve watershed problems that existed prior to the wildfire.)

ask region for costs	Units	Unit cost	NFS Lands			Other Lands			Total dollars all lands
			No. of units NFS	FFP 094 dollars	Other dollars (Name)	No. of units other	Federal dollars (Name)	Non-Fed. dollars (Name)	
<b>58. LAND</b>									
Seeding	Acres	13.00	2,600	33,800					33,800
Slashing & Barriers	Acres	400	10	4,000					4,000
<b>59. CHANNELS</b>									
Opening water courses	Miles	-							
Stabilizing streambanks	Miles	-							
<b>60. ROADS &amp; TRAILS</b>									
Pony Express Trail	1	500	2	1,000					1,000
<b>61. MAJOR STRUCTURES</b>									
Preplanned -- from Forest Plans	N/A Each	0							
TOTAL				38,800					38,800

EXAMINING IMPACTS OF MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR AN EMERGENCY PROGRAM

62.

EXPECTED DAMAGE REDUCTION BENEFIT SUMMARY  
at current Water Resources Council interest rate of 7.375 percent

Economic benefit indices	Units of measure	Damage expected				Expected \$ damage reduction
		Without treatment		With treatment		
		No. of units	Present value \$	No. of units	Present value \$	
WATERSHED IMPACTS \$75 SEDIMENTS Downstream water storage	ac-ft	105	7,875	21	1,575	6,300
Sediment removal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Fish habitat (9 miles)	user/days	1,000	15,000	500	7,500	7,500
Water quality	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
FLOOD WATER Land	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Improvements	Cabins	12	600,000	0	0	600,000
Subtotal watershed			622,875		9,075	613,800
RESOURCE RELATED IMPACTS Range	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Wildlife and recreation	deer hunter days	575	23,000	0	0	23,000
Timber	MBF	59,976	146,129	0	0	146,129
Subtotal resource related			169,129		0	169,129
OTHER IMPACTS						-
						-
Subtotal other						-
Total dollars			792,004		9,075	782,929

Fire Name Wrights

Date of Report Aug. 17, 1981

## EXAMINING IMPACTS OF MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVES FOR AN EMERGENCY PROGRAM

63. (Table 4)

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BENEFIT INDEX

ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA	Weight Factor	Without treatment		With treatment		Difference	
		Actual	Weighted	Actual	Weighted	Actual	Weighted
Erosion and sediment	8	2	16	1	8	1	8
Aesthetic land quality	5	1	5	0	0	1	5
Water quality	9	2	18	1	9	1	9
Site productivity	10	2	20	0	0	2	20
Wildlife habitat	6	1	6	0	0	1	6
Fish habitat	4	1	4	0	0	1	4
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	42		69		17		52
Average weighted index			1.6		0.4		1.2
Net environmental quality benefit index							S

64. (Table 5)

SOCIAL WELL-BEING BENEFIT INDEX

SOCIAL CRITERIA	Weight Factor	Without treatment		With treatment		Difference	
		Actual	Weighted	Actual	Weighted	Actual	Weighted
Life, health, safety	10	2	20	1	10	1	10
Employment	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Recreational opportunity	6	1	6	0	0	1	6
Economic stability	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Income distribution	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Preserve special sites	6	1	6	0	0	1	6
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	28		32		10		22
Average weighted index			1.1		0.4		0.8
Net social well-being benefit index							S