USDA-FOREST SERVICE

FS-2500-8 (6/06)

Date of Report: August 12, 2015

BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

[x] 1. Funding request for estimated emergency stabilization funds
[ ] 2. Accomplishment Report
[ ] 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

[x] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds needed to complete eligible stabilization 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: Frog

B. Fire Number: CA-MDF-000570

C. State: CA

D. County: Modoc

E. Region: 05

F. Forest: Modoc

G. District: Big Valley Ranger District

H. Fire Incident Job Code: 0509 P5J0HP

I. Date Fire Started: 07/30/2015

J. Date Fire Contained: 08/07/2015

K. Suppression Cost: Estimated at 5 million

L. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds
1. Fireline waterbarred (miles):
2. Fireline seeded (miles):
3. Other (identify):

M. Watershed Number: HUC12, 1802000213
6th Field Sub-watersheds: 180200021304, 180200021302,180200021303, 180200021307

N. Total Acres Burned: 4,780
NFS Acres(x) Other Federal ( ) State ( ) Private ( )

O. Vegetation Types: Two major types were found: eastside pine forest and shrub dominated openings which included a combination of manzanita, bitterbrush, sagebrush and a small component of mountain mahogany.

P. Dominant Soils: Germany, lithic Xerumbrepts, and lava flows

Q. Geologic Types:

R. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: 0 (no mapped streams were indicated in the burn area using NHD data. Watershed analysis using 1/3 Arc-sec DEM Watershed analysis was performed using ArcGIS and no flowlines were detected).

S. Transportation System

Trails: 0 miles Roads: 16 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres) 790 (very low) 2,426 (low) 1,554 (moderate) 10 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 1,243

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
4,780 (low) - (moderate) - (high)

D. Erosion Potential: 0.035 tons/acre (moderate severity fire modelled for 2 year event)

E. Sediment Potential: was not calculated due to no streams within the burn cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): 10

B. Design Chance of Success, (percent): 90

C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): N/A

D. Design Storm Duration, (hours): N/A

E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): N/A

F. Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): N/A

G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): 20%

H. Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): N/A

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A Describe Watershed Emergency:

The Frog Fire started on July 30th 2014 from an outbreak of dry lightening and is approximately 4,780 acres in size. The fire burned in areas with a high amount of lava reefs, scattered timber, brush, with relatively flat and rock armored slopes. The fire was in a rural area and the identified values at risk included, Human Safety and Plant Community values at risk (see table 1 for the values at risk identified and the risk assessment). There is little risk to other values due predominantly to low to moderate soil burn severity and lava reefs; little watershed response above unburned levels is anticipated.

Table 1: Values-At-Risk, Risk Assessment, and Recommendations for the Frog Fire.

Value at Risk	**Probability of Loss**	**Magnitude of Consequences**	**Risk**	**Notes/Reccommendations**
NFS Roads	Unlikely	Minor	Very Low	Flat watersheds, low soil burn severity, significant amounts of surface rock
Noxious Weeds	Very Likely	Moderate	Very High	Suppression vehiles were not washed prior to entering the fire perimeter.
Visitor/Employee Safety	Unlikely	Major	Intermediate	Flat watershed, low to moderate soil burn severity, hunters and firewood cutters in the area. Low visitation area. Recommend warning signs located at key access points into the fire area.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives: As noted above, threats to life and natural resources from increased snags and noxious weeds exist with the fire area. For these reasons the primary treatment objectives are to minimize loss of life and risk to human safety. Noxious weed surveys and rapid response measures are identified to reduce the risk of degradation of significant botany resources (a fen with potential for federally listed plant species and an intact plant community) identified in the field.

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to Damaging Storm or Event:

Land **90** % Channel **N/A** % Roads/Trails **N/A** % Protection/Safety **90** %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment		
	1	3	5
Land	90	90	90
Channel	-	-	-
Roads/Trails	-	-	-
Protection/Safety	90	90	90

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): No property or infrastructure loss is expected as a result of this fire.

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): Assessment costs plus costs of proposed treatments $18,184

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

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

Mary Flores Assistant Team Leader/Soil Scientist Phone: 530 279-8318
Celia Yamagiwa, GIS
Forest Guana, Botany
Nik Semenza, Hydrology
Glenn Martin, THSP
Dale Weaver Engineering
**Wildlife, Range and Archeology were consulted, but indicated there were no values at risk for their resource.

Team Leader: Cathy A Carlock
Email: ccarlock@fs.fed.us Phone: 530 279-8331 FAX: 530 279-8009

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:
A weed washing station was not in place for the first two days of the incident. There is no confirmation that vehicles responding to the Frog Fire were cleaned or washed prior to entry, and may have introduced noxious weed seeds from areas outside the Forest.

Noxious Weed detection surveys are needed to determine if weeds have been introduced. Treatments of any weed sites found should take place the season following the fire, early enough in the year to ensure that weeds don't have an opportunity to set seed. Early detection and rapid response is the most effective means of controlling noxious weeds; once weeds become established, they provide a seed source for further spread to unimpacted and uninfested areas via livestock, wildlife, and human activities. The Frog Fire would be surveyed between April and July 2016 for weed occurrences. Monitoring would include documentation and hand-pulling of small new weed occurrences at the time of inspection. Weed occurrences identified will be pulled to root depth and, if necessary, placed in sealed plastic bags to prevent seed from dropping, and properly disposed of.

Cost Estimate:
12.5 days for a botany survey cerw consisting of 4 GS-5 technicians at $165 per technician per day:$8,250
Miscellaneous supplies and mileage:$680
Total Cost Estimate $8,930

Channel Treatments:

None

Roads and Trail Treatments:

None

Part VI – Emergency Stabilization Treatments and Source of Funds

Interim #

			NFS Lands				Other Lands				All
Line Items	Units	Unit Cost	# of Units	BAER $	Other $	# of units	Fed $	# of Units	Non Fed $	Total $
A. Land Treatments										
Noxious Weeds				$8,930	$0		$0		$0	$8,930
				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
Insert new items above this line!				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Land Treatments				$8,930	$0		$0		$0	$8,930
B. Channel Treatments										
				$0	$0		$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										
				$0	$0		$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. Protection/Safety										
Warning Signs	4			$1,663	$0		$0		$0	$1,663
				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
Insert new items above this line!				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Structures				$1,663	$0		$0		$0	$1,663
E. BAER Evaluation										
Assessment Team				$7,591			$0		$0	$0
Insert new items above this line!				—	$0		$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Evaluation				$7,591	$0		$0		$0	$0
F. Monitoring										
				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
Insert new items above this line!				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Monitoring				$0	$0		$0		$0	$0
G. Totals				$18,184	$0		$0		$0	$18,184
Previously approved										
Total for this request				**$18,184**						

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. for Amanda M. Adams
Forest Supervisor (signature)

August 13, 2015
Date

2. Barnie T. Dyant
Regional Forester (signature)

8/27/2015
Date

Protection/Safety Treatments:
Hazard Signs: Hazard trees are present in the burned interior of the fire along roadways. This is a hazard to FS employees, hunters or other public in the area, with an unlikely probability but major potential consequence if someone were to be struck by a falling tree. Because of the unlikely probablility, administrative closure is not considered warranted; signage would be a low-cost alternative to mitigate risk and liability.
Four main road intersections were identified for signage. Costs will be for the removal of signs from a previous burn, travel, hardware, posts and installation of the new signs.

Cost Estimate:
2 days for 2 technicians to remove signs from an old burn and install them at $230/day/technician:$920
Hardware and posts for 4 signs $160
Mileage:$583.40. (installation will be by an auger on a trax vehicle so cost/mile is higher for transporting)
Total Cost Estimate:$1,663.40

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.)

No treatment monitoring other than for noxious weeds (covered under land treatments) are proposed.