

Date of Report: 09/20/2008

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST**A. Type of Report**

- ☒ 1. Funding request for estimated emergency stabilization funds
☐ 2. Accomplishment Report
☐ 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

- ☒ 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 DESCRIPTIONA. Fire Name: Slinkard FireB. Fire Number: KNF-4096C. State: CAD. County: SiskiyouE. Region: 05F. Forest: Klamath National ForestG. District: Oak KnollH. Fire Incident Job Code: P5EG69I. Date Fire Started: August 17, 2008J. Date Fire Contained: August 24, 2008

K. Suppression Cost:

L. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds

1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): None
2. Fireline seeded (miles): None
3. Other (identify): None

M. Watershed Number: 18010206110104, 18010206110105

N. Total Acres Burned:

NFS Acres (363) Other Federal () State () Private ()

O. Vegetation Types: Douglas-fir, canyon live oak, ponderosa pine, tanoak, black oak, madrone, deerbrush, manzanitaP. Dominant Soils: Gilligan-Chawanakee, Gilligan-GoldridgeQ. Geologic Types: Granitic Rock of the Slinkard Pluton

R. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: perennial: 30.2, ephemeral: 38.0

S. Transportation System

Trails: 0 miles Roads: 0 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 139 unburned 207 (low) 17 (moderate) ____ (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 0

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): 224 (low) ____ (moderate) ____ (high) ____ (very high)

D. Erosion Potential: ____ tons/acre; average = ____ tons/acre (Not Calculated)

E. Sediment Potential: ____ cubic yards / square mile (Not Calculated)

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

This section is not completed because no treatments are proposed that require conducting an analysis for a design storm.

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): N/A

B. Design Chance of Success, (percent): N/A

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

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

E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):

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

G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): N/A

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

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Critical Values/Resources and Threats:

Due to the moderate to low burn severity and the size of the fire only a few resource values were assessed which included: long-term soil productivity, noxious weeds, developed water system, and private property. Field investigations and subsequent analyses/models were used to determine their post-wildfire hazard and associated risk from potential debris flows, flooding, soil erosion and accelerated sedimentation.

A sequential evaluation process assessed the post-fire watershed conditions starting at the hillslopes and moving downslope to determine potential hazards and associated risks to the various resource values just mentioned. First the hillslope burn severities were identified and mapped. A debris flow

initiation and transport map was developed that is based on inherent soil-hydrologic characteristics. Further field investigations of these resource values were conducted to determine if they were at risk from the post-fire induced hazards.

The only resource found to be a concern was the noxious weed populations in the vicinity of the Slinkard fire which have mostly been treated in the last few years. Spread into the region of the Slinkard fire is unlikely. However, both *Centaurea virgata* ssp. *squarrosa*, Squarose Knapweed, and *Isatis tinctoria*, Dyer's woad have very mobile seed and are a concern in this area, both of which had irregular treatment patterns over the past few years.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

The primary objectives of the Klamath Theater Burned Area Emergency Stabilization Plan were:

- To insure the BAER team's personal safety and provide for public safety during our assignment
- To coordinate with the NRCS, State, and County on private lands, if appropriate
- To assess the risk to human life and property and/or natural or cultural resources from impaired watershed conditions and to recommend appropriate stabilization actions to protect the following values:
 - Private Residence
 - Increased infestations of noxious weeds
 - Highway 96

The BAER assessment evaluated the above objectives for possible mitigation using an array of treatment options and/or actions allowable by Department of Agriculture (USDA) policy. A list of issues specific to the Slinkard Fire is listed below. Treatments will be designed specifically to mitigate the following list of issues:

- The loss of vegetation increases the potential for introducing weeds.

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

Land 90 % Channel NA % Roads/Trails NA % Protection/Safety NA %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

| | Years after Treatment | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----|----|
| | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Land | 70 | 80 | NA |
| Channel | NA | | |
| Roads/Trails | NA | | |
| Protection/Safety | NA | | |
| | | | |

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): (Not Calculated due to size of fire)

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): (Not Calculated due to size of fire)

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology | <input type="checkbox"/> Range | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildlife | <input type="checkbox"/> Fire Mgmt. | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Contracting | <input type="checkbox"/> Ecology | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Botany | <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeology | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fisheries | <input type="checkbox"/> Research | <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Arch | <input type="checkbox"/> GIS | |

Team Leader: TJ Clifford

Email: tjclifford@fs.fed.us

Phone: (208) 365-7007

FAX: (208) 365-7037

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:

General Description:

Monitor area within the perimeter of the Slinkard fire for weeds introduced during fire suppression and/ or rehabilitation. Dozer line and burn areas adjacent to roads are high priority sites for monitoring. Treat and map any new weed populations.

Location (Suitable) Sites:

Highway 96 and FS road 46N64, which are adjacent to the burned area, are high priority for treatment. 2.1 miles of dozer line within the fire area is also a critical area.

Design/Construction Specifications:

1. Monitoring will occur at multiple times during the growing season to catch both early and late maturing species.
2. Monitoring will be conducted by a botanist and/or a technician under direction of a botanist qualified to identify target species. Weeds of primary concern are Meadow Knapweed, Scotch Broom, Yellow Starthistle, Dyer's Woad, and Leafy Spurge.
3. New population locations will be mapped using a gps and/ or 1:24,000 quad map and flagged on the ground. NRIS and Klamath survey and treatment forms will be filled out and entered into national database.
4. If new populations are small, plants will be hand dug and bagged for removal at time of discovery. Larger populations will be flagged for later treatment and a request for additional funding will be submitted.
5. Equipment washing for weed prevention is mandatory on all equipment and/or vehicles that may be harboring soil and debris prior to entering burned area for rehab or any other related activity.

Purpose of Treatment Specifications:

The fire has created suitable habitat for the spread of noxious weeds. While weed washing was required of vehicles used for fire suppression and rehabilitation, information on weed washing during the initial attack phase of the fire is unknown. Vehicles could have come from weed infested areas and weeds introduced through mud and debris.

Water tenders used during the fire may have used drafting sites that contained weeds. Seeds may have been carried to the road system via water tenders.

Monitoring will reduce the potential for establishment of new noxious weed sites.

Channel Treatments:

No treatments

Roads and Trail Treatments:

No Treatments

Protection/Safety Treatments:

No Treatments

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.)

Additional monitoring and treatment will take place in the second and third year after the fire, if new populations are discovered during the first year.

Part VI – Emergency Stabilization Treatments and Source of Funds
Interim #

| Line Items | Units | Unit Cost | NFS Lands | | Other \$ | Other Lands | | | | All Total \$ |
|--|-------|-----------|------------|--------------|----------|-------------|--------|------------|------------|--------------|
| | | | # of Units | BAER \$ | | # of units | Fed \$ | # of Units | Non Fed \$ | |
| A. Land Treatments | | | | | | | | | | |
| Noxious Weed Monitor | Acre | 44 | 12 | \$528 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$528 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Land Treatments | | | | \$528 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$528 |
| B. Channel Treatments | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$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 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Road & Trails | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| D. Protection/Safety | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Structures | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| E. BAER Evaluation | Dats | 860 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | --- | | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | --- | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Evaluation | | | | --- | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| F. Monitoring | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| Subtotal Monitoring | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$0 |
| G. Totals | | | | \$528 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 | \$528 |
| Previously approved | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total for this request | | | | \$528 | | | | | | |

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. /s/ Patricia A. Grantham
Forest Supervisor (signature)

9/20/08
Date

2. /S/ KATHERINE CLEMENT (FOR)
Regional Forester (signature)

9/30/08
Date