white River
ute
1994

MESSAGE SCAN FOR JERRY FREEOUF

To j.freeouf:r02a

From: Gregory Kuyumjian:R02F15A
Postmark: Dec 04,95 1:58 PM Delivered: Dec 04,95 2:01 PM

Subject: ute final

Comments:
here tis

----------X=========-------

PRINTING INSTRUCTIONS: Laser Printer: 12 pitch, portrait. Left Margin: 7. Do not print/save headers/footers or user notes.

FS-2500-8
(8/93)
USDA-FOREST SERVICE

Date of Report: 2/14/95

BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

[X] 1. Funding request for estimated EFFS-FW22 funds
[ ] 2. Accomplishment Report
[ ] 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

[ ] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)

[ ] 2. Interim Report
[ ] Updating the initial funding request based on more accurate site data and design analysis
[ ] Status of accomplishments to date

[X] 3. Final report - following completion of work

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION

A. Fire Name: **Ute Creek**
B. Fire Number: **CO-WRF-P24258**

C. State: **Colorado**
D. County: **Rio Blanco**
E. Region: **Rocky Mountain**
F. Forest: **White River**
G. District: **Blanco**

Confined 7/27

H. Date Fire Started: **July 11, 1994**
I. Date Fire Controlled: **Out 9/26**
J. Suppression Cost: **$2,800,000**

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with EFFS-PF12 Funds:
1. Fireline waterbarred (miles) **8.0 miles** constructed, none repaired.
2. Fireline seeded (miles) **8.0 miles constr**ucted, none repaired.
3. Other (identify) **2 spike camps, 1 base camp, 1 heliport, 9 helispo**ts

L. Watershed Number: **1405000569**

M. NFS Acres Burned: **3190** Total Acres Burned: **3190**
Ownership type:
( )State ( )BLM ( )PVT ( )

N. Vegetation Types: **Spruce-Fir/Aspen/Mountain Meadows/Wetlands**

O. Dominant Soils: **Typic Cryochrepts, loamy skeletal.**
Typic Cryoboralfs, loamy skeletal.

P. Geologic Types: **Basalt, glacial till, and landslides**
Browns' Park Formation

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:

3.4 (1st)	0 (2nd)	0 (3rd)	1.9 (4th)

R. Transportation System:

Trails: 3 miles Roads: 0 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Fire Intensity (acres): 700 (low) 480 (moderate) 430 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 175

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
650 (low) 760 (moderate) 200 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: 15 tons/acre
E. Sediment Potential: 410 cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: 5 years
B. Design Chance of Success: 80 percent
C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval: 25 years
D. Design Storm Duration: 24 hours
E. Design Storm Magnitude: 2.6 inches
F. Design Flow: 18 cubic feet per second per square mile
G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: 20 percent
H. Adjusted Design Flow: 37 cubic feet per second per square mile

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

Mainstem of Ute Creek supports trout (Colorado River cutthroat and brook.) . There are two irrigation ditches and five miles of fish habitat threatened by ash and sediment deposits. Ditches filled with sediment will overtop and result in large amounts of gully erosion and deposition. There are summer cabins downstream which rely on Ute Creek for some of their domestic water supply. There are a number of burned "fingers" that lead down steep slopes directly into Ute Creek which are already contributing ash and burned debris into Ute Creek. First significant precipitation will wash ash into the mainstem of Ute Creek with potential affects on aquatic resources and downstream users.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

The emergency treatment objective is to maintain on-site ash and debris in burned areas adjacent to Ute Creek to reduce the effects on fish habitat and downstream investments and to prevent the concentration of flowlines which would result in gully formation and delivery of sediment directly into the mainstem of Ute Creek.

Emergency treatments are not being considered for burned areas within the wilderness (approximately 1080). Re-seeding was not recommended as the team felt that the mosaic pattern of the burn and the unburned areas adjacent to Ute Creek should be a sufficient buffer. The Ute Creek Burn in the fall of 1990 reached a size of 200 acres. Reconnaissance of those acres showed good natural revegetation. It should be noted, that the fire in 1990 did not have any burned areas immediately adjacent to Ute Creek.

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage-Producing Storm:
Land 80 % Channel N/A % Roads N/A % Other N/A %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	<----Years after treatment----->		
	1	3	5
Land	90%	80%	70%
Channel	N/A	N/A	N/A
Roads	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other			

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): $ 34,000 (estimated)

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): $ 19,000

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

[x] Hydrology	[x] Soils	[x] Geology	[x] Range
[ ] Timber	[x] Wildlife	[ ] Fire Mgmt.	[ ] Engineering
[ ] Contracting	[ ] Ecology	[ ] Research	[ ] Archaeology
[x] **Fish**	[x] **Recreation**	[ ] _____	[ ] _____

Team Leader: **Gregory A. Kuyumjian**
Phone: **(303) 945-2521** Electronic Address: **R02F15A**

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.

Supression Related

Seeding is not proposed except for impacted areas related to base camp and the heliport. These treatments were implemented after the heliport and base camp were closed. All line was constructed with hand tools. Duff and material excavated for line construction was scraped back into the line where appropriate. All line was waterbarred. Seeding of the hand line was not necessary. Helispots and spike camps were treated in areas with high compaction by light scarification with hand tools.

Emergency Related

Burned areas (medium and high intensity) with direct convenance into the mainstem of Ute Creek was treated to retain ash and debris on site. This was accomplished by contour placement of downed burned material and the felling of standing burned material where needed. "Log terraces" were installed in a manner to have full contact with the soil and "anchored" by either deeper excavation into the soil or placed upslope and against standing vegetation.

Areas of high intensity burn will be monitored to determine if ash and sediment is being transported into the channel network and if natural revegetation is taking place. Initial monitoring has showed that "terraces" are retaining soil and natural revegetation is occurring. All "terraces" were in place prior to rainfall events capable of transport of ash and fine soils.

The fire was "contained" on July 27,1994 in the area outside of the Flat Tops Wilderness, the fire continued to burn in the wilderness and was out on September 26, 1994.

PART VI - EMERGENCY REHABILITATION TREATMENTS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS BY LAND OWNERSHIP

Line Items	Units	Unit Cost $	NFS Lands Number of Units	NFS Lands EFFS-FW22 $	NFS Lands Other $ ident.	Other Lands Number of Units	Other Lands Fed $ ident.	Other Lands Non-Fed $ ident.	All Total $
A. LAND TREATMENTS									
Contour terraces	Acres	84	130	10920					22100
B. CHANNEL TREATMENTS									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
D. STRUCTURES									
E. BAER EVALUATION/ ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT									
Salary/Travel/Admin				1600					
F. TOTALS				12,520					

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. _____ _____
Forest Supervisor Date

2. _____ _____
Regional Forester Date

PRINTING INSTRUCTIONS: Laser Printer: 12 pitch, portrait. Left Margin: 7. Do not print/save headers/footers or user notes.

FS-2500-8
(8/93)
USDA-FOREST SERVICE

Date of Report: 7/22/94

BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

[X] 1. Funding request for estimated EFFS-FW22 funds
[ ] 2. Accomplishment Report
[ ] 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

[X] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)

[X] 2. Interim Report
[ ] Updating the initial funding request based on more accurate site data and design analysis
[ ] Status of accomplishments to date

[ ] 3. Final report - following completion of work

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION

A. Fire Name: Ute Creek
B. Fire Number: CO-WRF-P24258

C. State: Colorado
D. County: Rio Blanco
E. Region: Rocky Mountain
F. Forest: White River
G. District: Blanco

EST. Containment 7/23

H. Date Fire Started: July 11, 1994
I. Date Fire Controlled: Est. 10/15
J. Suppression Cost: $2,101,499 (as of 7/21/94)

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with EFFS-PF12 Funds:
1. Fireline waterbarred (miles) 8.0 miles constructed, none repaired.
2. Fireline seeded (miles) 8.0 miles constructed, none repaired.
3. Other (identify) 2 spike camps, 1 base camp, 1 heliport, 9 helispots

L. Watershed Number: 1405000569

M. NFS Acres Burned: 2850 Total Acres Burned: 2850
Ownership type:
( )State ( )BLM ( )PVT ( )

N. Vegetation Types: Spruce-Fir/Aspen/Mountain Meadows/Wetlands

O. Dominant Soils: Typic Cryochrepts, loamy skeletal.
Typic Cryoboralfs, loamy skeletal.

P. Geologic Types: Basalt, glacial till, and landslides
Browns' Park Formation

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:

3.4 (1st)	0 (2nd)	0 (3rd)	1.9 (4th)

R. Transportation System:
Trails: 3 miles Roads: 0 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Fire Intensity (acres): 570 (low) 430 (moderate) 430 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 175

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
570 (low) 660 (moderate) 200 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: 15 tons/acre
E. Sediment Potential: 410 cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: 5 years
B. Design Chance of Success: 80 percent
C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval: 25 years
D. Design Storm Duration: 24 hours
E. Design Storm Magnitude: 2.6 inches
F. Design Flow: 18 cubic feet per second per square mile
G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: 20 percent
H. Adjusted Design Flow: 37 cubic feet per second per square mile

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

Mainstem of Ute Creek supports trout (Colorado River cutthroat and brook.) . There are two irrigation ditches and five miles of fish habitat threatened by ash and sediment deposits. Ditches filled with sediment will overtop and result in large amounts of gully erosion and deposition. There are summer cabins downstream which rely on Ute Creek for some of their domestic water supply. There are a number of burned "fingers" that lead down steep slopes directly into Ute Creek which are already contributing ash and burned debris into Ute Creek. First significant precipitation will wash ash into the mainstem of Ute Creek with potential affects on aquatic resources and downstream users.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

The emergency treatment objective is to maintain on-site ash and debris in burned areas adjacent to Ute Creek to reduce the effects on fish habitat and downstream investments and to prevent the concentration of flowlines which would result in gully formation and delivery of sediment directly into the mainstem of Ute Creek.

Emergency treatments are not being considered for burned areas within the wilderness (approximately 900 acres as of 7/21/94)). Re-seeding is not recommended as the team felt that the mosaic pattern of the burn and the unburned (currently) areas adjacent to Ute Creek should be a sufficient. The Ute Creek Burn in the fall of 1990 reached a size of 200 acres. Reconnaissance of those acres showed good natural revegetation. It should be noted, that the fire in 1990 did not have any burned areas immediately adjacent to Ute Creek.

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage-Producing Storm:
Land 80 % Channel N/A % Roads N/A % Other N/A %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	<----Years after treatment-----> 1	3	5
Land	90%	80%	70%
Channel	N/A	N/A	N/A
Roads	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other			

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): $ 34,000 (estimated)

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): $ 30,000 (estimated)

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

[x] Hydrology	[x] Soils	[x] Geology	[x] Range
[ ] Timber	[x] Wildlife	[ ] Fire Mgmt.	[ ] Engineering
[ ] Contracting	[ ] Ecology	[ ] Research	[ ] Archaeology
[x] Fish	[x] Recreation	[ ] _____	[ ] _____

Team Leader: Gregory A. Kuyumjian
Phone: (303) 945-2521 Electronic Address: R02F15A

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.

Supression Related

Seeding is not proposed except for impacted areas related to base camp and the heliport. These treatments will be implemented as the heliport and base camp are closed. All line was constructed with hand tools. Duff and material excavated for line construction will be scraped back into the line. Line will be waterbarred. Seeding of the hand line is not recommended. Helispots and spike camps may be treated in areas with high compaction by light scarification with hand tools.

Emergency Related

Burned areas (medium and high intensity) with direct convenance into the mainstem of Ute Creek will be treated to retain ash and debris on site. Accomplished by contour placement of down burned material, and/or the felling of standing burned material. All "log terraces" will have full contact with the soil. In steeper topography, downed material will be anchored by placement uphill of existing standing material.

Areas of high intensity burn will be monitored to determine if ash and sediment is being transported into the channel network and if natural revegetation is taking place.

Fire is still buring in the Flat Tops Wilderness with a confinement strategy. Control in the wilderness is projected some time in October.

PART VI - EMERGENCY REHABILITATION TREATMENTS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS BY LAND OWNERSHIP

Line Items	Units	Unit Cost $	NFS Lands: Number of Units	NFS Lands: EFFS-FW22 $	NFS Lands: Other $ ident.	Other Lands: Number of Units	Other Lands: Fed $ ident.	Other Lands: Non-Fed $ ident.	All Tota $
A. LAND TREATMENTS									
Contour terraces	Acres	442	50	22100					22100
B. CHANNEL TREATMENTS									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
D. STRUCTURES									

E. BAER EVALUATION/ ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT								
Salary/Travel/Admin				1100				
F. TOTALS				23,200				

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. /s/ Kevin T. Riordan — July 22, 1994
(for)Forest Supervisor — Date

2. _____ _____
Regional Forester — Date