P. Geologic Types: Kaibab Limestone

Date of Report:

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A.	Type of Report								
	[X] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSU-S[] 2. Accomplishment Report[] 3. No Treatment Recommendation	ULT funds							
В.	3. Type of Action								
	[X] 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 or design analysis [] Status of accomplishments to date 								
	[] 3. Final Report (Following completion of work)								
	PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION								
A.		. Fire Number <u>: P3BOLQ</u>							
		. County: Coconino							
		. Forest <u>: Kaibab</u>							
G.	District: North Kaibab (03)								
Н.	Date Fire Started: 07/15/2005 I.	Date Fire Contained: 07/21/2005							
J.	Suppression Cost <u>: 1,300,000</u>								
K.	 K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds 1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 2.25 2. Fireline seeded (miles): 4.25 3. Other (identify): Straw Waddles adjacent to emphemeral drainage in Nail Canyon 								
L.	Watershed Number: 1501000394								
M.	Total Acres Burned: <u>750</u> NFS Acres(750) Other Federal () State ()	Private ()							
N.	Vegetation Types: Ponderosa pine/Gambels Oa	k, Pinyon pine/Utah Juniper, Ponderosa Pine/Pinyon Pine							
0	Dominant Soils: Mollic Futroboralfs, Typic Haplu	stalfs Lithic Ustochrents							

Q.	Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: 1st Order – 2.75, 2nd Order 2.00, 3rd Order 1.50					
R.	Transportation System					
	Trails: -0- miles Roads: 1.75 miles					
	PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION					
A.	Burn Severity (acres): 445 (low) 190 (moderate) 115 (high)					
В.	Water-Repellent Soil (acres): -0-					
C.	. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): 435 (low)215 (moderate)100 (high)					
D.	Erosion Potential: 3.75 tons/acre					
E.	Sediment Potential: 940 cubic yards / square mile					
	PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS					
A.	Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): NA					
В.	Design Chance of Success, (percent): NA					
C.	Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): NA					
D.	Design Storm Duration, (hours): NA					
E.	Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):					
F.	Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): NA					
G.	Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): NA					
Н.	Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): NA					
	PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS					

A. Describe Emergency: Though significant reductions in site productivity are not projected since the fire intensity was moderate to low on most of the area burned there is a high potential for the spread of bull thistle and cheatgrass without some level of treatment. While there were no bull thistle plants found within the fire area, adjacent to it on the western edge of the fire where it meets the 1996 Bridger Complex, numerous plants were observed. Cheatgrass was found in the burned area though the populations were small and the total area covered by this plant is estimated to be less then 5 acres. In contrast, the Bridger Fire had a high frequency of cheatgrass and numerous bull thistle plants inventoried. The potential exist for both bull thistle and cheatgrass to spread throughout the burned area and cause losses in wildlife and watershed conditions.

Canyon Fire are necessar	, eradicate b ry at some fu the integrate	ull thistle withi	in the fire a ontrol of bul	ntrol bull thistle adjacent to the westen edge of the Nail and monitor cheatgrass populations to assess if treatments thistle and cheatgrass using herbicides is consistant with invasive weeds within the Coconino, Kaibab, and Prescott
C. Probability	/ of Completi	ng Treatment	Prior to First	: Major Damage-Producing Storm:
·	•			ads <u>NA</u> % Other <u>NA</u> %
D. Probability	of Treatmer	nt Success		
	Year	s after Treatm	nent	
Land	1 60	3 75	5 90	
Channel				
Roads				
Other				
	•	luding Loss) <u>: I</u>		

- F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): NA
- G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

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

Team Leader: David G. Brewer

Email: <u>dgbrewer @fs.fed.us</u> Phone: <u>928-635-8221</u> FAX: <u>928-635-8208</u>

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.)

<u>Land Treatments</u>: Using an integrated weed management strategy treat approximately 35 acres that is infested with bull thistle adjacent to the Nail Canyon Fire where it interfaces with the Bridger Fire. Total acres treated is estimated at 20 of which 80 percent will be herbicides and 20 percent manual. 2, 4-D will be applied at the rate of 2 pounds of active ingrediate per acre in the fall of 2006 on rosettes by using either a back-pack sprayer or truck mounted boom. Follow-up treatments will occur as needed and will be paid by NFVW to reduce the potential of bull thistle invasion into the burned area. Cheatgrass will be monitored and treatments planned if populations begin to expand within the burn. A supplemental BAER report will be submitted to control cheatgrass if monitoring notes expansion of this plant.

Channel Treatments: NA

Roads and Trail Treatments: NA

Structures: NA

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 of treatments will be needed to assess the effectiveness of treatments on the contain/control objective for bull thistle between the Bridger Complex and the Nail Fire. A line-intercept will be employed to assess the treatment success and will be established in the fall 2006, when treatments occur and again in the spring of 2006. The treatment objective in the buffer zone is 90 to 100 percent kill on the rosettes.

Part VI – Emergency Rehabilitation Treatments and Source of Funds by Land Ownership

		Unit	# of	WFSU	Other 8	# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT \$	\$ 8		\$	Units	\$	\$
					K					
A. Land Treatments					8					
Manual Control	Acres	200	4	\$800	\$0\$		\$0		\$0	\$800
Herbicide Control	Acres	100	16	\$1,600	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$1,60
				\$0	\$0 \$		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$2,400	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$2,40
B. Channel Treatmen	ts				X			,	•	· ·
				\$0	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Channel Treat.				\$0	\$08		\$0		\$0	\$(
C. Road and Trails					Š		•	•	•	
				\$0	\$08		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$08		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$08		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$(
D. Structures					Š			•	•	
				\$0	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0 X	3	\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Structures				\$0	\$0 X		\$0		\$0	\$(
E. BAER Evaluation					8					
D. Brewer	Days	320	5		\$1,600	8	\$0		\$0	\$1,600
				\$0	\$08		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$08		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Evaluation				\$0	\$1,600	1	\$0		\$0	\$1,600
F. Monitoring					8	8				
D. Brewer	Days	320	5	\$1,600	\$0	8	\$0		\$0	\$1,600
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Monitoring				\$1,600	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$1,600
-					8					
G. Totals				\$4,000	\$1,600		\$0		\$0	\$5,600
					8					•

PART VII - APPROVALS

1.	/s/ Stuart M. Lovejoy	July 28, 2005
	Acting Forest Supervisor (signature)	Date
2.	_/s/ Harv Forsgren	_August 1, 2005
	Regional Forester (signature)	Date