USDA-FOREST SERVICE Date of Report: July 23, 1992

BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13, Report FS-2500-8)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

[X] 1. Funding request for estimated FFFS-FW22 funds
[ ] 2. Accomplishment Report

B. 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 and design analysis
[ ] Status of accomplishments to-date

[ ] 3. Final report - following completion of work

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION

A. Fire Name: Devil B. Fire Number: ANF 3562

C. State: California D. County: Los Angeles
E. Region: 5 F. Forest: Angeles
G. District: Saugus

H. Date Fire Started: 07/20/92 I. Date Fire Controlled: 7/22/92
J. Suppression Cost: $ 985,393.00

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFFS-PF12 Funds:
1. Fireline waterbarred (miles) 3.1
2. Fireline seeded (miles) 3.1
3. Other (identify) "Tank Traps" to close firelines to vehicle access

L. Watershed Number: 1807010207

M. NFS Acres Burned: 732 Total Acres Burned: 1331
Ownership type:
( )State ( )BLM (X - 599)PVT ( )

N. Vegetation Types: Grass-sage outside FS Boundary
Chaparral-grass inside FS Boundary
O. Dominant Soils: Osito, Trigo, Calleguas, Vertic Xerochrepts

P. Geologic Types: Sedimentary sandstone-shale

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:
2.4 (Cls 4)

R. Transportation System:
Trails: NA (miles) Roads: 1.27 (L. II) (miles)

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Fire Intensity (Acres): 10 (low) 55 (moderate) 35 (high)

B. Water Repellant Soil (Acres): 183

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (Acres):
15 (low) 30 (moderate) 55 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: ---- tons/acre
E. Sediment Potential: 1050 cu. yds/sq. mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: _____ years.
B. Design Chance of Success: _____ percent.
C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval: _____ years.
D. Design Storm Duration: _____ hours.
E. Design Storm Magnitude: _____ inches.
F. Design Flow: _____ cfsm.
G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: _____ percent.
H. Adjusted Design Flow: _____ cfsm.

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Emergency:

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage Producing Storm:
Land _____ % Channel _____ % Roads _____ % Other _____ %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	<----Years after treatment-----> 1	3	5
Land			
Channel			
Roads			
Other			

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Risk): $_____

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Risk): $_____

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team ("x" appropriate boxes):

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

Team Leader: Shawna Joyce
Phone: (805) 296-9710 DG Address: S.Joyce:R05F01D53A

H. Treatment Narrative:
Forest Service-administered lands consisted of approximately the northern half (732 acres) of the burned area. The Fire occurred primarily in an area of sedimentary sandstone and siltstone; and soil textures were mostly silt loams and silty clay loams. Slopes in the upper Forest lands were steeper and ranged from 40 to 80 percent while the slopes in the lower Private lands ranged from about 30 to 60 percent. The majority of the burn areas were in light fuel types of grass and sage species. The higher elevation zones contained more of the typical chaparral types along with grass.

The decision was made by the Burn Rehab Team not to aerial seed any portions of the burn area for the following reasons:
1. There should be adequate residual seed supply within these grassy burn watersheds to provide cover protection.
2. The Fire was mostly of moderate burn intensity, probably because of the relatively light fuels and short duration.
3. The size of the burn acreage in Forest Service lands was too small to justify aerial seeding contracting and still be economical.

The Burn Rehab Team decided, with concurrence from LA County Fire Department and LA County Flood Control personnel, that it would be unnecessary to do any channel treatments or structures for the protection of any downstream values or structures. The main drainage in the burn area, at its lower end, has its ground slopes flatten out significantly which would aid in trapping and holding most sediment before it reaches any downstream values or structures. The Team therefore is not requesting any Burn Rehab funds for channel treatments.

One cultural resource, CA-LAn-1672H, is located in the burn area on private lands. This site was visited by the Burn Rehab Team, and based on the reasons listed above, did not seem to be at any risk that would need specific treatment. The fire, as well as the suppression activities, did not harm the overall surface manifestation of the site.

All fire suppression cat lines will be seeded with Native grass species, and waterbars have been installed as necessary. All evidence of ground disturbance suppression activities were surveyed for cultural resources after the initial response to the fire. No additional resources were identified. Seeding will be applied at a later date to insure greater germination success.

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

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

			NFS Lands			Other Lands			All
Line Items	Units	Unit Cost $	Number of Units	FFFS-FW22 $	Other $ ident.	Number of Units	Fed $ ident.	Non-Fed $ ident.	Total $
A. LAND TREATMENTS									
B. CHANNEL TREATMENTS									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
D. STRUCTURES									
E. BAER EVALUATION/ ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT									
F. TOTALS									

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. /s/ Michael J. Rogers — 7/23/92
   Forest Supervisor (Signature) — Date

2. /s/ — _____
   Regional Forester (Signature) — Date