

Edited J.Bruggink 01/03/06

Date of Report: December 14, 2005

BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)**PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST****A. Type of Report**

- ☒ 1. Funding request for estimated WFSU-SULT 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 or design analysis
 ☐ Status of accomplishments to date
☐ 3. Final Report (Following completion of work)

PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTIONA. **Fire Name:** South Sage FireB. **Fire Number:** P45555C. **State:** NevadaD. **County:** White PineE. **Region:** 4F. **Forest:** Humboldt-ToiyabeG. **District:** ElyH. **Date Fire Started:** Sept. 16, 2003I. **Date Fire Contained:** Sept. 22, 2003J. **Suppression Cost:** \$900,000**K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds**

1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 2.5

2. Fireline seeded (miles): 0

3. Other (identify): The downed trees at Success Camp (with multiple buildings) were cleaned up so dry fuels did not pose a future problem and the camp was left in a tidy condition.

L. **Watershed Number:** 160600084020M. **Total Acres Burned:** 330

NFS Acres(319) Other Federal () State () Private (11)

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 35 (low) 180 (moderate) 115 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 115

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): 35 (low) 195 (moderate) 100 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: 10.8 tons/acre (WEPP erosion rate over 24 month time period)

E. Sediment Potential: 2613 cubic yards / square mile (WEPP sediment leaving profile over 12 month time period)

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. **Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period**, (years): 5

B. **Design Chance of Success**, (percent): 85

C. **Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval**, (years): 25

D. **Design Storm Duration**, (hours): 6

E. **Design Storm Magnitude**, (inches): 1.7

F. **Design Flow**, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): 28

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

H. **Adjusted Design Flow**, (cfs per square mile): 33.6

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

Springs

There are two springs in the burn area. Both had fencing around them to protect them from livestock trampling. The fire burned parts of the fences and trees fell across the wire. Even though the allotment will be closed to grazing for at least two years, there are no allotment fences to keep livestock out of the burn area and there may be unauthorized grazing use. The area also receives a high level of ATV use, especially during the current hunting season. The springs would be impacted by soil compaction and vegetation disturbance during this time if they are not adequately fenced. Therefore new fences are needed to protect this sensitive resource. The basin has little water in the area and wildlife depend on this limited resource.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

Fencing Springs:

Repair the two spring fence exclosures **that** are necessary to protect the areas from trampling by livestock and maintain the existing flow by reducing compaction from animals and ATV's.

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage-Producing Storm:

Land ___ % Channel ___ % Roads ___ % Other 99 %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment		
	1	3	5
Land			
Channel			
Roads			
Other	99	99	99
(signing, tree felling, fencing)			

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Engineering	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Contracting	<input checked="" 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: Loretta Cartner

Email: lcartner@fs.fed.us

Phone: 775-289-5120

FAX: 775-289-2132

H. Treatment Narrative:

Fencing Springs:

Repair damaged spring fencing \$500. Fences will consist of three strand barbed wire, T-posts and wooden corner tension structures to protect spring areas from trampling by livestock and maintain the existing flow by reducing compaction from animals and ATV's.

I. Monitoring Narrative:

Monitoring Needs:

Monitoring is needed **in 2006** for **determining success of treatments \$3000**. If monitoring shows the need for additional treatments, future requests for funding will be submitted.

Treatments to be Monitored, How, and When: Monitoring will include photo documentation.

Monitoring will take place during the spring or summer of 2006.

Seeding success across the entire burn area – **Re-measure** four transects where occurrence and cover of plant species and ground cover are recorded along transect lines that cross the plant community types within the burn area. Utilize this data to determine seeding success, regeneration success and presence of invasive species.

Roads and drainage dips – Visually monitor to make sure erosion isn't excessive.

Intermittent drainages - Visually monitor changes in drainage using proper functioning condition approach. Impacts from sediment and scour would be recorded.

Springs - Visually monitor fences, document impacts from sediment (depth, affect to vegetation, spring flow impacts) and recommend necessary repairs.

Straw bale erosion structures - Visually monitor the function for 3 years, estimate amount of sediment trapped, and recommend necessary repairs/modifications.

Rock headcut structures – Visually monitor the function, recommend necessary repairs/modifications.

Single log check dams – Visually monitor the function, recommend necessary repairs/modifications.

Erosion - Visually monitor for sheet erosion, rills, and gullies. Measure average depths of rills and gullies. Use data to verify erosion models and calculate how much sediment has eroded from the burn area.

Private Land - Visually monitor private land for impacts from fire (sediment, scour, impacts to PFC).

Livestock – Visually monitor for livestock use in the burn area and document any impacts.

Elk – Visually estimate elk use on woody species; especially on aspen.

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

Line Items	Units	Unit Cost	NFS Lands		Other \$	Other Lands				All Total \$
			# of Units	WFSU SULT \$		# of units	Fed \$	# of Units	Non Fed \$	
A. Land Treatment										
<i>Subtotal Land Treatment</i>										
B. Channel Treat.										
<i>Subtotal Channel Treat.</i>										
C. Road and Trails										
<i>Subtotal Road & Trails</i>										
D. Structures										
fencing	Perimeter	\$500	1	\$500						\$500
<i>Subtotal Structures</i>				\$500						\$500
E. BAER Evaluation										
<i>Subtotal Evaluation</i>										
F. Monitoring										
Team of 3 specialists	total	\$3,000	1	\$3,000						\$3,000
<i>Subtotal Monitoring</i>				\$3,000						\$3,000
G. Totals				\$3,500			#REF!		#REF!	\$3,500

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. Robert L. Vaught 12/16/05
Forest Supervisor (signature) Date

2. /s/ William P. LeVere for 1/5/06
Regional Forester (signature) Date