USDA-FOREST SERVICE FS-2500-8 (7/00)

Date of Report: July 2, 2009

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
[x] 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 DESCRIPTION

A. Fire Name: Sims

B. Fire Number: CA-KNF-003899

C. State: CA

D. County: Siskiyou

E. Region: 05

F. Forest: Klamath National Forest

G. District: Happy Camp

H. Date Fire Started: June 23, 2009

I. Date Fire Contained: June 25, 2009

J. Suppression Cost: $1,500,000

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds
1. Fireline waterbarred (miles):
2. Fireline seeded (miles): NA
3. Other (identify): NA

L. Watershed Number: 18010209010103

M. Total Acres Burned: 157 acres
NFS Acres(147) Other Federal ( ) State ( ) Private (10)

N. Vegetation Types: Mixed conifer, mixed hardwoods

O. Dominant Soils: Neuns, Deadwood, Kindig, Dubakella

P. Geologic Types: Metasediments, serpentinized peridotite

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: 0.64 miles of order 1 and 0.62 miles of order 2

R. Transportation System

Trails: 0 miles Roads: 0.32 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 25 (low) 82 (moderate) 50 (high)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 0

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
0 (low) 25 (moderate) 132 (high)

D. Erosion Potential: 3.4 tons/acre

E. Sediment Potential: 9.8 cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): NA

B. 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

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

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

Due to the mostly moderate and high burn severity and small size of the fire only a few critical resource values were assessed which included: long-term soil productivity, noxious weeds, Highway 96, and private property. Field investigations and subsequent analyses/models were used to determine their post-wildfire hazard and associated risk from potential debris flows, 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. It was determined that a summer thunderstorm has a high potential to deliver sediment to Highway 96 that will overwelm the roadside drainage ditch and deliver sediment and debris to the highway. It was determined that this would be a maintenance problem and not a threat to the integrity of the highway. The level of expected maintenance is within the normal type of storm damage maintenance that Cal-Trans routinely does. However, there would be a threat to travelers during and immediately after the thunderstorm event until cleaned up. It is possible that the highway could be closed for part of one day. There will be a longer term risk of debris flows (10-20 years) during multi-day winter storms. Aerial straw mulching of approximately 100 acres was considered to minimize summer thunderstorm debris flows but was deemed to be too expensive for the level of the expected impact to the highway.

The only resource found to be a concern was the noxious weed populations in the vicinity of the Sims fire which have mostly been treated in the last few years. Spread into the region of the Sims fire is unlikly.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

The primary objectives of the Sims BAER survey 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 resources from impaired watershed conditions and to recommend appropriate stabilization actions to protect the following values:
    - Private Property
    - Increased infestations of noxious weeds
    - Highway 96
- The BAER assessment evaluated the above objectives for possible mitigation. It was determined that no treatments were necessary due to no elevated threats beyond the scope of normal maintenance.

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

Land **NA** % Channel **NA** % Roads **NA** % Protection/Safety **NA** %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment		
	1	3	5
Land	NA	NA	NA
Channel	NA		
Roads	NA		
Protection/ Safety	NA		

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): Not calculated due to small 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:

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

Team Leader: Tom Laurent

Email: tlaurent@fs.fed.us Phone: 530 841-4416 FAX: 530 841-4571

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:

No Treatments

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.)

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

			NFS Lands				Other Lands				All
		Unit	# of	WFSU	Other	# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT $	$	units	$	Units	$	$
A. Land Treatments										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0			
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Land Treatments				$0			$0		$0	$0
B. Channel Treatments										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Channel Treat.				$0			$0		$0	$0
C. Road and Trails										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Road & Trails				$0			$0		$0	$0
D. Protection/Safety										
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
Subtotal Structures				$0			$0		$0	$0
E. BAER Evaluation	days	950	2							
				$0			$0		$0	$0
				$0			$0		$0	$0
F. Monitoring				$0			$0		$0	$0
G. Totals				**$0**			**$0**		**$0**	**$0**

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. _/s/_ Tom E. Laurent _____ July 2, 2009
Forest BAER Coordinator (signature) Date

2. _____ _____
Regional Forester (signature) Date