Date of Report: September 4, 2002

Yorba-Agua Dulce

P. Geologic Types: Granite, shale, conglomerate

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report						
[] 1. Funding request for estimated WFSU-[] 2. Accomplishment Report[X] 3. No Treatment Recommendation	SULT funds					
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 I[] Status of accomplishments to date	based on more accurate site data or design analysis					
[x] 3. Final Report (Following completion of	of work)					
DART II DUR	NED AREA DESCRIPTION					
PARTII - BUR	NED-AREA DESCRIPTION					
A. Fire Name:Red Hill	B. Fire Number: <u>LPF3330</u>					
C. State: Ca	D. County :San Luis Obispo					
E. Region: 5	F. Forest:Los Padres					
G. District:Santa Lucia						
H. Date Fire Started: 08/17/02	I. Date Fire Contained: 08/23/02					
J. Suppression Cost: \$300,000						
 K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Sup 1. Fireline waterbarred (miles):1.8 2. Fireline seeded (miles):0 3. Other (identify): 1 mile of handline 						
L. Watershed Number: 18060004						
M. Total Acres Burned: 715 NFS Acres(555) Other Federal () State (() Private (160)					
N. Vegetation Types: Chamise, Northern Mixed	<u>Chaparral</u>					
O. Dominant Soils:65% Millsholm-Exchequer-S	stonyford, 20% Trigo-San Andreas- Chualar, 15% Modesto-					

	Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: <u>About 1 mile of 2nd order stream. This is Navajo Creek ich is now dry.</u>						
R.	Transportation System						
	Trails: 0 miles Roads: 0.5 miles						
	PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION						
A.	Burn Severity (acres): <u>350ac</u> (low) <u>325ac</u> (moderate) <u>40ac</u> (high)						
В.	Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 200ac						
C.	Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres): (low) (moderate)715 (high)						
D.	Erosion Potential: 18 tons/acre (figure taken from Hwy 58 Fire in same area,1996)						
E.	Sediment Potential: 8065 cubic yards / square mile(figure taken from Hwy 58 Fire in same area,1996)						
	PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS						
A.	Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years):10						
В.	Design Chance of Success, (percent):						
C.	Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years):						
D.	Design Storm Duration, (hours):						
E.	Design Storm Magnitude, (inches):						
F.	Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile):						
G.	Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent):						
Н.	Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile):						
	PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS						

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

It was determined by Kevin Cooper, BAER team leader, that **no watershed emergency exists**. There are no structures within the burn perimeter or downstream of the fire and in the floodplain that would be affected by increased flows or sediment. Corroborating this claim the same area, plus the remainder of the Navajo watershed, burned in the 105,000 acre Highway 58 fire in 1996. No damage to any structures occurred during the first heavy rains in 1996 immediately after the fire, or in the El Nino winter of 1997/98, when rainfall was over twice that of normal.

There are no water diversions or reservoirs within or downstream of the burned area.

Navajo Road, which is below the fire, was modified with extra large culverts and low water crossings after the Highway 58 fire, and these are expected to continue to protect the road crossings.

About 30 acres of low intensity burn drains across the eastern most one-half mile of Pozo Summit road. The inside sloped road and inside drains will fill with debri and water due to undersized drains, and may cause some siltation buildup on the road. This buildup is not expected to be severe enough to cause a safety hazard, and if it did occur would normally be cleared by San Luis Obispo county during the wet season, since this is a county maintained road. Kevin Cooper has contacted the San Luis County Roads Department and informed them of this potential road hazard. The Pozo summit road is primarily a recreation road, and not primarily used for school, housing, or other community access, and other more convenient and safe alternative travel routes exist into and out of the burn area. If rains were abnormally heavy and subsequent erosion during this winter (2002, 2003) were to be severe enough to make the road impassable, the road could be closed for safety without a severe affect to the community. After the Highway 58 fire, higher water flows eroded portions of the route, and San Luis Obispo County Roads dept. closed the road within the burned area to travel until the road was repaired. This closure did not significantly affect the community access in the area.

C.	Probability	v of	Comi	pleting	Treatment	Prior to	First Ma	aior Da	amage-F	Producing	Storm:

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment						
	1	3	5				
Land							
Channel							
Roads							
Other							

- E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss):
- F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss):
- G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

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

Team Leader: Kevin Cooper

Email: <u>kccooper@fs.fed.us</u> Phone: (805) 925-9538 x216 FAX: (805)961-5781

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:n/a

Channel Treatments:n/a

Roads and Trail Treatments:n/a

Structures:n/a

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	ğ	# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT \$		8	units	\$	Units	\$	\$
						Š.					
A. Land Treatments						8					
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	v.		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	9		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	ν.		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$0	\$ 0	χ		\$0		\$ 0	\$(
B. Channel Treatment	ts					X.					
				\$0	\$0	X		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	0		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Channel Treat.				\$0	\$ 0	8		\$0		\$ 0	\$(
C. Road and Trails						8					
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	Š		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	X		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0	\$ 0	X		\$0		\$ 0	\$(
D. Structures						ģ				•	
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Structures				\$0	\$0	Š		\$0		\$0	\$(
E. BAER Evaluation						Š					
				\$1,000	\$0	X		\$0		\$0	\$1,000
				\$0	\$0	~		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	~		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Evaluation				\$1,000	\$0	ν.		\$0		\$0	\$1,000
F. Monitoring				. ,		8					. , -
<u> </u>				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	8		\$0		\$0	\$(
Subtotal Monitoring				\$0	\$0	1		\$0		\$0	\$(
						8		+0		"	Ψ.
G. Totals				\$1,000	\$0	Ø		\$0		\$0	\$1,000

PART VII - APPROVALS

1.	/s/Jeanine A. Derby	9/6/02
	Forest Supervisor (signature)	Date
_		
2.		
	Regional Forester (signature)	Date