Date of Report: 7/9/03

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						
В.	Type of Action							
	[] 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds	needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measures)						
	[] 2. Interim Report[] Updating the initial funding request[] Status of accomplishments to date	pased on more accurate site data or design analysis						
	[x] 3. Final Report (Following completion of	of work)						
	PART II - BURNED-AREA DESCRIPTION							
A.	Fire Name: Friday Fire	B. Fire Number: SRF-2762						
C.	State: California	D. County: Humboldt						
E.	Region: 5	F. Forest: Six Rivers						
G.	District: Lower Trinity							
Н.	Date Fire Started: 6-28-03	I. Date Fire Contained: 7-1-03						
J. :	Suppression Cost: \$1.8 million							
K.	 K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds 1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 5.3 mi 2. Fireline seeded (miles): none 3. Other (identify): fence repair, road repair 							
L.	Watershed Number: HUC 6 th field - 180102120	<u>0501</u>						
M.	Total Acres Burned: 389 NFS Acres (203) Other Federal () State	() Private (186)						
N.	Vegetation Types: Douglas fir -Tanoak-Madr	<u>one</u>						

O. Dominant Soils: Holland-Goldridge families association

P. Geologic Types: Galice metasediments

Q. Miles of Stream Chann	els by Order or Class:					
R. Transportation System	t. Transportation System					
Trails <u>: 0</u> miles	Roads <u>: 5</u> miles					
	PART III - WATERSHEI	D CONDITION				
A. Burn Severity (acres):	389 (low) (moderate)	(high)				
B. Water-Repellent Soil (a	cres) <u>: none</u>					
C. Soil Erosion Hazard Ra	nting (acres): 389 (low) (moderate)	(high)				
D. Erosion Potential: NA	tons/acre					
E. Sediment Potential: NA	A cubic yards / square mile	Э				
	PART IV - HYDROLOGIC D	ESIGN FACTORS				
A. Estimated Vegetative R	ecovery Period, (years):	<u>NA</u>				
B. Design Chance of Succ	ess, (percent):	<u>NA</u>				
C. Equivalent Design Reco	urrence Interval, (years):	<u>NA</u>				
D. Design Storm Duration,	(hours):	<u>NA</u>				
E. Design Storm Magnitud	le, (inches):					
F. Design Flow, (cubic fee	t / second/ square mile):	<u>NA</u>				
G. Estimated Reduction in	Infiltration, (percent):	<u>NA</u>				
H. Adjusted Design Flow,	(cfs per square mile):	<u>NA</u>				
PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS						
A. Describe Watershe	d Emergency:					
Due to the small size of the	e fire and the low burn severity,	field investigation indicated that the				

Due to the small size of the fire and the low burn severity, field investigation indicated that there is no watershed emergency. Burn severity investigation was carried out over all of the burned area. Factors considered in assessing burn severity were: 1/ condition of remaining duff layer and 2/ presence of water-repellency within the top soil. For most of the area the duff layer was lightly burned. Duff and litter were scorched and charred but not completely consumed. Ash was present in selected areas. Very few areas had soils with water-repellency. In areas were water repellency was detected, the degree of repellency was moderate and the class of repellency was low. No repellency was detected below ½ inch of the soil surface. In many areas, needle and litter cast would rapidly provide additional surface cover and reduce potential surface erosion. However, due to the low degree of water-repellency and degree of remaining duff, surface erosion as a result of the fire is expected to be very low.

The fire burned portions of ephemeral and intermittent channels that drain into the mainstem Trinity River and a small portion of the inner gorge on Old Campbell Creek which drains into the South Fork Trinity River. Old Campbell Creek provides critical habitat for coho and chinook salmond which are listed as endangered. The fire burned approximately an acre within the inner gorge of Old Campbell Creek. The fire was a low intentisty burn that left the canopy intact and duff in place. The fire did not damage the critical habitat. Portions of two ephemeral/intermittent channels draining into the mainstem Trinity River were burned. None of the channels on Forest Service land were domestic water sources nor did they provide critical habitat for anadromous fish on the mainstem Trinity River. A perennial channel on private lands was burned but was not investigated due to private land ownership considerations.

\Box	Emergency	Tra atma and	Oh: 001: 100.
В.	Emergency	Treatment	Uniectives:

none

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

Land __ % Channel __ % Roads __ % Other __ %

D. Probability of Treatment Success: NA

	Ye	Years after Treatment						
	1	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:

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

Team Leader: Carolyn Cook

Email: <u>cacook@fs.fed.us</u> Phone: <u>707-441-3551</u> FAX: <u>707-442-9242</u>

H. Treatment Narrative: NA

(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:

Channel Treatments:

Roads and Trail Treatments:

Structures:

I. Monitoring Narrative: NA

(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

		Unit	# of	WFSU	Other	# of	Fed		Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT \$	\$ 8	units	\$	Units	\$	\$
					8					
A. Land Treatments						<u> </u>				
				\$0	\$0.		\$0		\$0	(
				\$0	\$0	3	\$0		\$0	(
				\$0	\$0 \$	3	\$0		\$0	Ç
nsert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	9
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$0	\$0	1	\$0		\$0	Ç
B. Channel Treatmen	ts				8					
				\$0	\$0	8	\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0\$		\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0	3	\$0		\$0	9
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0 \$		\$0		\$0	9
Subtotal Channel Treat.				\$0	\$0	S	\$0		\$0	9
C. Road and Trails					8	8		-		
				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0	3	\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0	8	\$0		\$0	9
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0\$	8	\$0		\$0	9
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0	\$0	1	\$0		\$0	9
D. Structures					8				•	
				\$0	\$0.8	3	\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0.8	3	\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0.8	3	\$0		\$0	\$
nsert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	3	\$0		\$0	\$
Subtotal Structures				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	\$
E. BAER Evaluation					8	Š				•
				\$0	\$0	1	\$0		\$0	9
				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	9
nsert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	9
Subtotal Evaluation				\$0	\$0	3	\$0		\$0	9
F. Monitoring				4 -	8	3	,,,		, ,	,
				\$0	\$0	3	\$0		\$0	9
nsert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0	*	\$0		\$0	9
Subtotal Monitoring				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	3
zaztotai moimoinig				ΨΟ	Ť,	*	Ψ0		+ +	
G. Totals				\$0	\$0		\$0		\$0	•
J. 10tulo				Ψ	Ψ υ (ς		ΨΟ		Ψ	4

PART VII - APPROVALS

1.	<u>_/s/S. E. WOLTERING_</u>	<u>7/14/2003</u>
	S.E. "LOU" WOLTERING	Date
	Forest Supervisor	
_		
2.		
	JACK A. BLACKWELL	Date
	Regional Forester	