

Date of Report:

BURNED-AREA REPORT

(Reference FSH 2509.13)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST**A. Type of Report**

- ☒ 1. Funding request for estimated emergency stabilization funds
☐ 2. Accomplishment Report
☐ 3. No Treatment Recommendation

B. Type of Action

- ☒ 1. Initial Request (Best estimate of funds needed to complete eligible stabilization 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: SlinkardB. Fire Number: CA-OVD-001478C. State: CA/NVD. County: Mono Co California
Douglas Co NVE. Region: 04 - IntermountainF. Forest: 17 - Humboldt-ToiyabeG. District: BridgeportH. Fire Incident Job Code: PDLA2817I. Date Fire Started: 8/29/17J. Date Fire Contained: 9/11/17K. Suppression Cost: \$5,800,000**L. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds**

1. Fireline waterbarred (miles): 3 miles total, none on NF lands
2. Fireline seeded (miles): _____
3. Other (identify): 7 miles dozer line rehabbed

M. Watershed Number: 160503020206N. Total Acres Burned: 9049

NFS Acres(3,037) Other Federal (4,706) State & Private (1,306)

O. Vegetation Types: sagebrush, bitterbrush, pinyon, grass

P. Dominant Soils: Major soils series on NF lands are Leroman-Chenhigh-Celeridge association, Heenlake-Loope-Chenhigh assoc & Canfire-Crispy-Rock outcrop. These soil groups tend to have gravelly to stony sandy loam surface. Soils are shallow to moderately deep.

Q. Geologic Types: Andesite, tuff breccia, metamorphic

R. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class:

Whole Fire

Perennial – 5.8mi

Intermittent – 6.3mi

Forest Service

Perennial – 1.3mi

Intermittent – 1.7mi

S. Transportation System

Trails: 0 miles

Roads: 5.08 miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 760 (low) 1923 (moderate) 162 (high) NFS lands
4164 (low) 3449 (mod) 188 (high) all lands

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres): 2,085 acres (NFS lands)

C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
789 (low) 911 (moderate) 1336 (high) (NFS lands)

D. Erosion Potential: 2.19 tons/acre (*ERMit calculations for entire fire)

E. Sediment Potential: 904 cubic yards / square mile (whole fire)

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): 3-5

B. Design Chance of Success, (percent): 80

C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): 5

D. Design Storm Duration, (hours): 2

E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): 1.16

F. Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): 16

G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): 68

H. Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): 28

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

Background: The Slinkard Fire was started on August 29, 2017 from a lightning strike. It burned approximately 9,000 acres across National Forest, BLM, California state and private lands. The fire primarily burned in the West Fork Walker River watershed above Topaz Lake.

A. Describe Critical Values/Resources and Threats:

High risk to native plant diversity and sage grouse habitat due to the threat from the spread of noxious weeds and invasive plant species. Known noxious weed and invasive populations (Scotch thistle) exist within and immediately adjacent to the burned area. There is also invasive cheatgrass scattered throughout the burned and surrounding area. (Treatment: T1)

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

Control expected expansion and invasion of noxious weeds within and adjacent to the area.

C. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to Damaging Storm or Event:

Land 30 % Channel % Roads/Trails % Protection/Safety %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

| | Years after Treatment | | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----|---|
| | 1 | 3 | 5 |
| Land | 80 | 70 | |
| | | | |
| Channel | | | |
| | | | |
| Roads/Trails | | | |
| | | | |
| Protection/Safety | | | |
| | | | |

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): A VAR was done for the only treatment identified for this fire. Map zone A includes all NFS lands within the fire perimeter. The treatment cost is estimated at \$6,000 with an expected benefit of \$18,000. Cost of no-action was estimated at \$45,000. (VAR analysis attached.)

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): \$6,000

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology | <input type="checkbox"/> Soils | <input 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS | |

Team Leader: Sally Champion/Casey Shannon

Email: schampion@fs.fed.us
cshannon@fs.fed.us

Phone: 775-884-8116 FAX:
760-873-2407

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:

T1 - Early Detection & Rapid Response

General Description of Treatment: Invasive plants and weed assessments will be conducted in FY2018 for Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) on any new infestation located within the fire perimeter. Treatments will occur at proper phenology of each species to ensure maximum control.

Because noxious weeds are scattered in small patches (mostly less than 1 acre) in and near the burn area, there is a high risk for new infestations within the fire perimeter to become established due to the disturbance caused by the wildfire and the suppression equipment used to fight the fire. Scotch thistle is the primary species of concern to invade the burn; cheatgrass is already a concern due to the amount prior to the wildfire along roads.

Suitable Sites: Assess areas that have a high potential for weed/invasive species establishment. Priority acres for EDRR are as follows:

- 1) Fire Lines @ 281 acres and Roads/Trails @ 12 acres.
- 2) 2 acres: Existing infestation sites
- 3) Approximately 3,000 acres - Bi-state sage-grouse habitat Pine Nut Population Management Unit (PMU)

Design/Construction Specifications:

1. Conduct short-term monitoring in FY2018 using EDRR assessment/monitoring of noxious weed/non-native invasive plant species infestations within the burned area. Monitoring to determine the post-fire presence or spread of invasive species will be prioritized by critical areas and disturbed areas near existing infestations.
2. Inventory/assessment, photos and map new noxious weed infestations within burned area using GPS technology and upload into the Carson Ranger District GIS Noxious Weeds/FACTS database.
3. Mechanical treatments, primarily through hand pulling, will be used on appropriate noxious and non-native invasive species such as scotch thistle, which is located within the fire on public lands. Prior to mechanical treatments, clear observed occurrences for cultural resources.
4. If Humboldt-Toiyabe N.F. completes the California Integrated Weeds Management Project Decision before expiration of the funds, chemical treatments using pickups, UTVs and backpack spray units will be used on any noxious weeds located within the fire on public lands.
5. Biocontrol agents will be used if available and applicable on larger infestations for long term weed management.

6. For the unoccupied bi-state sage grouse Pine Nut PMU, monitor cheatgrass expansion in the PMU using a stratified sampling method to focus efforts on areas of highest concern for the district.

Purpose of Treatment: This treatment is necessary to prevent the establishment and to control the spread of new noxious weeds and non-native invasive species in the burned area. Low sagebrush and mountain big sagebrush communities are at risk of type conversion to cheatgrass-dominated communities. The Slinkard Fire includes unoccupied bi-state sage-grouse habitat that is a part of the Pine Nut PMU as well as rangelands with a grazing allotment. This treatment is necessary to protect the integrity of the area for bi-state sage-grouse habitat and grazing suitability from expansion of noxious weeds.

Cost Estimate:

EDRR would be conducted by the Carson Ranger District 4-person weed crew with oversight from the range management/noxious weeds program manager. Total time in FY 2018 would be about 15 days. Crew cost with manager is about \$400/day.

Channel Treatments:

Roads and Trail Treatments:

Protection/Safety 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 Stabilization Treatments and Source of Funds

Interim #

| Line Items | Units | Unit Cost | NFS Lands | | Other \$ | Other Lands | | Non Fed | Total |
|--|-------|-----------|------------|---------|----------|-------------|--------|------------|---------|
| | | | # of Units | BAER \$ | | # of units | Fed \$ | # of Units | |
| A. Land Treatments | | | | | | | | | |
| | days | 400 | 15 | \$6,000 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$6,000 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Subtotal Land Treatments</i> | | | | \$6,000 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$6,000 |
| B. Channel Treatments | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Subtotal Channel Treat.</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| C. Road and Trails | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Subtotal Road & Trails</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| D. Protection/Safety | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Subtotal Structures</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| E. BAER Evaluation | | | | | | | | | |
| | rpt | 1 | | \$8,000 | | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | --- | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Subtotal Evaluation</i> | | | | \$8,000 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| F. Monitoring | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Insert new items above this line!</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| <i>Subtotal Monitoring</i> | | | | \$0 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$0 |
| G. Totals | | | | \$6,000 | \$0 | | \$0 | | \$6,000 |
| Previously approved | | | | | | | | | |
| Total for this request | | | | \$6,000 | | | | | |

PART VII - APPROVALS

 1. /s/William A. Dunkelberger
 Forest Supervisor (signature)

09/19/2017
 Date

 2. _____
 Regional Forester (signature)

 Date

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Fire Name | Slinkard |
| Location | Monitor Pass, CA |
| Date | 9/12/2017 |

EACH MAP ZONE REPRESENTS A SYSTEM OF LINKED TREATMENTS AND ASSOCIATED VALUES AT RISK

| MAP ZONE A - VALUES AT RISK (VAR) | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| PLEASE NOTE: IF PUBLIC SAFETY IS A FACTOR, B/C RATIO SHOULD NOT BE RELEVANT AND SHOULD STRICTLY BE AN ACCOUNTING EXERCISE | | | |
| Map link # | Non-Market: Cultural Values | Description | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Map link # | Non-Market: Ecological | Description | |
| | Plant diversity | Loss of plant diversity from spread of noxious weeds | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Map link # | Market Values: Direct | Description | Total |
| | Rangeland seeding | Re-seeding native species in range allotment and sage | \$ 25,000 |
| | | | \$ - |
| | | | \$ - |
| Map link # | Market Values: Loss-of-Use | Description | |
| | Range permittee loss | Loss of range production and grazing lands | \$ 20,000 |
| | | | \$ - |
| | | | \$ - |
| Probability of experiencing the loss with no treatment (enter as decimal) | | | 0.70 |
| Source of loss probability with no treatment: <input type="text"/> Select Source... | | | |
| Market Resource Value | | | \$ 45,000 |
| TREATMENT DESCRIPTION | | | |
| Map link # | Proposed treatment | | Total |
| | T1-EDRR | | \$ 6,000 |
| | | | \$ - |
| | | | \$ - |
| Probability of experiencing loss if treatment occurs (enter as decimal) | | | 0.30 |
| Source of loss probability with treatment: <input type="text"/> Select Source... | | | |
| Total Treatment Cost | | | \$ 6,000 |
| VAR CALCULATION RESULTS | | | |
| REDUCTION IN PROBABILITY OF LOSS | | | 0.40 |
| EXPECTED BENEFIT OF TREATMENT | | | \$ 18,000 |
| Expected Benefit/Cost ratio of treatment for market resources only (economically justified if > 1.0) | | | 3.0 |
| IMPLIED MINIMUM VALUE OF PROTECTING NON-MARKET RESOURCE VALUES | | | Justified |
| Comments <input type="text"/> | | | |

Non-Market Values Literature

View Literature