USDA-FOREST SERVICE

Date of Report: MAY 5, 1988

BURNED AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13, Report FS-2500-A)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. Type of Report

   [X] A. Funding (Request for estimated FFF funds)
   [X] B. Accomplishment Report

2. Type of Action

   [ ] A. Initial (estimated funding is first requested)
   [ ] B. Interim

      [ ] Updating the initial funding request.
      [ ] Supplying information for accomplishments to date on emergency work underway.

   [X] C. Final

      [ ] Best estimate for funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measure.
      [X] Following completion of funded work.

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

1. Fire Name (from Form FS-5100-29): **FORKS**
2. Forest Supervisor's Fire No. (from Form FS-5100-29): MNF 0360
3. State: CALIFORNIA
4. County: TEHAMA
5. Region: 5
6. Forest: MENDOCINO
7. Ranger District: CORNING
8. Date Fire Started: AUGUST 31, 1987
9. Date Fire Controlled: SEPTEMBER 8, 1987
10. Estimated Suppression Costs: $_____
11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds:

    _____ miles (firelines waterbarred)
    _____ acres (firelines seeded)
    _____ Other (identify)

12. Fire Intensity: 30 % (low) 60 % (medium) 10 % (high)

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed No.: 18020114-02
2. NFS Acres Burned: 700
3. Water Repellant Soil: 20 % of NFS acres burned

4. Vegetation Types: MIXED CONIFER
5. Geologic Types: FRANCISCAN FORMATION
6. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating:

_____ % (low) 70 % (medium) 30 % (high)

7. Erosion Potential: 3200 cu. yds/sq. miles
8. Miles of Stream Channels by Regional Order or Classes: II=2
9. Miles of Forest Service Trails:
10. Miles of Forest Service Roads by Maintenance Levels:

_____ miles (Level I) 3 miles (Level II)
2 miles (Levels III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

1. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: 10 years.
2. Chance of Success Desired by Management: 80 percent.
3. Equivalent Design Recurrence Period: 5 years.
4. Related Design Storm Duration: 24 hours.
5. Related Design Storm Magnitude: ___ inches.60 INCH PRECIP
6. Related Design Flow _____ cfsm.
7. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: 50 percent.
8. Adjusted Related Design Flow: _____ cfsm.

PART V - SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills Represented on Burned Area Survey Team ("x" appropriate boxes):

[X] Hydrology [X] Soils [X] Geology [X] Range
[X] Timber [X] Wildlife [X] Fire Mgmt. [X] Engineering
[ ] Contracting [X] Local Mgmt. [ ] Research [ ] Other (identify)
CAL FISH AND GAME, S.C.S., CAL DEPT OF FORESTRY

2. Describe Emergency: POTENTIAL DAMAGE TO WATERSHED, NATIVE FISHERIES
3. Emergency Rehabilitation Objective: REDUCE WATERSHED DAMAGE FROM EROSION
4. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage Producing Storm:

Land 30 % Channel 5 % Roads 100 % Other _____ %

PART VI - ELIGIBLE EMERGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS AND SOURCE OF FUNDS

NOTE: Emergency rehabilitation is work done promptly following a wildfire and is not to solve watershed problems that existed prior to the wildfire.

			NFS Lands			Other Lands			All Lands
Line Items	Units	Unit Cost	No. of Units	FFF 092 $	Other $ FFF 102 ident.	No. of Units	Federal$ ident.	Non-Federal $ PVT identify	Total $
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
A. LAND									
a. Seeding	Acres	100	5	500					500
b. Straw Mulch	Acres	600	5	3,000					3,000
c.									
d.									
e.									
B. CHANNELS									
a.									
b.									
c.									
d.									
e.									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
a. Roads	Miles	1636	22		36,000				36,000
b.									
c.									
D. MAJOR STRUCTURES									
a. Preplanned - from Forest Plans									
E. TOTAL				$ 3500	$ 36000		$	$	$ 39,500

PART VII - APPROVALS

/S/ DANIEL K. CHISHOLM
Forest Supervisor (Signature)

5/5/88
Date

By Jarboe for
Andrew A. Leven for
Regional Forester (Signature)

11/18/88
Date

5. Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index: 1.6

[X] Significant [ ] Not Significant

6. Net Social Well Being Benefit Index: 1.0

[X] Significant [ ] Not Significant

7. Benefit/Cost Ratio:
8. Net Benefits: $ _____
9. Cost Effectiveness Index: [ ] I. [ ] II. [ ] III. [ ] IV.