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

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. Type of Rep	port
----------------	------

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

2. Type of Action

- [x] A. Initial (estimated funding is first requested)
- [] B. Interim
 - [] Updating the initial funding request.
 - [] Supplying information for accomplishments to date on emergency work underway.
- []C. Final
 - [] Best estimate for funds needed to complete eligible rehabilitation measure.
 - [] Following completion of funded work.

PART II - FIRE LOCATION

- 1. Fire Name (from Form FS-5100-29): GORDA-RAT
- 2. Forest Supervisor's Fire No. (from Form FS-5100-29): LPF 568
- 3. State: CALIFORNIA
- 4. County: MONTEREY
- 5. Region: 5 PACIFIC SOUTHWEST
- 6. Forest: LOS PADRES
- 7. Ranger District: MONTEREY
- 8. Date Fire Started: JULY 6, 1985
- 9. Date Fire Controlled: (NOT CONTROLLED AS OF 8-8-85)
- 10. Estimated Suppression Costs: \$12 MM
- 11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds:

51 NFS miles (firelines waterbarred)

250 NFS acres (firelines seeded)

acres Other (identify) — Fire Camp

12. Fire Intensity:

30 % (low)

30 % (medium)

40 % (high)

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

- 1. Watershed No.: 1806000501, 02, 03, 1806000601
- 2. NFS Acres Burned: 47,940 (Total all ownerships 58,000 acres)
- 3. Water Repellant Soil:

60 % of NFS acres burned

	Vegetation Types: CHAPARALL-40%, TANOAK-MAPLE-HAY-MADHONE-30%, PINE-SANTA A FIR-10%, REDWOOD-10%, OTHER-10;									
	Geologic Types: FRANCISCIAN (SANLSTONE, SHALE, SCHIST, SERPENTINE) SUR SERIES									
6.	Soil Erosion Hazard Rating:									
	2 % (low) 20 % (medium) 78 % (high)									
7.	Erosion Potential: 44,800 cu. yds/sq. miles									
	Miles of Stream Channels by Regional Classes:1st-217, 2nd-70, 3rd-20									
9.	Miles of Forest Service Trails: 52									
10.	Miles of Forest Service Roads by Maintenance Levels:									
	0 miles (Level I) 0 miles (Level II) 12 miles (Levels III, IV, V)									
	PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION									
1.	Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period: 5 years.									
	Chance of Success Desired by Management: 80 percent.									
3.	Equivalent Design Recurrence Period: 25 years.									
	Related Design Storm Duration: 6 hours.									
	Related Design Storm Magnitude: 5.5 inches.									
	Related Design Flow 240 cfsm.									
•	Estimated Reduction in Infiltration: 60 percent. Adjusted Related Design Flow: 360 cfsm.									
0.	Adjusted herated besign from: 300 crsm.									
	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 [x] Visual									
	Describe Emergency: INCREASED PEAK FLOWS, SEDIMENT FLOWS, HIGHWAY #1 OUTS, DAMAGE TO HOMES, AND WATER SUPPLIES.									
	Emergency Rehabilitation Objective: REDUCE PEAK FLOW AND SEDIMENT FLOWS.									
	4. Probability of Completing Treatment Prior to First Major Damage Producing Storm:									
	Land 100 % Channel 100 % Roads 100 % Other %									
5.	Net Environmental Quality Benefit Index:									
	[X] Significant [] Not Significant									
6.	Net Social Well Being Benefit Index:									
	[X] Significant [] Not Significant									
8.	Benefit/Cost Ratio: 2/1 Net Benefits: \$ 715 M									
9.	Cost Effectiveness Index: [X] I. [] III. [] IV.									

PART VI - ELIGIBLE EMEPGENCY REHABILITATION MEASURES OR TREATMENTS) 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.

					Lands		L	Other L		All Lands
I	ine Items	Units	Unit	No. of	FFF 092	Other \$	No. of	Federal\$	Non-Federal	Total
		1 1	Cost	Units	\$	CFR&T	Units	1	! \$	\$
				l			<u> </u>	<u></u>	<u> </u>	
						ident.		ident.		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
T AND				<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>
. LAND	Conding NPC	I A award	47	20.1M	l the out	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>i</u>	\$140.9M
	Seeding NFS	Acres ACRES		<u>ieu. Im</u>	140.9M	<u> </u>	3.6M	\$12.6M	\$12.6M	\$25.2M
	SEEDING PVT SEEDING MILITARY			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	2.1M		1 012.011	\$14.7M
	SEEDING STATE PK.		Ð/	<u>l</u> I	<u> </u>		0	\$14.114	 	<u> </u>
		ACRES		 	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	0	<u> </u>	 	! !
.	SEEDING OC	HCIES!		! !	!	L	<u>. </u>	<u> </u>	 	!!
B. CHANN	els			<u></u> 	<u> </u>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	i	<u> </u>
	Opening water			1	1				I	
		Miles	\$5M	17	\$85M		1 4	\$10M	\$10M	\$105M
b.	Stabilizing			<u> </u>			Ī			l
	streambanks	Miles		1	!			L	I	
c.		1		<u> </u>			1		1	
d.				L			l		L	L
е.				L	<u> </u>		1	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>
		L		L		L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
. ROADS	S AND TRAILS			L	<u> </u>	L	1	<u> </u>	<u>L</u>	<u> </u>
a. (FR&T REPAIR	MILES		12	<u> </u>	\$8.5M	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	\$8.5M
b. I	DRAIN DIPS OVER S.	EA	1100	23	\$25.3M	<u> </u>	1	<u>L</u>	1	\$25.3M
c. (LEAN DRAINS AFTER			L	L/	Ĺ <u></u>	<u> </u>	<u>L</u>	1	<u>L /</u>
FIRS	ST MAJOR STORM	EA	25	200	\$5.0M	<u> </u>	1	<u>L</u>	1	<u> \\$5.08</u>
MAJOI	STRUCTURES	1		<u> </u>		<u>L</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	
a.	Preplanned -	<u> </u>	L	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	Ľ	<u> 1</u>	L	L	<u>L</u>
	from Forest	L		L	<u></u>	L	<u> </u>	<u>L</u>	<u> </u>	L
	Plans	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	#	<u>L</u>	L	#	<u>L</u>	L	
.1 REHAL	REPORT **	I EA	\$25	<u> </u>	\$2.5M		<u> L</u>	<u> </u>	<u>L</u>	\$2.5
. TOTAL	4	1		1	J	\$8.5	1	 \$37.3	 \$22.6	\$ ``*9-6°

PART VII -	APPROVALS
/S/Signed by Erwin N. Ward, Acting Supervisor Forest Supervisor (Signature)	August 14,1885 Date
/S/ Andrew A. Leven, for	August 14, 1985
Regional Forester (Signature)	Date

·				

DEPARIMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Service

6144 Calle Real Goleta, CA 93117

Reply To: 2510 Emergency Rehabilitation

Date: August 8, 1985

Subject: Ventana Wilderness Seeding and Channel Clearing

To: Forest Supervisor

The Gorda-Rat Rehabilitation Team has evaluated the need to seed portions of the Ventana Wildeness burned during the Gorda-Rat Fire. The Team evaluated four alternatives. These are:

ALTERNATIVE 1. DO NOTHING.

ADVANTAGES

- A. Least Cost.
- B. Least competition with native species.
- C. Least competition with sensitive species and areas.

DISADVANTAGES

A. No potential boost to the soil portection effort where life and property are threatened.

ALTERNATIVE 2. SEED COMMON RYEGRASS AT SEVEN POUNDS PER ACRE IN SELECTED AREAS.

ADVANTAGES

- A. Least expensive of available seeds at 0.155 cents/lb.
- B. Provides quick growth.
- C. Dies out in 3-4 years as natives keep coming back in their natural cycle.
- D. Can be recognized by botanists as a seeded species.
- E. Seed is available in quantities needed.
- F. Has been used successfully many times in other burned areas without destroying natural succession. Because it does not persist it is often not found in communities with other naturalized species.

DISADVANTAGES

- A.Considerable cost to apply Approximately \$7.00/acre.
- B.May slow, to some extent natural succession following a fire.
- C.May cause greater sedimentation problems in the long term.
- D.May result in the loss of some conifer stands.

ALTERNATIVE 3. SEED SOFT CHESS AT 7 POUNDS/ACRE IN SELECTED AREAS.

ADVANTAGES

A. Reseeds itself and persists for many years.

DISADVANTAGES

A. Seed is expensive, about \$2.50/lb. Raises seeding

- B. Naturalized and already occurs in the Wilderness and in other California annual gras ands.
- C. Conforms with FSM, as a naturalized species.
- costs by two times over.
- B. Not available in quantities needed.
- C. May slow to a larger extent than annual ryegrass, the natural succession following a fire.
- D. May cause greater sedimentation problems in the long run.
- E. May result in the loss of some conifer stands.

ALTERNATIVE 4. SEED NATIVES.

ADVANTAGES

- A. At first appearance, this looks like a good solution.
- B. Appeals immediately to one's Wilderness ethic.
- C. Conforms with FSM policy to use natives or naturalized species.

DISADVANTAGES

- A. Seed is expensive, up to \$2.00 per ounce. Total costs could be astronomical.
- B. Seed is not available in quantities needed.
- C. Compounds botanical studies. Varities did not develop in areas seeded.
- D. Botanists can not recognize seeded and unseeded species.
- E. Would cause genetic mixing.

The four alternatives were evaluated for each watershed. Each watershed was analyzed for the burn intensity, potential soil erosion, economics of treatment and downstream values (including Highway 1). Also assessed were the impacts to the gene pools of residual conifer stands, as well as sensitive, threatened or endangered plants. The ecosystem integrity of the proposed Biosphere Resource and the proposed Cone Peak Gradient RNA were also part of the assessment process.

The Team recommends seeding the areas identified on Map 1 with common annual ryegrass at seven pounds per acre. The areas identified on Map 2 would be seeded with soft chess, also at seven pounds per acre. The areas identified on Map 2 are all tractor lines constructed during the suppression actions.

The Team identified 15 miles of channel clearing within the Wilderness. This activity will require the use of chain saws for which past approval has been obtained.

I concur with the Team's recommendations. I would like approval from the Washington Office to seed the identified areas and for the use of chain saws in the Wilderness.

/s/DAVID R. HARMER District Ranger