

ELMORE FIRE BURNED-AREA REPORT
(Reference FSH 2509.13)



(Elmore Fire looking east towards Shasta Lake on the upper portion of fire)

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

A. Type of Report

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

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 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 DESCRIPTION

A. Fire Name: Elmore

B. Fire Number: CASHF-001945

C. State: CA

D. County: Shasta

E. Region: 5

F. Forest: Shasta-Trinity

G. District:NRA Shasta Lake

H. Date Fire Started:9/07/08

I. Date Fire Contained:9/09/08

J. Suppression Cost: \$1 million

K. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with Suppression Funds

1. Fireline waterbarred (miles):
2. Fireline seeded (miles):
3. Other (identify):

L. Watershed Number:

M. Total Acres Burned:340

NFS Acres(340) Other Federal () State () Private ()



N. Vegetation Types:Ponderosa Pine/Chapparral

O. Dominant Soils:Neuns, Holland, Goulding

P. Geologic Types:Metavolcanic

Q. Miles of Stream Channels by Order or Class: 2 intermittents

R. Transportation System

Trails: miles Roads: miles

PART III - WATERSHED CONDITION

A. Burn Severity (acres): 153 (low – 45%) 119 (moderate – 35%) 102 (high – 30%)

B. Water-Repellent Soil (acres):0

- C. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating (acres):
 17 (low – 5%) 153 (moderate – 45%) 170 (high – 50%)
- D. Erosion Potential: 10 tons/acre
- E. Sediment Potential: 5,000 cubic yards / square mile

PART IV - HYDROLOGIC DESIGN FACTORS

- A. Estimated Vegetative Recovery Period, (years): 30
- B. Design Chance of Success, (percent): 80
- C. Equivalent Design Recurrence Interval, (years): 2
- D. Design Storm Duration, (hours): 6hr
- E. Design Storm Magnitude, (inches): 1.8
- F. Design Flow, (cubic feet / second/ square mile): 35
- G. Estimated Reduction in Infiltration, (percent): 5
- H. Adjusted Design Flow, (cfs per square mile): 65

PART V - SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS

A. Describe Watershed Emergency:

The Elmore Fire was a moderately high intensity fire driven by strong winds (30+mph) that moved through the area rapidly consuming mixed chaparral with scattered Ponderosa Pine. The short residence time caused little soil heating and soil structure destruction. The large response from local, state and federal units raises the possibility that noxious weeds were introduced in unwashed suppression equipment. Specialists on the BAER team did not find any watershed emergency in regard to erosion, water quality, wildlife and archaeology. The only concerns were the possible introduction of noxious weeds by multi-resource units off the forest and a few partially filled culverts under the Northern Pacific Railroad.

B. Emergency Treatment Objectives:

Need to order up a noxious weed detection survey to insure no invasive weeds get established in fire perimeter and along dozer lines. If noxious weeds are detected in the spring, proceed with eradication plan of hand pulling and bagging.

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

Land ___ % Channel ___ % Roads ___ % Other ___ %

D. Probability of Treatment Success

	Years after Treatment		
	1	3	5
Land			

Channel			
Roads			
Other			

E. Cost of No-Action (Including Loss): \$30,000

F. Cost of Selected Alternative (Including Loss): \$3,150

G. Skills Represented on Burned-Area Survey Team:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology	<input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> GIS	

Team Leader: Brad Rust

Email: brust@fs.fed.us

Phone: 530-226-2427

FAX: 530-226-2485

Shasta-Trinity National Forest
3644 Avtech Parkway
Redding, CA 96002

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: Allow natural regeneration due to the moderate to low soil burn intensity that did not destroy the natural seedbed. No watershed emergency exists in regards to erosion, water quality, fish, wildlife, archeology.

Noxious weed detection survey needs to be conducted in the Spring to determine if introduction of noxious weeds occurred from multi-agency response to the Elmore Fire.

One week of time for district botanist and assistant to monitor fire area, esp. fire perimeter and dozer lines for noxious weeds. If noxious weeds are detected, weeds will be hand pulled and put in plastic bags for disposal. If further treatments are needed an Interim request will be submitted.

Channel Treatments: Inform Northern Pacific Railroad about 2 partially filled culverts below slopes above.

Roads and Trail Treatments: Suppression rehabilitation will cover with waterbarring and seeding.

Structures: none

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		# of	Fed	# of	Non Fed	Total
Line Items	Units	Cost	Units	SULT \$	\$		units	\$	Units	\$	\$
A. Land Treatments	none										
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Land Treatments				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
B. Channel Treatmen	none										
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Channel Treat.				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
C. Road and Trails	none										
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Road & Trails				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
D. Structures	none										
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Structures				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
E. BAER Evaluation											
BAER team	ea			\$0	\$1,000			\$0		\$0	\$1,000
Nx Weeds	days	450	7	\$3,150	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$3,150
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Evaluation				\$3,150	\$1,000			\$0		\$0	\$4,150
F. Monitoring											
					\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Insert new items above this line!				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
Subtotal Monitoring				\$0	\$0			\$0		\$0	\$0
G. Totals				\$3,150	\$1,000			\$0		\$0	\$4,150

PART VII - APPROVALS

1. /s/ J. Sharon Heywood
Forest Supervisor (signature)

14 Jan 09
Date

2. _____
Regional Forester (signature)

Date