

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE

FOREST
SERVICE

R5

REPLY TO: 2520
6520

DATE: September 11, 1986

SUBJECT: Emergency Burned-Area Rehabilitation - Intake and Power Fires

TO: Forest Supervisor, San Bernardino National Forest

Your request for FFF-092 funds has been approved as follows:

\$17,468	purchase of seed - Intake and Power Fires
400	channel clearing - Power Fire
<u>2,100</u>	road work - Power fire
\$19,968	for FY86

A discrepancy exists between seed costs in your cover letter and form 2500-8. The seeding costs shown in the 2500-8 forms, less the application cost (cover letter), were used for the cost of seed. The remainder of the request, \$4,105 will be acted on in FY 1987.

Monitoring seeding success is not an appropriate use of FFF-092 funds. However, these funds can be used for follow-up evaluations to determine if additional emergency work is required. These costs should be included in your survey expenses, entered under item A of the fund request form (R5-2500-8).

Potomac orchardgrass and weeping lovegrass should be dropped from the seed mix for the following reasons. Annual ryegrass and blando brome meet erosion control objectives. Potomac orchardgrass is not summer dormant and therefore not adapted to the burn area. Summer dormant varieties (Berber and Palestine) are adapted to the area. However, perennials in the seed mix would not meet your concern about competition with native species. Once established, orchardgrass and lovegrass, would offer greater long-term competition with natives than annual ryegrass. The seed mix has been added to the signature page of form 2500-8.

If you have any questions, please contact Watershed Management Staff at (415) 556-1564.

/s/ ZANE G. SMITH, JR.

ZANE G. SMITH, JR.
Regional Forester

Enclosures

File Copy

DOCUMENT HEADER

Document name: INTAKE FIRE

Document type: WRD

Deleted from Drawer: BURN AREA REHABILITATION

Deleted from Folder: BURN REHAB REPORTS

on Sep 04,87 8:13 AM

Received from: Hollis A. Hardy

Last modified on Jan 27,87

9:39 AM

by WS

Author: Katherine Foster

Typist: Katherine Foster

Filed on: Jul 31,86 4:39 PM

Message attached

Subject: 2500-8 for Intake Fire 7/86

Summary:

Initial 2500-8 and narrative report

Comments:

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

PART I - TYPE OF REQUEST

1. Type of Report

- ☒ A. Funding (Request for estimated FFF funds)
☐ 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.

☐ 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): Intake Fire
2. Forest Supervisor's Fire No. (from Form FS-5100-29): BDF 3980
3. State: California
4. County: San Bernardino
5. Region: R-5
6. Forest: San Bernardino
7. Ranger District: Cajon
8. Date Fire Started: 20 July 86
9. Date Fire Controlled: 22 July 86
10. Estimated Suppression Costs: \$164,000
11. Fire Suppression Damages Repaired with FFF 102 Funds:

1.5 miles (firelines waterbarred)
6 acres (firelines seeded - to be done in the fall)
Repair of water system and sprinkler system at Lytle Creek Ranger Station
12. Fire Intensity: 40% (low) 55% (medium) 5% (high)

PART III - NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM PROBLEM INVENTORY

1. Watershed No.: 37 - Lytle Creek
2. NFS Acres Burned: 527
3. Water Repellant Soil: 50% of NFS acres burned
4. Vegetation Types: Ceanothus, Manzanita, Interior Live Oak, Sycamore
5. Geologic Types: grt,m,ms
6. Soil Erosion Hazard Rating:
0% (low) 20% (medium) 80% (high)
7. Erosion Potential: 44350 cu. yds/sq. miles
8. Miles of Stream Channels by Regional Order or Classes: 0.75 mi Order 1
9. Miles of Forest Service Trails: 0
10. Miles of Forest Service Roads by Maintenance Levels:
0 miles (Level I) 0 miles (Level II)
0.2 miles (Levels III, IV, V)

PART IV - CALCULATED RISK AND CLIMATIC EVALUATION

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

PART V - SUMMARY OF SURVEY AND ANALYSIS

1. Skills Represented on Burned Area Survey Team ("x" appropriate boxes):
☒ Hydrology ☐ Soils ☐ Geology ☐ Range
☐ Timber ☒ Wildlife ☐ Fire Mgmt. ☒ Engineering
☐ Contracting ☒ Local Mgmt. ☐ Research ☐ Other (identify)
2. Describe Emergency: See attached narrative
3. Emergency Rehabilitation Objective: See attached narrative
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:
 ☒ Significant ☐ Not Significant
6. Net Social Well Being Benefit Index:
 ☒ Significant ☐ Not Significant
7. Benefit/Cost Ratio: 13000/6755
8. Net Benefits: \$6245
9. Cost Effectiveness Index: ☒ I. ☐ II. ☐ III. ☐ IV.

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.

Line Items	NFS Lands					Other Lands			All Lands
	Units	Unit	No. of	FFP 092	Other \$	No. of	Federal\$	Non-Federal	Total
		Cost	Units	\$		Units		\$	\$
					FFP 102				
					ident.		ident.	identify	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
A. LAND									
a. Seeding	Acres		21	1630	650				2280
b.									
c.									
d.									
e.									
B. CHANNELS									
a. Opening water									
courses	Miles								
b. Stabilizing									
streambanks	Miles								
c. Improvement of				3550					3550
levees @ Box Cyn									
d.									
C. ROADS AND TRAILS									
a Water tank rd				1575					1575
b.									
c.									
D. MAJOR STRUCTURES									
a. Preplanned -									
from Forest									
Plans									
E. TOTAL				\$6755	\$ 650		\$	\$	\$ 7405

PART VII - APPROVALS

/S/ CHARLES H. IRBY 7/24/86
For Forest Supervisor (Signature) Date

/S/ _____
Regional Forester (Signature) Date

NARRATIVE TO ACCOMPANY 2500-8 FOR THE INTAKE FIRE

The total acreage for the Intake Fire is 560 acres. The fire was confined to the east side of Lytle Creek more or less between the Lytle Creek Ranger Station and Mountain Lakes Resort. Portions of the east slope of Lytle Creek are burned. Box Canyon is the major watershed in the burned area and is completely burned. The west slope of CCC Canyon is partially burned in a spotty pattern.

On 21 July Katherine Foster, burn rehab team leader, and Steve Holl, district resource officer, surveyed the burned area. Tom Okamura, assistant forest engineer, also participated in part of the survey.

The suppression cat lines have been waterbarred.

The survey team considered measures in CCC Canyon. The Lytle Creek sewage treatment plant is in the mouth of the canyon. Only a small portion of this watershed was burned and it was the judgement of the survey team that the fire had not altered the watershed enough to present a threat to the treatment plant.

The following treatment needs were identified:

Repair of Suppression Damages FFF 102

Seed the cat lines above Mountain Lakes (should be done in late fall) \$650

Repair the water system at the ranger station \$800

Repair the sprinkler system at the station \$200

Emergency Watershed Rehabilitation FFF 092

Refurbish the levees at the mouth of Box Canyon \$3550

Protect the access road to the ranger station water tank \$1575

inslope the road and install overside drains

Seed the steep east facing slope above Lytle Creek Ranger Station residences (should be done in late fall) \$1630

Justification of Emergency Needs

Box Canyon is a 270 acre watershed immediately behind the Lytle Creek Ranger Station. The entire watershed has been burned; the last time the area burned was in 1954. The valley bottom is broad and is gullied. In places the stream channel is incised six to eight feet; the channel is ephemeral and flashy. Levees have been constructed across the mouth of the canyon to protect the ranger station compound. The compound consists of the district's offices, a work center, barracks, and three residences which are occupied year-round. The most recent work on the levees was done in 1978 following a series of tropical storms which resulted in some damage to the compound. This fire has increased both the hazard and risk to the ranger station. The Forest is proposing to reinforce or reconstruct portions of the existing levees to the original standards to insure that any floods and debris are diverted around the compound. Estimated cost of the work is \$3550; work can be completed before the first major storms.

The access road to the ranger station water tank is on a steep slope which has completely burned. The Forest is proposing to inslope the road and install overside drains. These measures will protect the access to the compound's only source of water and will also provide protection from debris to the residences on that side of the compound. The Forest is also proposing to seed this slope. The seeding is intended to control dry ravel and debris movement. After consultation with the Soil Conservation Service and the Forest's botanist a seeding rate of 30 lbs/acre and application in the late fall was determined to be essential to insure a reasonable probability of success. Estimated cost of the road protection measures is \$1575; estimated cost of the seeding including application is \$1630. The suppression cat lines will be seeded at the same time; estimated cost is \$650.

