COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS

INCIDENT NAME: Modoc Lightning Complex DATE: 7/28, 09:30

| | INCIDENT COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS | YES | NO |
|-----------|--|-----|----------|
| | A. FIRE BEHAVIOR | | |
| 1. | Burning index (from on-site measurement of weather conditions) | | Х |
| | predicted to be above the 90% level using the major fuel model in which | | |
| | the fire is burning. | | |
| 2. | Potential exists for extreme fire behavior (fuel moisture, winds, etc.) | | Х |
| <u> </u> | Crowning, profuse or long-range spotting. | | Х |
| 4. | Weather forecast indicating no significant relief or worsening conditions. | 1 | |
| | TOTAL | 1 | 3 |
| | B. RESOURCES COMMITTED | | |
| 1. | 200 or more personnel assigned. | Х | |
| 2. | Three or more divisions. | Х | ~ |
| 3. | Wide variety of support personnel. | | Х |
| 4. | Substantial air operation which is not properly staffed. | | Х |
| 5. | Majority of initial attack resources committed. | | Х |
| | TOTAL | 2 | 3 |
| | C. RESOURCES THREATENED | | |
| 1. | Urban interface. | | Х |
| 2. | Developments and facilities. | | Х |
| 3. | Restricted, threatened, or endangered species habitat. | | Х |
| 4. | Cultural sites. | | Х |
| 5. | Unique natural resources, special-designation areas, wilderness. | | Х |
| 6. | Other special resources. | | Х |
| | TOTAL | 0 | 6 |
| _ | D. SAFETY | | |
| 1. | Unusually hazardous Fireline construction. | - | х |
| 2. | Serious accidents or fatalities. | | X |
| 3. | Threat to safety of visitors from fire and related operations. | • | <u>^</u> |
| 4. | Restrictions and/or closures in effect or being considered. | Х | |
| 5. | No night operations in place for safety reasons. | | X |
| | TOTAL | 1 | 4 |
| | F. OWNERSHIP | т. | - |
| 1. | Fire burning or threatening more than one jurisdiction. | | х |
| 2. | Potential for claims (damages). | Х | ^ |
| 3. | Different or conflicting management objectives. | ^ | V |
| 4. | Disputes over suppression responsibility. | | X |
| 5. | Potential for unified command. | | X |
| <u>J.</u> | | 4 | X |
| | TOTAL | 1 | 4 |
| | | | |

| INCIDENT COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS | YES | NO |
|---|-----|----|
| F. EXTERNAL INFLUENCES | | • |
| 1. Controversial fire policies. | | Х |
| 2. Pre-existing controversies/relationships. | | х |
| 3. Sensitive media relationships. | | Х |
| 4. Smoke management issues. | | х |
| 5. Sensitive political interests. | | Х |
| 6. Other external influences. | | Х |
| TOTAL | 0 | 6 |
| G. CHANGE IN STRATEGY | | |
| 1. Change in strategy. | | Х |
| 2. Large amounts of unburned fuel within planned perimeter. | | Х |
| 3. WFDSS invalid or requires updating. | | Х |
| TOTAL | 0 | 3 |
| H. EXISTING OVERHEAD | | • |
| 1. Worked two operational periods without achieving initial objectives. | | Х |
| 2. Existing management organization ineffective. | | Х |
| 3. Overhead overextended mentally and/or physically. | | Х |
| 4. Incident action plans, briefing, etc. missing or poorly prepared. | | Х |
| TOTAL | 0 | 4 |

RATIONALE: Incident size has been re-calculated to 64 acres. Today three Divisions were staffed minimally. Given no new ignitions incident will have the characteristics of a Type 4 incident as there will be less than 30 personnel and a single division fire.

Kent Swartziander, Incident Commander