## **COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS**

INCIDENT NAME: McDonald

DATE: 7/31/10, 10:00

INCIDENT COMPLEXITY ANALYSIS	YES	N
A. FIRE BEHAVIOR	<del></del>	
1. Burning index (from on-site measurement of weather conditions)	X	
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	ļ.,
3. Crowning, profuse or long-range spotting.		
4. Weather forecast indicating no significant relief or worsening conditions.		
TOTAL TOTAL	2	
B. RESOURCES COMMITTED		Г
<ol> <li>200 or more personnel assigned.</li> <li>Three or more divisions.</li> </ol>	X	
	X	<del>                                     </del>
<ol> <li>Wide variety of support personnel.</li> <li>Substantial air operation which is not properly staffed.</li> </ol>	<del></del>	,
		,
5. Majority of initial attack resources committed.  TOTAL	2	
C. RESOURCES THREATENED		
1. Urban interface.	<u> </u>	
2. Developments and facilities.	Х	-
3. Restricted, threatened, or endangered species habitat.	X	-
4. Cultural sites.		
5. Unique natural resources, special-designation areas, wilderness.	х	
6. Other special resources.		
TOTAL	3	
D. SAFETY		L
1. Unusually hazardous Fireline construction.		
2. Serious accidents or fatalities.		
3. Threat to safety of visitors from fire and related operations.		
4. Restrictions and/or closures in effect or being considered.		
5. No night operations in place for safety reasons.		· ·
TOTAL	0	!
E. OWNERSHIP		
1. Fire burning or threatening more than one jurisdiction.		7
2. Potential for claims (damages).	Х	
3. Different or conflicting management objectives.		7
4. Disputes over suppression responsibility.		7
5. Potential for unified command.		2
TOTAL	1	
		ļ

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: This incident has 6 Divisions, 600+ personnel and is approximately 90% contained. With the number of personnel, size of fire, aircraft utilization, and logistical support needs, it remains as Type 2 complexity. With the predicted wind speeds over the next day, this incident will likely sustain the characteristics of a Type 2 incident for the next 12 – 16 hours. If progress continues, the incident will begin to ramp down quickly.

Kent Swartzlander, Incident Commander