

Prescribed Fire Complexity Rating System Guide Worksheet

Instructions: This worksheet is designed to used with the Prescribed Fire Complexity Rating descriptors on Page 6.

Project Name Glipi Slash Number _____

Complexity elements:

1. Potential for Escape

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	Established firebreaks will contain fire. Spotting potential should be minimal and is easily detectable and controlled.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	An escape would not produce negative impacts to resources. There is the potential for the burn to cross onto private land and there is a private cabin within ¼ mile of the burn unit.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	Prescribed winds are intended to prevent an escape from spreading in the direction of the private land and cabin.
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Holding operations are at the single resource boss level or below, however there are several different types of resources being used on the burn. The burn unit is easily accessible to holding forces, but this fuel type is new to some of the holding personnel.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change

2. The Number and Dependency of Activities

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	Activities on this burn are loosely dependent on other activities. A delay in the completion of one activity will not provide significant delays in project completion.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change

Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Failure to coordinate activities would increase the likelihood for an escape and could prevent project completion.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change. Burning in a new fuel type for some personnel will require some learning. This may produce some delays in coordination of activities.
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	Coordination of activities will provide minimal difficulty. Communication and coordination can be carried out both verbally and by radio over many parts of this unit.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change

3. Off-Site Values

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	There is a private cabin ¼ mile north-northeast of the burn unit. Prescribed winds and containment lines are intended to keep fire from spreading in the direction of this improvement.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Vegetation adjacent to these sites would quickly recover should an escape occur. Should private lands and improvements become involved the consequences would be negative. Part of the Glipi Road, and access to Pickerel Lake, may be temporarily closed during portions of the burn if it is deemed necessary.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate <u>High</u></i>	Protection of the off site private cabin in the event of an escape would require a high skill level due to limited access and fuels adjacent to the structure.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Prescribed winds are intended to prevent an escape from spreading in the direction of the private land and cabin reducing the technical difficulty.

4. On-Site Values

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	NA
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	NA
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	NA
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	

5. Fire Behavior

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Fuels are uniform on the site over mostly level ground. There are small isolated areas where torching could occur in pockets of balsam fir or spruce. Fire behavior is predictable over the majority of the site.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: Low Moderate <u>High</u>	Fire outside the unit boundary would be more intense than within the burn unit based on visual observations and from the BEHAVE runs done for this site.
Final Rating: Low Moderate <u>High</u>	To decrease intensities prescribed wind speeds were reduced and a J5 will be utilized to allow direct attack should a spot occur. This does not change the fact that intensities will still be higher outside the unit boundary and care will need to be exercised working a spot fire.
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Personnel safety can be obtained with standard fire safety procedures. Spot fires are expected to be able to be controlled by on site personnel by direct attack methods.

Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change
---	-----------

6. Management Organization

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Staffing of the burn will require a burn boss, an ignition specialist and single resource bosses.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	Minimal supervision and communication problems are expected.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	The majority of team members are familiar with project objectives. However, this unit involves fuel types that some personnel have not worked in and ignition patterns that have not been utilized by some team members.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change

7. Public and Political Interest

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	The unit is small in size and has generated limited public interest. The smoke from the burn would be visible from the Fernberg Road.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	The unit is small size and posting of signs on the road identifying the burn would alert the public to the Rx burn.
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Adverse events would generate public or media interest. News releases would be needed.

Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No information position is needed for this burn. News releases would be routine in nature with normal public notifications.
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No change

8. Fire Treatment Objectives

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	Treatment objectives are easily achieved fuel reduction/site preparation. Desired fire behavior is readily obtained and manageable.
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	Other management opportunities to reach objectives are available for these sites. Other management objectives are dependent on the completion of this project.
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	Objectives are easy to obtain, however will require moderate fire behavior to achieve desired objectives.
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No change

9. Constraints

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	There are no constraints that are known for these units related to water use, equipment, fire lines, tactics, equipment or aircraft use.
Final Rating: <i>Low Moderate High</i>	No change

Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Project can be initiated when it is in prescription.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Constraints do not prevent project completion.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change

10. Safety

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Safety issues are readily identifiable and typical of those found on most prescribed burns. Briefings will be able to easily cover those issues. There is little or no potential for adverse impacts to public health and safety.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	The potential for serious injuries to the public or firefighters is minimal.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: Low <u>Moderate</u> High	The safety issues on this burn are typical of most prescribed burns and can be mitigated with LCES. Travel to safety zones would require additional coordination, as safety zones are not immediately adjacent to the burn unit.
Final Rating: Low <u>Moderate</u> High	No change

11. Ignition Procedures/Methods

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Project site is small and mostly visible to the burn boss and/or ignition specialist. Firing sequences are not complex, however they will need to be carried out in a logical order.

Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	Firing sequences do not pose a safety concern to project personnel, compromise project completion or increase the risk of escape.
Final Rating: <i><u>Low</u> Moderate High</i>	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Firing methods are simple with a small ignition team. Drip torches will be used for ignition. Lighters will need to be aware of pockets of balsam fir and pay attention to their lighting patterns to reduce torching and spotting potential.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	No change.

12. Interagency Coordination

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate <u>High</u></i>	Project completion requires coordination with the Lake County Land Department along with burn day contacts. Assistance from USFS personnel will be needed to complete the project
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Coordination with Lake County complete. Lack of assistance from USFS personnel will delay project completion. Other partners can be contacted to assist with project completion.
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low Moderate <u>High</u></i>	Most project coordination can be completed ahead of time. However, assistance from federal partners could prevent project completion.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Contacting other partners for assistance can potentially mitigate lack of assistance from federal partners.
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Project requires an MOU with the Lake County Land Department. This burn is in the federal protection area will require coordination with the USFS along with their assistance in the completion of the burn.
Final Rating: <i>Low <u>Moderate</u> High</i>	Coordination with Lake County already completed. USFS will be aware of the burn as a result of regular burn day contacts lack of assistance on their part will require contacting other partners.

13. Project Logistics

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Project requires minimal logistical planning. Equipment is readily available and no special communication needs are required.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Logistical problems will not increase the likelihood for fire to escape control lines, affect project completion or create a safety concern.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Logistics will be handled at the local level. Supplies and personnel are readily available.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change

14. Smoke Management

Risk	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	Smoke concerns will be minimal due to small unit size and short burn duration. Smoke exposure or amounts are not expected to cause health or safety concerns to project personnel or the public. The public has expressed few or no concerns about smoke. Smoke management concerns can be easily mitigated.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change
Potential Consequences	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	The Fernberg Road is ¾ mile north of this unit however; distance and lift of smoke will produce minimal impacts. The Glipi Road is lightly traveled and smoke impacts should not be an issue. Smoke exposure of firefighters should be normal for most Rx burns.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change

Technical Difficulty	Rationale
Preliminary Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	There will be limited operational procedures needed to deal with smoke. These can be met with the prescription for wind direction and dispersal.
Final Rating: <u>Low</u> Moderate High	No change

COMPLEXITY RATING SUMMARY

RISK	OVERALL RATING <u>Moderate</u>
POTENTIAL CONSEQUENCES	OVERALL RATING <u>Moderate</u>
TECHNICAL DIFFICULTY	OVERALL RATING <u>Moderate</u>
SUMMARY COMPLEXITY RATING	<u>Moderate</u>

RATIONALE: This burn is relatively simple, however prescribed burning in this fuel type may be new to some of the personnel involved. Fire behavior outside the unit will be higher than within the unit and burning at the high end of the prescription will increase the likelihood for spotting. These factors along with the need for participation of federal or other partners place the burn in the moderate category.

Prepared by: ___ Date: _____