

After Incident Report Lessons Learned Center

The purpose of the After Incident Report is to identify issues that occurred on an incident and how they were resolved. The lessons learned in the report will also be used to refresh or update training curriculums. Issues and trends that are identified may have Information Collection Teams assigned to them in the future for further analysis and resolution.

Type I – V Incident Commanders and Agency Administrators are requested to complete the following questionnaire for the incident(s) that they managed. Crews and single resources are also encouraged to complete the questionnaire for incidents they participated in:

Incident Name: Supply Creek #13 Dates of Assignment: 8/14-20/02

Unit or Jurisdiction(s): BIA Geographic Area: Hoopa Valley Tribe

Report Submitted by: Linda Szczepanik Phone Number: 530-333-4312

1. What was the most notable success at the incident that others may learn from?
 1. Worked with Tribal Council to develop evacuation plan.
 2. Taped a public service announcement that discussed evacuation.
 3. While complying with LCES and properly discussing risk and direct attack methods, held the fire in a position to keep it relatively small. Contingency planning and implementation of contingency lines aided to the confidence in suppression attack methods. Fire would have likely have grown to 3-5000 acres had direct attack been ineffective.
 4. The support given to the incident from Fortuna Dispatch.

2. What were some of the most difficult challenges faced and how were they overcome?
 1. Difficulty: Attacking fire with uncertainty about spot fire locations, size, burning intensity and potential during an inversion (high quantity of smoke and reduced visibility)
Mitigation: Established trigger point, posted lookouts, scouted and assessed spots from down canyon side before committing, used IR to validate. Did not rely on air support as tactical measure.
 2. Difficulty: Assuming IA responsibility on entire reservation 24 hrs/day, while statistically it was know that 80% of starts occur during the period of 1800-0400 hrs.
Mitigation: Staffed night shift as heavily as day for IA and as a separate Group assigned to the incident.
 3. Difficulty: Lack of FELB's on the Incident
Mitigation: Pulled FELB's off Type 1 Hotshot Crews to fill positions. Also tried 1-FELB to supervise up to 3 fallers. Lesson Learned: 1-FELB is only effective with 1-2 fallers. 3 fallers seem to create a difficulty with span of control.
 4. Difficulty: High public concern over smoke
Mitigation: A lot of public contact and press releases about fire activities, anticipated containment dates, health hazards of smoke, and the compounding effects of smoke drifting down from fires in Oregon.

3. What changes, additions or deletions are recommended to various training curriculums?
California Local Government continues to send individuals that they say are qualified for the position that was ordered. The individuals arrive and are not qualified, and don't have task books. This needs to be dealt with at the CA Office of Emergency Services level for California local government units. Make sure people are qualified using 310-1.
4. What issues were not resolved to your satisfaction and need further review? Based on what was learned, what is your recommendation for resolution? Using crews from Rocky Mtn area who are under M.I.F.F. agreement. These crews need to have crew reps travel with them, need to carry their agreements, and need to share pertinent information with the IMT they are working for early on in the incident.

Please submit this report to the Lessons Learned Center at the National Advanced Resource Technology Center (NARTC) attention Paula Nasiatka(pnasiatka@fs.fed.us or Fax 520-670-6413)

Thank you for completing the report. Others can learn from your experiences.