|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| State: | | | | | | | | Site: | | | |
| Date: | | | | | | | | Approved by: | | | |
|  ☐ High Consequence ☐ Not High Consequence | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overview:  The Consequence Analysis, *a required element of TNC Prescribed Burn Unit Plans*, evaluates the potential for financial loss or significant harm to TNC reputation or partnerships, should damage to third parties occur from escaped fire or from smoke. As part of the burn planning process, the Consequence Analysis identifies burns with characteristics that may result in a high level of exposure to financial or reputational loss from an adverse unexpected event. These *“High Consequence” burns will require the OU Director to be briefed on the burn prior to implementation.*  *For more information on filling in this element, see TNC document “TNC Complexity Analysis Guidance”.* | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Factor identified for planned burn areas | | | | CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS FACTORS | | | | | | |
| YES | | NO | | DESCRIPTION | | EXAMPLE | | | SITE CONDITIONS | |
|  | |  | | Offsite values High  Potential for significant damage claims due to risk to improvements or other fire sensitive resources in the area | | Highly flammable wildland fuels contiguous to high value (>$1,000,000) improvements, such as housing developments, historic buildings, high public use recreation areas, or commercial or industrial developments. | | |  | |
|  | |  | | Smoke sensitive areas  Burn Plan identifies one or more highly smoke sensitive areas that are not easily mitigated | | Hospitals, schools, major roads, airports or factories, each with low tolerance for smoke intrusion, nearby on multiple sides of a burn unit | | |  | |
|  | |  | | Public/Political sensitivity  Burn Is likely to attract significant negative public, political, or media attention; significantly aggravated by any unexpected or adverse event | | Burn to be conducted in area that has been impacted recently by damaging wildfire or escaped prescribed fire; or in an area with frequent hostile political/ community response to planned burning | | |  | |
| Secondary Factors | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ADDITIONAL FACTORS |  | |  | | Burn Complexity  A high degree of technical difficulty or the possibility for multiple adverse operational events or situations to occur | | Complexity Rating of High, after mitigation measures incorporated into planning | | |  | |
|  | |  | | Escape Containment  Contingency planning identifies high degree of difficulty in Initial Attack and containment of escaped fire | | Contiguous wildland fuels outside burn unit extend into neighboring lands with potential for rapidly moving wind-driven escaped fires and limited avenues for secondary containment or indirect attack of escaped fire; or Burn objectives Require burning under drought or other conditions typically regulated by burn bans or public burn safety warnings | | |  | |
|  | |  | | Residual Burning Fuels  Burn unit contains fuels with potential for prolonged smoldering combustion, resulting in extended potential for fire escape or smoke intrusions | | Burn unit contains peat, heavy slash, or other fuels that will likely ignite and burn for many days, weeks or even months | | |  | |
|  | |  | | Third Party Lands  Conservancy burn on third party lands where landowner is unwilling to provide liability waiver, indemnification to the Conservancy against third party claims, or possess adequate insurance | | Conservancy to burn on a farm as part of an ongoing private‐lands conservation project, but landowner does not have insurance and/or is unwilling to indemnify the Conservancy from potential damage claims resulting from the burn | | |  | |